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ABSTRACT

This study examines the American mythmaking of late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Apache “renegades” and their post–Apache Wars counterpart the Apache “bronchos” in popular culture and memory. The idea of the “broncho” Apache created fear, insecurity, and cautionary folklore for residents of the American Southwest and northern Mexico from 1886–1930s. Over time, white appropriations of Apaches in literature, film, and pop culture would evolve from the murderous wild “savage,” to the sympathetic anti-hero, to the hero. This thesis connects representations of Apaches with contemporaneous American attitudes on race, masculinity, nostalgia. Although portrayals of Apaches changed over time, an underlying theme of the American white male's gender and racial superiority remained in place—reinforcing images of manhood in the mythic West and failing to accurately depict historic Apache individuals and historical events.

The study, broken into three chapters, focuses on several mediums and aspects of Apache renegade/broncho mythologization. The first chapter largely centers on Massai, a historical Apache “broncho,” and newspaper, military, and first-hand white and Apache accounts from the “broncho period.” The second analyzes representations of Apaches in film and literature. And the third surveys the historiography of Apache “renegades.”
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A Note on Terminology

This paper largely examines white American perceptions and mythmaking of Apaches from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; in particular, the evolving image of the “renegade” Apache. Renegade is a loaded and problematic term, interchangeably meaning “traitor,” “rebel,” or “outlaw.” From 1860–1886, whites labeled Chiricahua Apaches who fled Arizona and New Mexico reservations and participated in activities deemed “hostile”—altercations with the U.S. military, raiding of settlements and ranches, and general resistance and evasion—“renegades.” From the Apache perspective, they were simply fighting to preserve traditional lifeways, and one can hardly be a traitor or outlaw from a government and society foreign and hostile to their own. For the purposes of this study, however, the term renegade will appear without quotation marks—unless specifically referring to terminology—as short-hand for this historic, and mythic, body of resisters. Similarly, the contemporaneous American term “broncho Apache” (wild or untamable Apache) will be used to refer to Apaches who continued to elude U.S. and Mexican forces in the post–Apache Wars period.

“Broncho” is an American misspelling of the Spanish term “bronco.” Because this study centers on American appropriations of other peoples and largely draws from American popular culture, I am deferring to Paul I. Wellman’s spelling in the title of his novel Broncho Apache (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1937).
Introduction

For the last one hundred fifty years, few historical groups have managed to captivate the imagination of people around the world as the Apache of the American Southwest. Under the leadership of the infamous Geronimo, their resistance to the U.S. military formed the last of the Indian Wars and spanned more than twenty-five years (1861–1886). At the time of Geronimo’s final surrender in September, 1886, the United States had deployed one-fourth of its standing army (5,000 men) to locate and capture his remaining thirty-five male “hostiles.”1 Subsequently, the U.S. government designated prisoners of war Geronimo and five hundred of his fellow Chiricahuas, including peaceful reservation Apaches and those who had served as U.S. scouts, and sent them to prison camps in Florida—then on to camps in Alabama and, finally, Oklahoma.

With Geronimo’s surrender, many Americans believed that the wildest component of the Wild West had been tamed, and that the Southwest was now safe for white “civilization” and the final consolidation of American expansion. Inhabitants of Arizona, New Mexico, and northern Mexico, however, continued to experience Apache “broncho” activity into the 1930s. Sensationalized tales of crimes perpetrated by these Apache “outlaws” created fear, insecurity, and cautionary folklore throughout the region. Although few in number, bronchos, such as the Apache Kid, Indian Juan, and Massai, made a lasting impact on the imaginations of local settlers, military men, and western writers.

---

1 These numbers vary slightly depending on the source.
According to American Studies scholar Richard Slotkin, “A myth is a construction of symbols and values derived from real and imaginary experience and ordered by the imagination according to the deepest needs of the psyche. . . . True myths are generated on a subliterary level by the historical experiences of a people.” Countless histories and ethnographies, memoirs, novels, biographies, films, and even comic books have recounted the Apache Wars, the broncho period, and the legendary individuals who participated in them. The mythologizing of these Apaches began as soon as the wars started. Newspapers and military figures marveled at renegade’s physicality and endurance, while decrying their bloodthirstiness, brutality, and “treachery.” Over the next one hundred years, American popular culture would portray renegades as everything from bloodthirsty terrorists to romanticized freedom fighters.

Apaches have predominately, however, played the role of the villain. Although other Native American tribes have experienced vilification in popular media and historical memory, film and cultural historians acknowledge that Apaches were cast as one-dimensional villains more frequently than other groups—such as the Plains tribes, who found themselves more often stereotyped as “noble savages.” As film expert Bob Herzberg points out, “When one thinks of the savagery of the marauding Indian onscreen, the Apaches almost immediately come to mind.” Historically, Apache

---


3 Definitions for “noble” and “ignoble” savages will be discussed at length in chapter two.

renegades were indeed fierce perpetrators of warfare, raiding, mutilation, and kidnapping, but this sort of violence was not uniquely Apachean. For example, Comanches, Blackfeet, Cheyennes, and Americans also committed such violent acts.

Apaches and their most well-known leaders—Cochise, Mangas Coloradas, Victorio, Chatto, and Geronimo—remain some of the most recognizable and celebrated Native American historical figures throughout the world. This thesis explores how American cultural memory changed characterizations of the mythic Apache warrior and the specific role the post-wars Apache broncho played in shaping or informing those perceptions. This paper argues that from the 1880s to the present, producers of media about Apache renegades manipulated—and were in turn manipulated by—personal and political agendas, racial perceptions, gender constructions, and cultural mythmaking. Each chapter examines textual and/or visual sources in the context of their time in order to determine how Apaches have been portrayed, by whom, and for what purpose.

Chapter One centers on the infamous broncho Apache Massai. He was a Warm Springs Apache sent east with his fellow Chiricahuas at the close of the Apache Wars in 1886. Unlike Geronimo and the others, however, Massai never reached Florida. Just east of St. Louis, Missouri, he jumped from the prison train and, incredibly, made the 1500-mile-journey back to the Mescalero reservation in New Mexico undetected. For twenty years Massai eluded capture in the New Mexico and Arizona wilderness, always staying one step ahead of the posses sent to find him. Iconic western figures such as Mickey Free, Tom Horn, Al Sieber, Frederic Remington, John Slaughter, Edgar Rice Burroughs, and the seventh and tenth cavalries all failed to bring him in. Locals blamed the outlaw every
time a murder occurred, a horse was stolen, or a woman was kidnapped. He became a phantom, a boogie man of the desert.

Although Massai’s legend found its way into local lore, newspapers, memoirs, frontier reminiscences, magazine articles, novels, and even a film, *Apache* (1954), no comprehensive scholarly work has been published detailing the events of Massai’s life. Despite the existence of a few military records, first-hand accounts, oral histories, census and reservation records, and newspaper reports, most surviving information about Massai’s activities is too thin, contradictory, or unreliable to fill a definitive biography.

For the purposes of this study, discovering what “really” happened to Massai is only significant insomuch as it helps uncover how others have interpreted his story and incorporated it into their own narratives and constructions. This chapter will draw from sources produced by journalists, military men, American locals, boosters, and Apaches. The rhetoric produced in these accounts illustrates anti-Apache agendas by the U.S. military and American residents of the Southwest, but also a glorification of masculine Apache and American warrior virtues. Some Apache sources attempt to justify broncho actions, while others offer more damning portrayals.

The “broncho” is the central figure of this paper for several reasons. First, the bronchos, such as Massai, carried the mystique of the Apache warrior forward into the twentieth century, long after every other Indian tribal group had been militarily defeated. Their presence in headlines into the 1930s encouraged nostalgic Americans to view Apaches as the last vestiges of a “vanished” people and “savage” wilderness. Second, Massai acts as a case study of a historical individual whose personae—co-opted by journalists, novelists, and filmmakers—changed with the times. Lastly, very little
historiography exists on these fascinating but forgotten individuals. Most works on Apaches make only passing reference, if any, to Chiricahuas living in the Sierra Madres after the wars, or to the mystery surrounding the fates of Massai and his fellow outlaw the Apache Kid.\(^5\)

The second chapter utilizes film, literature, and visual materials to analyze the evolution and significance of Apaches in mass popular culture. Four films in particular, *Broken Arrow* (1950), *Apache* (1954), *Ulzana’s Raid* (1972), and *Geronimo: An American Legend* (1993) are representative of cultural shifts in the depiction of Apaches, and will receive deeper analysis. This study attempts to build upon the work of Richard Slotkin, Paul Andrew Hutton, Phillip J. Deloria, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, Stephen Tatum, and Brian Dippie, among others, who find themes and characters in Westerns indicative of societal trends involving politics, militarization, race, class, gender, and American identity.

The third chapter surveys the historiography of the Apache Wars from 1900–2013 to better understand the role of the historian in influencing and reflecting perceptions of Apache renegades in the public imagination. This chapter, broken into three periods (1900–1970, 1970–2000, and 2000–2013), identifies broad trends, analyzes significant contributions to the subject, and assesses the state of the field today.

Too often, scholars cast the historical experiences and the cultural representations of Native Americans as one homogenous phenomenon. This study argues that Americans

---

\(^5\) In addition, the recent publication of William A. Clements’s *Imagining Geronimo: An Apache Icon in Popular Culture* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2013), renders another study of Geronimo in popular culture redundant, but an exploration of renegades generally and bronchos specifically offers fresh material to the field.
have stereotyped Apaches in ways unique or heightened from that of other Native groups. The casting of Apaches as the most villainous, formidable, and yet admired American Indian tribe in popular culture speaks to a mystique stemming from an American nostalgia for mythic western hypermasculinity, a deep-seated reverence for violence, and sense of racial superiority. Exploring how and why cultural memory mythologized the history of Apache renegades enables historians to understand better the role race, gender, and nostalgia plays in forming the American identity in the imagination of Anglo American males. This paper will also examine how these myths created ramifications for actual Native Americans, both in their place in American popular culture and in the policies enacted towards them.
We spared not the spur as to Duncan we went,
Though bronchos were jaded, their strength almost spent;
‘Twas the ride of a year from mines at Carlisle,
And we grudged the few moments that measured each mile;
So we dashed into town in a halo of dust,
Speechless, all fearful, with faint hope or trust.

For the place had been stripped of all who could fight,
And the cursed Apache had turned in the night;
He has doubled his trail as we hunted him down,
And the tracks of his teguas were set to the town.

We had gathered at Duncan the morning before,
A motely assemblage, some forty or more—
Cowboy and miner, and Yankee and Scot,
Tenderfoot, gambler, clerk and what not.

So we rode to the east at an easy jog trot,
And bragged what we’d do when Apaches we caught.

We picked up the tracks. They were moccasin shod,
And they led straight ahead quite across the broad
Dusty way that would take them to Duncan. Then
Like a whirlwind we rode, some forty odd men.

Not a man dared to speak for he fancied he knew,
For his brain was aghast with the picture he drew.

But at Duncan they watched. They looked to Carlisle
And they saw the far dust-cloud grow dense with each mile.

Then they acted, and wisely, for men there were three,
Two guarded the hamlet, one sat at the key
And ticked a brief message to Clifton for aid:

“Apaches are coming, they’re out on a raid,
Fire up your best engine, don’t wait a whole year;
For our wives’ sakes send help. My God, they are here:”

‘Twas a false alarm; ‘twas our halo of dust;
‘Twas an hour of wild fear in the Land of Mistrust

In the Land of Mistrust
—Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen, 8 January 1902
Chapter One

Stranger Than Fiction?

Massai and the Broncho Apaches in Historical Record and Memory

Figure 1 The train that took Geronimo (third from right) and his fellow Apaches East, September 1886.

For American residents of the Southwest in the late nineteenth century, Apache renegades were the scourge of the land. For evidence of this sentiment, one need not look any further than the daily rhetoric of Arizona newspapers. “Every valley swarms with the hostile barbarians,” cried the Tucson Arizona Weekly Star, “they pillage in all directions and kill at every opportunity.”6 “The red-blood hounds of destruction are on the trail of white people in Arizona, bent on appeasing their coyote passions for blood,” blared the Weekly Journal Miner (Prescott, Arizona).7 Not to be outdone, New Mexican organ the Albuquerque Democrat suggested a subtle new approach for white-Apache dialogue:

Bring the brutes in . . . bring them in front of the fathers who have lost little children at their savage hands; the husbands who have heard the wail of anguish as these fiends outraged and tortured [their] loving wives unto death most horrible . . . trot them before the gaze of the citizens whose lives they have made worthless, whose


manhood they have insulted, and then you will see what should and will be done with the howling devils whose eternal home is in the bottom-most pits of hell, and whose just desserts is the fire of everlasting damnation.\(^8\)

Perhaps the only thing the local press loathed more than Apaches was the ineptitude of the U.S. Army. “There ought to be an investigation of the late campaign against the Arizona Apaches. . . . Pains of anguish of captives are crying up to high heaven against the imbecility of the late so-called campaign against the fleeing hostiles, who were pressed just hard enough to drive them across the border into a friendly state, and not sufficient to kill or capture any renegades,” wrote the \textit{Tombstone Epitaph}.\(^9\) “The Indian situation in this Territory is a shame and disgrace to the country,” concurred the \textit{Tucson Arizona Weekly Star}, “The spectacle of a few hundred savages setting at defiance of the power of a great government, is humiliating to the last degree.”\(^10\)

Fed up with embarrassing military campaigns, ineffective policies, and negligent reservation control, the public began to call for extreme measures. “The Government’s policy of dealing with [Apaches] is a derisive farce. . . . We say let us have a policy of our own . . . EXTERMINATION. Kill the Indians as the tigers and the wolves are killed.”\(^11\)

Although Apache genocide had its proponents in the Southwest, the country at large and the U.S. government favored a less drastic approach. A year before Geronimo’s surrender, mounting pressure from the public convinced Army Commander General

\(^8\) “What Shall be Done?” \textit{Albuquerque (N.Mex) Morning Democrat}, 3 March 1886, 4.


Phillip Sheridan and Secretary of War William Endicott to approve a policy of permanent eastern exile for any hostile Apaches who surrendered. In the months that followed, this policy would not only pertain to those deemed “renegades,” but hundreds of peaceful Apaches and loyal U.S. Army scouts. Although few Apaches at San Carlos and Fort Apache reservations counted Geronimo as a friend, white Americans considered them all guilty by association, and began to ship reservation as well as surrendered renegade Apaches to Fort Marion, Florida, in the spring of 1886. Weary of fighting and anxious to reunite with their exiled families, Geronimo and his small band finally surrendered first to Lieutenant Charles Gatewood, and then, on September 3, 1886, to newly appointed General Nelson A. Miles. Geronimo agreed to removal on the condition that it last only two years. Unfortunately for the Apaches, this agreement was not kept. Sheridan never agreed to two years, nor did President Grover Cleveland, and Miles knew it. Most Chiricahuas would never see their beloved southwestern homeland again.

On September 8, 1886, at Fort Bowie station, Geronimo’s band of Chiricahuas began the first leg of their journey to Florida. As the train pulled away from the depot, the post’s band struck up “Auld Lang Syne.” Throughout the Southwest, jubilant onlookers gathered along the tracks to, as the Albuquerque Democrat put it, “say a final adios to

---


these demons with a feeling of great relief.”¹⁴ In their revelry, they surely never anticipated that one “demon” would come back.

**Prelude of an Outlaw**

I had the pleasure of meeting [Colonel Wade] at the depot at Albuquerque, and of seeing the long train loaded with the worst element that ever infested that country glide slowly past on its way to the East. Thus far Colonel Wade had not lost a single Indian and did not lose one until he was east of the Mississippi River. Just after they passed St. Louis one Indian contrived to make his escape from the train, despite all the precautions that had been taken. True to his wolfish nature, he succeeded in avoiding the settlements and people who would likely arrest him, and though it took him a year to work his way back to the San Carlos reservation, he finally succeeded in doing it.¹⁵

–Gen. Nelson A. Miles

This “wolfish” individual was Massai, a Warm Springs (Chihenne-Chiricahua) Apache, born in western New Mexico around 1847.¹⁶ According to his daughter Alberta

---


Begay, Massai’s youth was spent training for survival. His father taught him how to use “the bow and spear; to go a long time without food or water,” and “to run long distances.” Under the leadership of the great warrior-chief Victorio and Warm Springs leader Loco, Chihennes engaged in raiding and warfare throughout the 1860s and 1870s (Massai’s participation in these forays is unknown). Many warriors—including, at times, Victorio, Loco, and others—also led a peaceful reservation existence. Although the Chihennes were placed at several agencies, they preferred their ancestral lands at Ojo Caliente Reservation in New Mexico. Despite their pleas to remain there, in 1878 U.S. troops on orders from the Indian Bureau, forcibly removed Chief Loco’s band, including Massai, from Ojo Caliente to San Carlos Reservation in southeastern Arizona.

By all accounts, life at San Carlos was unpleasant. Far from the cool waters and lush mountain oases found in traditional Apache landscapes, San Carlos was a hot, flat, barren wasteland. Many bands of the 5000 Apaches crowded on the reservation were traditional enemies, creating an atmosphere of “hostility and distrust.” Corruption among reservation employees and internal bickering between the federal Indian service and the

2001), Mickey Free ephemera file, Arizona Historical Society at Tucson [hereafter AHST].

For a helpful anthropological breakdown of the four bands of Chiricahua—Chihennes, Bedonkes, Chokonen, and Nednhis—see Sweeney, From Geronimo, 17–18.

military were ever-present. And practices such as alcohol consumption and hunting were either prohibited or closely regulated.

Under these harsh and monotonous conditions, many Apaches decided to enlist as U.S. scouts or Indian police. Although some Apaches viewed the act as traitorous, most did not and becoming a scout had many advantages. Banned from raiding and warfare,Apache men needed an outlet to exert their energies, perform traditional cultural roles, and escape boredom and, most importantly, San Carlos. Scouting allowed young males to train for adulthood and gain responsibility. In addition, there existed historic intertribal rivalries between many factions. Western Apaches, for instance, had old feuds with the Chiricahuas; and now they received aid and pay to kill and capture their adversaries. Many Chiricahua Apaches also resented Geronimo and his followers. Ramifications were often brought upon reservation Apaches because of the actions of those still fighting. They felt that peace and accommodation were keys to physical and cultural survival.

---


Perhaps one or more of these reasons compelled Massai to enlist as a scout for the U.S. Army and participate in the campaigns against Chief Victorio in 1880.\textsuperscript{20}

Like Apache renegades, the Apache scouts have earned distinction in American history and popular culture for their extraordinary physical endurance, tracking, and survival skills. Historian Thomas W. Dunlay writes: “No Indian scout units achieved more contemporary and historical fame or generated more controversy than the Apache scouts of Arizona. They have been the subject of more detailed study than other scout units, and have figured more prominently in histories of Indian wars. . . .The Apaches have become an American myth; both formal history and popular entertainment have depicted them as fierce, cruel, implacably warlike, and diabolically cunning.”\textsuperscript{21} The use of scouts to find “hostile” Apaches during the wars is well documented, and two in particular, Kayitah and Martine, are credited with locating Geronimo and facilitating the peace talks with Lieutenant Gatewood that would end the war.\textsuperscript{22} Even in the years after the wars, the U.S. Army continued to employ scouts to help track down broncho Apaches. In 1891 Lieutenant Powhatan H. Clarke hailed the bronco-tracking skills of Native scouts who “hunt these wild criminals” with the “precision of a sleuth-hound.” He

\textsuperscript{20} On Apache scouts, see Thomas W. Dunlay, \textit{Wolves for the Blue Soldiers: Indian Scouts and Auxiliaries with the United States Army, 1860–1890} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), chap. 10.

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 165.

\textsuperscript{22} For Kayitah and Martine’s account of Geronimo’s surrender see Eve Ball, \textit{Indeh: An Apache Odyssey} (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), chap. 20.
had “seen them perform feats” akin “to the most thrilling narrative of Fennimore Cooper.”

At San Carlos, Massai married a Chiricahua woman and they had two children. In May 1882, he was returning from a scouting mission in New Mexico to San Carlos by train when he heard that a war party led by Juh and Geronimo had slipped onto the reservation and forced the Warm Springs band, including Chief Loco and Massai’s wife and children, to flee with them back to their camp in Mexico. One of the most commonly cited sources on Massai is Jason Betzinez, a Chihenne Apache warrior who dictated his memoir, *I Fought with Geronimo* (1959), at the age of 99. According to Betzinez, “Massai jumped from the train and, eluding capture in a country infested with troops who were following runaways, headed south for the Sierra Madres. He succeeded in finding our band while we were camped on the brink of the great canyon where he was happy to be reunited with his family.”

Research by historian Edwin Sweeney suggests, however, that a different scout jumped

---


from the train on May 12, and Massai was ordered to retrieve him. Unsuccessful, Massai returned to San Carlos, where he was discharged the following week. Ten days later, Massai left the reservation and found his family in Mexico. Either way, Massai disliked life with Geronimo in the Sierra Madres, and subsequently stole Betzinez’s horse and took his family back to San Carlos. Betzinez, who knew Massai well because they were members of the same band while on the reservation, described Massai as a “restless individual [who] could not stay very long in one place.”

Evidently this was the case. Betzinez alleges that in 1885 at Fort Apache reservation, where Massai’s and Geronimo’s bands had been relocated, Massai broke out with Geronimo and others. After a few months, though, Massai grew tired of the warpath and returned to Fort Apache and his family. This reunion did not last long. When Geronimo and his renegades surrendered the following September, Geronimo, Betzinez, Massai and his family, and five hundred other Apaches boarded the prison trains bound for Florida. So ended the Apache Wars, and began Massai’s rise to infamy.

Somewhere just east of St. Louis, Missouri, perhaps as the locomotive slowed to make a turn, Massai quietly slipped from the train and found himself alone, in a foreign land, fifteen hundred miles from home. Nearly everyone he knew, including his wife and children, were now on their way across the country, never to return. No records chronicling Massai’s odyssey back to New Mexico and Arizona exist, but to appreciate

26 Sweeny, From Cochise, 239.
27 Betzinez, I Fought with Geronimo, 143.
28 Ibid., 143–44.
the feat Betzinez reminds us that “this Indian could not read printed road signs, did not
dare ask questions, had no map, and had never been in this country before.”

Nevertheless, he (likely) traveled at night, navigated by the stars, and slipped through the
populated country unseen. From that point on, Massai lived as an outlaw in the
southwestern deserts, hunting, foraging, and raiding the population who thought they had
seen the last of the Apache renegades.

The Broncho Period

“The wildest goddam Injun I ever saw was th’ bronco Ma-si…I’ve known some tough
hombres in my time, but…th’ bronco was the toughest.” —Al Sieber, chief of scouts.

Newspaper and published military accounts were the first mass cultural influence
on perceptions of Apaches. As we have seen, these largely negative images, often
portrayed renegades as bloodthirsty animals rather than human beings with justified
grievances. “Atrocity” stories (whether true, false, or exaggerated) especially benefitted

29 Ibid., 144. Chief of Scouts Al Sieber was similarly in awe: “It is a midnight prowl of a
human coyote through a settled country for twelve hundred miles, the hardihood of the
undertaking being equaled only by the instinct which took him home.” Frederick
Remington, “Massai’s Crooked Trail,” in Crooked Trails (fac. 1898, New York: Bonanza
Books, n.d.) 84. This story originally appeared in Harper’s New Monthly Magazine
(January 1898). In the 1950s, Begay gave an account of Massai’s journey, which was
passed down from her mother. Her story, however, is inconsistent with all other known
information about the incident. These discrepancies will be discussed later in this chapter.
For Begay’s account see Ball, Indeh, 251–53; and Ball and Begay, “Massai-Broncho
Apache.”

30 A. Kinney Griffith, Mickey Free, Manhunter (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1969),
195. Kinney was born in Arizona Territory in 1897, and knew famous Apache Wars
figure Mickey Free. Although he purports his book as fact, there are many historical
errors, and only a handful of citations. Sieber’s undocumented quote is an example of
broncho mythmaking—whether by Sieber or Kinney.
the military and government by swaying public opinion against the Apaches, and
swelling military budgets. By the end of the Apache Wars, however, the exploits of
Geronimo and other renegades began to capture Anglo American imaginations in more
adulatory ways and the press began to offer a dual narrative.\(^{31}\) The Apaches were still
seen as the most ruthless and formidable Native foe the United States had ever
encountered, but their endurance and strength in the face of overwhelming odds also
inspired admiration among Americans and generated mythologizing by the media and
military personnel alike.

On September 8, 1886, the same day Geronimo boarded his train for Florida,
Indian Commissioner John Atkins proclaimed, “There has not been a warrior like
Geronimo since the days of Rob Roy. His barbarous heroism and endurance are
unsurpassed by anything in history.”\(^{32}\) In his memoirs, General Miles asserts, “The
Indians that surrendered with Geronimo have probably never been matched since the
days of Robin Hood.”\(^{33}\)

Comparisons of Geronimo and his renegades to Rob Roy or Robin Hood and his
Merry Men illustrates two important dimensions of white men mythologizing Apaches.
First, it implies an admiration for emblematic masculine virtues such as martial acumen,

\(^{31}\) William M. Clements similarly argues that Geronimo’s image “wavered” between
highly negative and positive extremes, though not necessarily chronologically. William
M. Clements, *Imagining Geronimo: An Apache Icon in Popular Culture* (Albuquerque:
University of New Mexico Press, 2013), 4–5. For the military’s use of Geronimo in
atrocity stories, see ibid., 57–70.

\(^{32}\) “A Remarkable Indian,” *Argus and Patriot* (Montpelier, Vt.), 8 September 1886, 2.

\(^{33}\) Miles, *Personal Recollections*, 525.
violence, vitality, and independence on such a level that it transcends the barbaric “savages” into the realm of legendary white heroes who fought for noble causes. Second, these exaltations reaffirm Anglo American masculinity by simultaneously excusing the U.S. military’s humiliating ineptitude in apprehending this small band of outlaws for twenty-five years, and emphasizing the superiority and manliness of the white race in that they did (finally) “tame” (and thereby emasculate) such supermen.

With Geronimo vanquished, the army and press turned their attention to the last remnants of the Indian Wars, the Apache bronchos. The most famous was the Apache Kid. The Kid (Has-kay-bay-nay-ntayl), a U.S. Apache scout–turned–fugitive, was accused of murdering, robbing, and kidnapping scores of Americans, Mexicans, and Native Americans across the Southwest. The Kid initially assimilated into Anglo American culture well: he spoke English, wore white men’s clothing, distinguished himself as first sergeant in the scouts, and became one of Chief of Scouts Sieber’s favorite recruits. As an Aravaipa, he was not sent east with the Chiricahua scouts but remained on active duty at San Carlos after Geronimo’s surrender. In 1887, however, a series of tragic events transformed the Kid from officer to outlaw.34

That summer an old family rival, Gonizzie, murdered the Kid’s father. As per tribal custom, the Kid then killed the man’s brother, Rip, in an act of retribution—the Kid was highly intoxicated from tiswin (an alcohol made from corn) at the time.35 Afterward, Robinson, Apache Voices, 79–85; and McKanna, Court Martial, 45–55.

35 The Major Crimes Act of 1885 dictated that Indians could no longer settle disputes by tribal means for seven major crimes: rape, assault, burglary, larceny, manslaughter, arson, and murder. For Apaches, this greatly affected long-held cultural practices of atonement and retribution.
the Kid and four companions attempted to surrender to Sieber, but a misunderstanding with an interpreter led them to believe they were about to be exiled to Florida. In the panic to escape, shots were fired, and Sieber suffered a bullet wound to the leg. The Kid fled, but turned himself in three weeks later. A court-martial found the Kid guilty of mutiny and desertion. Originally sentenced to death, General Miles managed to have his sentence commuted to ten years at Alcatraz Penitentiary. He only served one before his conviction was overturned in 1888. The following year, however, brought a new trial, new conviction, and a new sentence to be carried out at Arizona Territorial Prison in Yuma. As the wagon carrying the Kid and seven other Apache prisoners made its way toward Yuma, the convicts overpowered their guards, killed two, and escaped into the desert. The Kid was a hunted man the rest of his days.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{36} Like Massai’s story, the details concerning the Apache Kid episode vary by source. According to McKanna, the victim was his grandfather. I generally favor McKanna’s version of events, for he draws heavily on court documents as well as oral accounts, but the vast majority of other sources identify the victim as the Kid’s father. McKanna, \textit{Court-Martial}, especially 1–4.
As an “untamed” Apache, the Kid’s coast-to-coast press echoed much of the sensationalized headlines Geronimo experienced when he was a “hostile,” while incorporating some of the romanticized rhetoric found in post–Apache Wars media. An 1893 article for the *New York Times*—“‘Kid,’ the Apache Renegade: The Most Bloodthirsty Scoundrel in the Southwest”—deems the Kid undeserving of “sympathy” and accuses the outlaw of “never having any nobility or character,” but describes him as “handsome,” a “thinker,” and exhibiting an “individuality” and “self-reliance.”

Whereas physical descriptions of the Southwest’s most famous “Kid,” Billy Bonney, were unflattering in his own time, the media managed to compliment to the hated Apache outlaw (see fig. 5). Any concessions to the Apache Kid’s “handsomeness” or physical and intellectual abilities, however, were offset by the “terror” he struck in local settlers with his “lust for blood.”

---


39 Newspapers attributed many violent acts to the Kid without substantiating his involvement. For example, see transcriptions of *Globe Arizona Silver Belt*, 28 May 1892,
who fought for the freedom of their people, the escaped convict’s cause curried far less sympa-thy among contemporary white audiences: “He kills for the mere love of killing, and murders out of pure wantonness,” alleged the San Francisco Examiner.40

Broncho atrocity tales told by white residents of the Southwest, likewise, created and fanned fear, Indian-hating, and mythmaking for decades after the Indian Wars. As late as the 1920s, local lore circulated dubious stories about the Kid’s hanging children by their chins on meat hooks.41 Frontiersmen, such as Walapai Clarke, Ed James, and Walter Hearn, spoke to the press or wrote manuscripts detailing their skirmishes with and narrow escapes from the Kid and other bronchos.42 Folklorist William A. Clements

---

40 “An Indian Ishmael,” San Francisco Examiner, 29 April 1894. This article features an interview with an unidentified Apache woman who claims to have accompanied the Kid on several raids, including one in which he murdered a white woman and young boy, and threw a surviving baby into a cactus bush. The title of the article, “An Indian Ishmael,” references the biblical character Ishmael, who was the disowned son of Abraham, and who became a “hostile” man who dwelled in the desert wilderness. God tells Ishmael’s mother, "Behold, you are with child . . . you shall call his name Ishmael . . . he shall be a wild man, his hand against every man and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell over against all his kinsmen.” Genesis, The Holy Bible, King James version (RSV), 16:11-12.


argues that “narrow escape” or “near miss” stories are meant to emphasize the teller’s own cunning and bravery for getting past the brutal Indian(s), as well as to establish his “credentials” as a genuine westerner. With the end of the Indian Wars, the “frontier” coming to a close, and the rise of an urban, industrial society, Anglo American males feared a creeping “delicacy and sentimentality” and compensated by resurrecting “images of vigorous, potent masculinity.” One response was to appropriate broncho Apaches as symbolic warrior foes to reinforce their own heroic masculine ideologies and fortify their racial superiority. The Kid (and Massai) easily fit into this role; historian Clare V. McKanna explains, “As a renegade, Kid became the Apache challenger to white domination and authority, the much-feared red avenger.”

By the early 1890s, five years after his daring train escape, Massai’s legend began to evolve in the press as well. In an interview with the New Orleans Daily Picayune in March 1891, Lieutenant Powhatan H. Clarke gave one of the earliest published accounts

____

43 Clements, Imagining Geronimo, 70–72.

44 McCall, Across the Great Divide: Cultures of Manhood in the American West, ed. Matthew Basso, Laura McCall, and Dee Garceau (New York: Routledge, 2001), 11.


46 McKanna, Court-Martial, 146. In 1893 the Arizona Legislature passed a bill authorizing a $5000 reward for the Apache Kid, dead or alive, but no one would ever claim the prize. “Telegraphic Brevities,” New York Times, 20 February 1893.
of Massai’s outlawry: “In 1887 [1886], when Geronimo’s band of Chiricahuas were banished to Florida, a member of it named Massey jumped from the train near Republican, Mo. . . . He found his way back to Arizona, where his first act was to slay a squaw and capture her daughter. . . . He was then a ‘broncho,’ and engaged in whatever evil deeds came to hand.” After the kidnapping, Lieutenant Clarke and a party of Indian scouts were tasked with hunting down Massai. Clarke claims that on the fifth day of searching, a scout in front of him suddenly yelled “look out” and dropped to the ground: “‘What is it?’ I asked, ‘Broncho’ was his laconic reply.” A bullet then “whizzed” past Clarke. By the time the scouts reached the depression from which the bullet came Massai had vanished. Another officer, C. S. West, told the Philadelphia Inquirer the following month that “Massey” was a “daring and desperate man.” West explains: “He spares no one. His own people are just as liable to slaughter at his hands as any white person.” West continues that Massai had been committing “horrible depredations” for years and the army has a standing order to take him dead or alive, but the troops could “never get near him.” West accused Massai of kidnapping “squaws” at gun point and then killing them after his “purpose was accomplished.” At the same time, West can admire that

47 “An Indian Fighter,” 2.

48 “Massai” often appears in military, newspaper, and popular accounts as “Massey,” “Masse,” “Ma-say,” and “Ma-si,” among others.
“Massey is a man of wonderful physical energies. His powers of endurance are marvelous.”

In “Massai’s Crooked Trail” published by Harper’s New Monthly in 1898, iconic western artist Frederic Remington cemented Massai’s mythic status with a colorful story related by Al Sieber. Remington—who had accompanied the Tenth Cavalry on its searches for Massai and the Apache Kid—began his story by asserting, “It is a bold person who will dare to say that a wilder savage ever lived than an Apache Indian, and in this respect no Apache can rival Massai.” Sieber recounted his decade-long search for this “terror of Arizona,” though he “never saw Massai but once, and then it was only a piece of his G string flickering in the brush.” The outlaw’s ability to elude capture bordered on the supernatural: “Massai manifested himself like the dust-storm or the morning mist—a shiver in the air, and gone.”

---


50 Remington, “Massai’s Crooked Trail,” 79–91. Army correspondence corroborates many aspects of this otherwise incredible story. For Indian scouts on “Mussay’s” trail,
Massai became a legend in the minds of whites and Apaches alike. Although Betzinez says when he knew Massai, he was “never considered . . . to be outstanding as a fighter. He was just an average Apache,” he concedes that Massai’s train escape and “outlaw” years “demonstrated . . . almost superhuman power.” U.S. Cavalry member Neil Erikson writes in an unpublished account that he was “more than once told by our Scouts that Massai was the fiercest warier [sic], and most daring among his tribe.” In 1892 Lieutenant William E. Shipp describes “Wassil” (Massai) as “a fine scout and the best hunter of all.” Generally, contemporaneous accounts of Massai presented him as

---


52 See Neil Erickson, “Some Facts about (Bigfoot) Massai Said by Indian Scouts to have been the Most Fierce Warier [sic] of the Chiricahua Tribe of Apaches,” 1935, Neil Erickson Journal, Chiricahua National Monument files, ACC 1490 F-16, transcribed by Britt W. Wilson, 16 April 1999, BWC.

mythic figure who, in a modern-day analogy, would be considered a cross between the survivalist Jeremiah Johnson, the revenge-seeking Rambo, and the elusive Keyser Söze.

Although literary and newspaper portrayals of Massai evoked the Kid’s revered warrior/loathed criminal dichotomy, he was generally less vilified than the Apache Kid, for several reasons. First, even though they were both U.S. Army scouts, Massai’s mystique originated in his association with Apache renegades. The press referred to him as a member of Geronimo’s band, and he escaped a prison train carrying renegades east—a feat even the great shaman Geronimo could not accomplish. Granted, contemporaneous Americans greatly despised the renegades, but they also respected the Natives tenacity, endurance, and freedom. As a distinguished member of the Army scouts, and personal friend of Sieber and other white officers, the Kid was seen as a traitor—something American mythology deems unworthy of hero-worship. Second, the Kid escaped and traveled with several other bronchos. Although some evidence suggests Massai sometimes raided with others, including the Kid, his reputation was that of a “lone wanderer.”54 Surviving for so many years on his own reflected the American ideal of the self-sufficient “rugged individual,” while incorporating romantic archetypes such as “the man in the wilderness” and the “lone desperado.”55 Third, Massai had an advocate, his daughter Alberta Begay—and by extension Eve Ball—to render a “nobler” broncho in revisionary histories during the second half of the twentieth century.56 The

54 H. B. Wharfield, *Apache Indian scouts; Service in Arizona and Mexico against Renegade Apaches* (El Cajon, Calif.: n/a, 1964), 45.

55 These motifs will be discussed further in chapter two.

56 See Ball, *Indeh*, chap. 10.
Kid’s death is a mystery. He may have died of disease in the Sierra Madres, or from wounds in a skirmish with Mexican troops in 1890, or continued to raid and live in northern Mexico well into the 1920s.\(^{57}\) In any scenario, no acquaintance or advocate came forward to popularize his side of the story.\(^{58}\)

Whether Massai kidnapped, raped, and murdered multiple Native women is perhaps the most controversial aspect of his legend. Contemporary American sources certainly support these accusations.\(^{59}\) According to General Miles, “like a hyena,” Massai “occasionally stole down upon the Indian camp at San Carlos, captured an Indian woman,

---

\(^{57}\) According to author and former Tucson police officer Lorenzo D. Walters, the Kid’s wife told her people the Kid died of tuberculosis in the Sierra Madres in 1900. Lorenzo D. Walters, “Tombstone’s Yesterdays,” manuscript, 1928, file 9, MS 843, AHST. A Mrs. Geo. F. Kitt says, “Most everyone believes [the Kid] died of decease [sic].” Kitt to Mr. L. S. Kinder, letter, 14 August 1929, Apache Kid ephemera file, AHST. McKanna believes the various stories claiming that the Kid lived into the 1920s in Mexico. Maureen Cavanaugh, “SDSU Professor Chronicles Apache Kid,” transcript of radio interview, 19 August 2009, KPBS, accessed at http://www.kpbs.org/news/2009/aug/19/sdsu-professor-chronicles-apache-kid/. See also, Robinson, Apache Voices, 83–85.

\(^{58}\) Recent historiography, however, such as Mckanna’s \textit{Court-Martial of the Apache Kid} (2009) offers a narrative more sympathetic to the Kid. In 1952 a woman claiming to be the Kid’s sister came forward and said “he was a good brother” and he “never killed any white men.” Her story, however, did not catch on the way Begay’s did. “Tells Reason for Brother’s Killings,” \textit{Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen}, 19 November 1952.

\(^{59}\) Arizona Ranger, cowman, and writer William Sparks claims that he went to “the reservation and saw the three squaws who are still living” who were kidnapped by “Kid and Massey.” He claims that he “got all the story from them that any white man can get.” Sparks to Maj. C. B. Gatewood, letter, 14 January 1926, letter 175, reel 7, Gatewood papers, 1883–1955, AHST. For further examples, see Rivers to Post Adjutant, 29 August 1894; Edwin Vose Sumner to Adjutant General Demoy[?], letter, 17 February 1896, Fort Grant, Arizona, Letters Sent 1896, part 5, RG 393, NA, transcribed by Wilson, BWC.
carried her back up into the mountains, kept her for several months then cruelly murdered her.”

In the fall of 1890, a White Mountain Apache girl named Natastale was kidnapped and her mother murdered while they picked walnuts. Al Sieber sent a posse including one of his most skilled and famous scouts, Mickey Free, on the trail, but they failed to find anything but moccasin tracks. (According to several sources, Massai had a large, distinct foot print for which he received the nickname “Bigfoot.”) In the spring, the girl rode into Fort Apache “on a fine horse.” Once she had recovered from exhaustion, she told Sieber her story. Massai had taken her deep into the Sierra Madres. Although he initially threatened to kill her and kept her bound so she could not escape, he quickly grew fond of Natastale and they “lived as man and wife.” He told her of his

---

60 Miles, *Personal Recollections*, 529.

61 Powhatan Clarke to Post Adjutant, letter, Fort Bowie, Arizona, 26 January 1891, Fort Bowie Letters Received, part 5, RG 393, NA, transcribed by Wilson, BWC.

62 See Erickson, “Some Facts about (Bigfoot) Massai.”

63 Remington, “Massai’s Crooked Trail,” 84–87. According to an account written in 1935 by former U.S. cavalry man Neil Erikson, Massai abducted an Apache woman in the winter of 1886 or 1887, and she returned to San Carlos pregnant three years later. She told an Indian Agent that Massai let her go so she could be “properly delivered.” Erikson also recounts several instances of robbery and murder attributed to Massai, and of futile searches to find him. Erickson, “Some Facts about (Bigfoot) Massai.”
escape from an eastbound train, and how he had “made his way alone back to his native deserts.” True to his restless reputation, Massai eventually became tired of Natastale. She said his “heart got bad,” as it sometimes did before he went into “the bad country” to murder Mexicans, and he announced it was time to kill her. Natastale pleaded with him, and eventually Massai decided to return her to the reservation instead. Before they parted he instructed Natastale to inform “the white officer [that] he would come again and get another.”

Undisputedly, Massai did come back for at least one other woman. One day in a canyon at the Mescalero Reservation in New Mexico, Massai approached a group of women picking nuts. He kidnapped one, a seventeen-year-old married mother of two named Zanagoliche. He took her deep into New Mexico’s desert mountains, safe from the army’s pursuit. Although taken by force, tied up, and threatened, Zanagoliche willingly agreed to marry Massai, “for, despite all,” Begay explains, “she knew that Massai was a good man.” He “took good care of her” and they were “very happy

---

together.” Eventually the pair had six children, including Alberta Begay, and spent a dozen years living in wilderness areas of southern Arizona and New Mexico.

Massai’s daughter emphatically denies that her father took any women besides her mother, Zanagoliche. Furthermore, Begay claims her father only killed in situations when his family was in danger. Despite an arrest warrant for the murder of ranch hand Sabino Quiroz in 1889, and his alleged involvement in multiple kidnappings from San Carlos during 1887–1890, Begay insists her father was wrongly accused. In Begay’s account, Zanagoliche’s kidnapping was one of her father’s first actions after he arrived back in the Southwest in 1887. Historians Eve Ball and Sherry Robinson privilege Begay’s version in their works on Massai. Robinson argues that “given Massai’s domestic obligations, it’s unlikely he would waste effort stealing [other] women.” She also questions how witnesses to Quiroz’s murder could have possibly known what Massai looked like. They likely accused him on the weight of his growing legend.

Military dispatches and correspondence, as well as frontier accounts demonstrate that perhaps dozens of Apache women were kidnapped during the broncho years. Although few broncho Apaches lived in the American Southwest (more resided in Mexico’s Sierra Madres) after 1886, there were enough simultaneous actions over a vast

---

65 Ball, *Indeh*, 255–56. Zangoliche’s fondness for her captor may suggest a cultural aspect in Apache relationships between men and women or could show the ability for adaptation by captive women.


area to suggest a multitude of individuals committed offenses that Americans and Natives attributed to Massai. Even Anglo “old timers” admitted years later that many killings “laid” to the broncho Apaches’ “credit” were “probably committed by white men.”

Nevertheless, Massai became a convenient scapegoat, and the accusations only added to his legend. In an *American Mercury* article about Massai from 1953, author Morgan M. Miles remarked: “A murder committed one evening would be followed by another in the morning, so far removed from the original crime that for months scouts and officers could not believe they had been committed by the same man. . . .Only gradually . . . did scouts come to realize that Massai possessed unequalled human endurance.”

Most significantly, Massai and the Apache Kid were often mistaken for each other, and the media, military, and locals constantly conflated the details of their respective stories. Even decades after the broncho period, writers and residents recalled the life, death, and escapades of the “Apache Kid,” who jumped from Geronimo’s train

---

68 “Killing of the Apache Kid Recalled by Old Timers,” *El Paso (Tex.) Herald*, 8 October [1927], Apache Kid ephemera file, AHST.


70 In Grenville Goodwin and Neil Goodwin, *The Apache Diaries: A Father-Son Journey* (Norman: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), Neil Goodwin writes: “Often referred to as New Mexico’s Apache Kid, Massai is frequently confused with the real Apache Kid,” (p. 214). In my research, however, I have not come across any primary or contemporaneous secondary sources identifying Massai as “New Mexico’s Apache Kid.” Goodwin is likely referencing a paper written by independent historian Karl Laumbach from 1993, cited in *Apache Diaries*’ notes. Karl Laumbach, “Massai (New Mexico’s Apache Kid),” presented at the annual meeting of the New Mexico Historical Society, 23 April 1993. My thanks to Mr. Laumbach for sharing this paper with me.
and/or lived in the wilderness with his kidnapped Mescalero wife and their children. In an 1894 army report, Lieutenant W. C. Rivers of the First Cavalry details his pursuit of “Massay” after the Apache reportedly stole a woman near White River, Arizona. What convinced Rivers and his scouts that the abductor was Massai is unclear. Rivers stated: “That we were on the trail of some miscreant is certain. The Indians say it was Massay. They first reported it was the Kid but I can scarcely believe that.” The kidnapped woman was found abandoned by her captor the following day, but the broncho’s trail had gone cold. In December of 1892, a woman claiming to be the Kid’s wife surrendered at San Carlos. She admitted that the Kid’s band had committed “many murders that have been charged to others.” Compounding the confusion, the Kid and Massai likely knew each other.

---

71 For example, many newspaper articles detail the death of “the Kid,” although they are actually describing Massai, as evidenced by the presence of Zangoliche and her children in the pieces. Marc Simmons, “Death of the Apache Kid,” El Defensor Chieftain (Socorro, N.Mex) 30 January 1999; “Killing of the Apache Kid Recalled by Old Timers”; Mrs. Tom Charles, “Woman Kidnapped by Apache Kid and Forced to Wed Him Dies: Story of His Life Revealed,” El Paso (Tex.) Herald, 15 February no year [c. 1932]; and Art Leibson, “They Tracked ‘the Kid’ and Lived to Tell About it,” El Paso (Tex.) Times, n.d.[c. 1950s], Apache Kid ephemera file, AHST. These last clippings appear without dates, but the article on Zanagoliche likely appeared in her death year, known to be in the 1930s. She disappears from Mescalero Reservation rolls in 1932. Indian Census Rolls, 1885–1940, Mescalero, r. 254, M595, NA, transcribed by Wilson, BWC.

72 Rivers to Post Adjutant, 29 August 1894.

73 “Apache ‘Kid’ Deserted by His Wife,” New York Times, 12 December 1892, 4. This woman supplied information to U.S. troops for the their man-hunt, see R. B. Wallace to Maj. Thos McGregor, letter, 29 December 1892, Rucker Canon, Arizona, Letters Received 1890–1894, Part V, Fort Bowie, RG 393, NA, transcribed by Wilson, BWC.

The Kid initially traveled with a small band of bronchos, although sources conflict over how long. In an 1892 report, a U.S. cavalry detachment engages and chases after a group of bronchos headed by, it claimed, the Apache Kid. Capt. [William H.] Powell, telegram, 22 November 1892, Fort Bowie, Arizona, Letters Sent 1890–1892, part 5, RG 393, NA, transcribed by Wilson, BWC. Operations to find the Kid’s band intensified in the fall/winter of 1892, see New York Times, 20 November 1892, 4.
other as scouts (see fig. 3), and some evidence suggests they rode together at times throughout the 1890s. In particular, army officers claimed both Apaches were present at skirmishes located in Guadalupe Canyon in May 1896—these fights mark the last U.S. military engagement with Apaches.\footnote{Britt W. Wilson, “Guadalupe Canyon: the Army’s Last Fight Against Apache Indians in Arizona,” unpublished manuscript, 1999, BWC; and Remington, “Massai’s Crooked Trail,” 90–91.} Famed Tombstone, Arizona, sheriff John Slaughter participated in the campaign, and although the Apaches escaped, witnesses believed that Slaughter may have fatally wounded the Kid.\footnote{Slaughter adopted a baby girl (Apache “Patchy” May) left at the scene, whom he believed to be the daughter of the Apache Kid. She tragically died four years later from severe burns after her dress caught fire. For the Apache May story, see “Mathilde and Theo Hampe Their Book,” n.d., Mathilde Hampe Papers, 1897–1917, MS 0324, AHST; and Victoria Smith, \textit{Captive Arizona, 1851–1900} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), 176–82. For a description of the Guadalupe Canyon engagement, see E. V. Sumner to General Wheaton, telegram, 9 May 1896, Fort Grant, Arizona Territory, U.S. Records of Continental Commands, Fort Grant, RG 393 V, NA, transcribed by Wilson, BWC.}

Thus, regardless of scant hard evidence and many documented cases of mistaken identity, Americans accused Massai of being a monster who “stretched a woman dead if she did not please his errant fancy.”\footnote{Remington, \textit{Crooked Trails}, 89.} Although later writers and audiences reconciled Zanagoliche’s abduction with the idea of Massai as a converted family man (see for example, Sherry Robinson’s 2012 \textit{Wild West} article “Massai and Zanagoliche: An Apache Abduction Turned Enduring Love Story”), nineteenth- and early-twentieth-
century mythmakers had their own agendas for propagating broncho kidnappings as the last frontier captivity narratives.77

Captivity narratives are some of the oldest and most titillating “historical” narratives. Historians have commented that the hypersexualized nature of such accounts in popular media simultaneously promoted an erotic “thrill and sexual threat to white women and consequently a competitive sexual threat to white men.”78 Historian Victoria Smith contends that the infamous kidnapping of Olive and Mary Oatman in Arizona Territory in 1851 set the stage for a “captivity complex” from which Arizonans feared and demonized Apaches for generations. She quotes a young Oregonian boy, who “grew up hating Apaches” after he saw Olive Oatman, freed in 1856, at a speaking engagement. Ironically, the Oatman sisters were actually kidnapped by Yavapai and Mohave Indians, but Olive’s biographer, Royal B. Stratton, insisted on referring to her captors as the more fearsome “Apaches” in The Captivity of the Oatman Girls (1857).79 Smith explains that scholars now cite the Oatman biography and similar texts as perpetuating the “suspicion among whites that Native American males were ‘naturally inclined to sexual violence.’”80


80 Smith, Captive Arizona, 23–24.
In reality, rape was an uncommon and taboo practice among Apaches. Abductions of women (mainly Mexican and Native) during raids did occur, however, in order to replenish populations and exact retribution for attacks on Apaches.81

Although kidnapping allegations such as Miles’ and Sieber’s against Massai did not romanticize the abductions’ sexual overtones, they promoted the stereotypical connotation that Native males are violent toward women.82 This depiction provides a Anglo men useful plot point for it lets them express heroic manly virtues as rescuers—or, in Massai’s case, attempted rescuers—of “damsels in distress,” while reaffirming their gender role as protector of women. In reality, captivities of white, Mexican, and Native women in the Southwest often demonstrate women’s adaptability, agency, intelligence, and resilience.83

Sensationalized tales of abduction, rapine, and murder also provided fodder for proponents of anti-Indian policies. While the stated objective of U.S.-Indian policy in the

---


82 How this stereotype effects characterizations of Apache women will be discussed in chapter two.

83 For examples of such women, see Smith, Captive Arizona; Margot Mifflin, The Blue Tattoo: The Life of Olive Oatman (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); and S. C. Gwyne, Empire of the Summer Moon: Quanah Parker and the Rise and Fall of the Comanches, the Most Powerful Indian Tribe in American History (New York: Scribner, 2010).
late nineteenth century was to assimilate Indians into American society, many Anglos believed Indians could not be “civilized.” Some proponents of Indian extermination or complete subjugation pointed to the “Apache broncho” as evidence that Indian acculturation would fail. On April 28, 1891, C. S. West of the Second U.S. Cavalry spoke to a crowded room at the Colonnade Hotel in Philadelphia. “There is only one way to civilize or educate the Indian, and that is with a well-loaded shotgun,” he proclaimed. The Philadelphia native had recently arrived in the city after fourteen years stationed on the frontier, most recently at San Carlos. “I know that is not the popular idea in the East, but it is the conclusion many of us who have been out in the West contending with the copper-skinned rascals have been forced to accept.”

To illustrate his opposition to Indian education, West described the exploits of the “desperate assassin,” Massai, and the “most troublesome and dangerous Indian,” the Apache Kid. West incorrectly stated that the Kid had been educated at Carlisle Indian School—confusing him with another Apache “outlaw,” the “Carlisle Kid.” (The Carlisle Kid [Nahdeizaz] was a Carlisle Indian school-educated Apache who killed Lieutenant Seward Mott in 1887 over a land dispute at San Carlos. He was often misidentified as the Kid or Massai.) West argued that despite the Kid’s supposed assimilation, his “native

---

84 “Shot-Gun Policy.”


An 1894 article for the New York Times uncovers that the Apache Kid did not, in fact, attend Carlisle. “Supervisor of Indian schools Moss has sent a denial . . . that
instinct of blood and rapine dominates him.” “Education will not eliminate from the Indian [his] native devilry. . . . By developing his mental faculties you simply develop his capacity for greater mischief.” Resorting further into his scare-tactics, West warned: “We are going to have a serious outbreak among the Apaches at San Carlos. We are on the eve of rebellion. Now, mark my word . . . they are treacherous, devilish and thirsting for blood.”

Such sensational rhetoric characterizing Massai and other Apaches as hypersexual, hypermasculine, ultraviolent “copper-skinned rascals” suggests that race and gender played a significant role in the mythmaking of bronchos. But does the existence of anti-Apache attitudes invalidate historical accounts by whites and legitimize Begay’s version of her father’s story? Not necessarily. Begay says Massai took her mother shortly after he returned from the East, probably in the fall of 1887. Despite Sherry Robinson’s earlier support for Begay’s narrative, she admits in a 2012 article that Mescalero Reservation records still list Zanagoliche as a resident in 1889, and Robinson “had trouble reconciling Alberta’s account with San Carlos Agency records from 1887–1890 that describe Massai raiding and stealing women.”

Fred Crosby, superintendent of the cattle industry at Mescalero, was an agency employee at the time of Zanagoliche’s

‘Apache Kid,’ the notorious outlaw, was an educated Indian, which has been used as an argument against educating the red men.” “The Bad Indian Not Educated.” Other sources denying the Kid’s education are reproduced in Susan E. Lee, They Also Served (Los Lunas, N.Mex.: Self-published, 1960), chap. 6, BWC.

86 “Shot-Gun Policy.”

kidnapping, and describes the incident as happening in 1893 or 1894.\textsuperscript{88} This timeline leaves at least six years for Massai to commit at least some of the charges leveled against him, especially the kidnapping of Natastle in 1890. Over the 20th century, depictions of Massai’s violence would transform from deplorable atrocities to celebrated vigilante justice; but no version, save Begay’s, characterizes it solely as self-defense.

Another major discrepancy in Begay’s narrative is her claim that Massai did not escape the prison train alone, but fled with his childhood friend Gray Lizard. She describes their youth together in detail, their train escape and arduous journey home, and their parting ways once reaching New Mexico.\textsuperscript{89} Although authors of nonfiction and fiction alike have drawn heavily from the Begay interviews, they almost always omit Gray Lizard.\textsuperscript{90} Perhaps this is due to a lack of independent evidence. That problem, however, applies to other claims in Begay’s account that writers and historians accept as facts. Surely, the inclusion of a companion on the broncho’s epic journey would undermine Massai’s hypermasculine narrative and “lone wolf” archetype. One man against seemingly insurmountable odds: alone in a foreign land; hunted by the law; driven by the desire for freedom; relying on his own strength and wits for survival proves

\textsuperscript{88} “Killing of Apache Kid Recalled by Old Timers.”

\textsuperscript{89} Ball and Begay, "Massai, Broncho Apache," 6–9, 44; Ball, \textit{Indeh}, 248–263; and Robinson, \textit{Apache Voices}, 87–92.

\textsuperscript{90} In a 2008 historical novel, \textit{Massai: The Last Apache Outlaw}, author Grady E. McCright includes Gray Lizard in the train scene, but he does not jump off with Massai. Instead, he watches his old comrade escape, then thrusts his arm out the window and raises “his hand to signify his friendship and support.” Grady E. McCright, \textit{Massai: The Last Apache Outlaw} (Bloomington, In.: Iuniverse Self-Publishing, 2008), 8. Grady interviewed Begay in 1979, and counted Eve Ball as a friend.
considerably manlier than an endearing buddy tale. Nevertheless, Gray Lizard is conspicuously absent from the historical record.

As the most authoritative Apache account of Massai’s story, besides Betzinez’s autobiography, historians have utilized Begay’s interviews with Eve Ball as a counterpoint to white narratives rife with exaggerations. Although Begay indeed offers invaluable information about her family’s history, her story understandably exhibits biases and mythmaking as well. Begay was only four years old when her father was killed. Despite her young age, Begay claimed to have remembered the stories her father told her of his upbringing, legendary escape, and subsequent years in the wilderness. Her mother also ingrained these stories into Begay’s memory until her death in the 1930s. Certainly, Zanagoliche passed down what Massai purported to her as fact, what she experienced after 1893, and what she felt Alberta should know or believe about her father. By the time Ball interviewed Begay in 1955, the 53 year-old had seen her father and mother’s life fictionally portrayed in novel and motion picture form. Compelled to set the record straight, Begay relayed her own version of events. On Zanagoliche’s deathbed, Begay’s mother instructed her to “remember all the story. Your father was not a murderer . . . I want you to clear his name if you can.”

* * *

In early September 1906, nearly twenty years to the day Geronimo’s people boarded their eastbound-train, a posse consisting of local white men finally caught up with Massai in New Mexico’s San Mateo Mountains. The details of Massai’s death are as

91 Robinson, *Apache Voices*, 100.
varied as those of his life. Many accounts and secondary sources depicting his demise incorrectly identify him as the Apache Kid and/or his death year as 1907. Several members of the posse recalled the incident decades afterward—once they felt safe from legal ramifications—and Begay’s version substantiates much of their claims.\(^\text{92}\) By synthesizing these various accounts, Massai’s death proves less a mystery than legend would have us believe—although, similar to other western outlaws, the fate of his remains is a point of debate.\(^\text{93}\)

On 4 September 1906, in Chloride, New Mexico, rancher Charlie Anderson approached his friend Walter Hearn about tracking down whoever had just ransacked his house and stolen his horses. He believed the culprits were Indians, and Anderson was having trouble finding “anyone in Chloride willing to go.”\(^\text{94}\) Hearn agreed and the two headed for town to collect supplies and recruits. Once they secured cheese, crackers, sardines, and a substantial number of men (including Bill Keene, Harry James, Mike


\(^\text{93}\) Conspiracies still exist over the gravesites of Geronimo, Billy the Kid, Daniel Boone, and Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid.

\(^\text{94}\) Hearn, \textit{Killing of the Apache Kid}, 17.
Sullivan, Burt Slinkard, Charley Yaples, Ben Kemp, Ed and John James, Sebe Sorrells, Wesley Burris, and Anderson’s brother-in-law, Jim Hiller), the party headed for the San Mateos.95

The men were on high alert, for Indians had recently killed a local man named D. L. Saunders and stolen his gold watch, and the James’s ranch had also been raided a few days prior.96 After a couple days on the trail, a portion of the posse found Anderson’s horses and a recently active campsite. The men staked out the site until a man and boy approached at daybreak. According to Burt Slinkard, Bill Keene gave the men present (Slinkard, Sorrells, Sullivan) a signal and the four opened fire. The younger Apache, Massai’s son, escaped, but the infamous broncho suffered two fatal shots. Slinkard later told his stepdaughter: “I am not proud of my part in the killing. . . . We thought we were trailing a well-armed Indian renegade . . . but we searched his camp and found he did not have so much as one shell for his gun. I never liked to think of ambushing an unarmed man regardless of who it was.”97 In the campsite debris, the men say they found Saunders’ gold watch and other articles of raided goods.

Nearby, Massai’s family heard the gunfire and Alberta’s brother soon joined them and broke the news. They hid, but could see “the White Eyes building a big fire—a much bigger fire than was needed for cooking.” The next day, after the “White Eyes” left,

95 Ibid. Posse members vary by account; some were involved at different stages and in various capacities but not present when Massai was killed.

96 Kemp, Cow Dust and Saddle Leather, 214; and Kemp, “Ma-si, Alias Apache Kid,” 20–23, 56–57.

97 Lee, They Also Served, 53.
Zanagoliche and her son went to the campfire and discovered Massai’s charred bones amongst the ashes.\textsuperscript{98} Several sources claim the white men took a grisly trophy with them that day—Massai’s head. According to Ben Kemp, he found Keene boiling the head in an iron pot on his property a few days later (the men believed it belonged to the Kid, though they do not explain how they reached that conclusion).\textsuperscript{99} In an interview years later, Ed James claimed that “he had something to do with” decapitating “the bandit.”\textsuperscript{100} The mutilation of the body and confusion over the legality of the ambush prompted the men to take a vow of secrecy and forego any claims to the “Apache Kid’s” bounty.\textsuperscript{101} James revealed that “among the party were friends of Yaleman John Phillips, then publisher of American Magazine,” and through Phillips the boiled skull wound up in the possession of Yale’s Skull and Bones fraternal society.\textsuperscript{102}

This rumor is similar to conspiracies accusing presidential sire Prescott Bush and other Bones society members stationed at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, during WWI of stealing Geronimo’s skull and depositing it in the Skull and Bones’ clubhouse, or “the tomb.” Intriguingly, syndicated dispatches in the spring of 1907 report that a group of

\textsuperscript{98} Ball and Begay, \textit{Indeh}, 258–259.

\textsuperscript{99} Kemp, “Ma-Si, Alias Apache Kid,” 57.

\textsuperscript{100} Leibson, “Rancher Reveals 40-Year Secret.”

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid; and Kemp, “Ma-Si, Alias Apache Kid,” 57.

Chicagoans, including future Illinois congressman William Kent, killed “the Apache Kid” while vacationing in New Mexico the previous September. The group refused to specify who among them actually killed the Kid but announced their plan to gift the skull to Yale’s Skull and Bones society, of which they were members.\textsuperscript{103} The \textit{Tucson Daily Citizen}—well accustomed to tall-tales about Apaches—questioned the story’s veracity: “Arizona, like Chicago, loves to have its little stories. And so it is that at least eighteen heroes . . . have also killed Apache Kid. In certain of our fairest homes the soap holders and tobacco boxes are made of what is solemnly averred to be the skull of this bad Indian. If the Skull and Bones Society would like a stack of skulls of the Apache Kid it can get them here at wholesale rates.”\textsuperscript{104} Although the posse that gunned-down “the Apache Kid” [Massai] the previous September was not comprised of Chicagoans, it is possible the groups/incidents have a connection. Perhaps the Chicagoans stumbled upon Massai’s remains while they were hunting and snatched the burned skull, or knew Keene and took the trophy off his hands. When asked about the decapitation rumor, Slinkard scoffed: “Now that is an absolute lie. If the Kid’s head were cut off it wasn’t by the men that killed him.”\textsuperscript{105}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{103} “Outlaw Killed By Chicago Man ‘Apache Kid,’ with price on His Head, Shot Down,” \textit{Plain Dealer} (Cleveland, Ohio), 18 May 1907; “Apache Kid Killed Once More According to Chicago Yarn,” \textit{Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen}, 25 May 1907, 1; and “Skull for Yale New Apache Kid Notorious Outlaw, Killed by Chicago Huntsmen,” \textit{The Evening Time} (Pawtucket, RI), 18 May 1907, 1.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{104} “Apache Kid Killed Once More,” 1.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{105} Lee, \textit{They Also Served}, 53.
\end{flushleft}
After Massai’s murder, Zanagoliche took Begay and her siblings to the Mescalero Reservation. There Zanagoliche reunited with family members whom she had not seen since her abduction. Tragically, within the first year of reservation life, three of Begay’s brothers and sisters died from disease. Mrs. A. E. Thomas, a former teacher at the Mescalero Indian School, said, “The older children, accustomed to a free, animal-like existence, pined away and died.” Her brother Clifford was murdered as a teenager.106 Begay lived her last years in a retirement home in Alamogordo, New Mexico. She died in 1980, the same year Ball published her much-celebrated ethnohistory, Indeh: An Apache Odyssey, in which Begay’s interviews were prominently featured. Begay was among the last of her kind, an Apache born in the desert “wilderness,” daughter of a broncho. She experienced many tragedies during her long life, but she retained her voice and used it to tell her truth.

The Vanishing Apache

After Massai’s death, reports of broncho activity continued south of the border. These so-called “Lost Apaches” lived deep in northern Mexico’s rugged Sierra Madres, a traditional Apache retreat and stronghold. Rumors surfaced periodically to claim the Apache Kid was alive and well in the mountains. Others claimed Charlie McComas—a young boy kidnapped by the Chiricahuas in 1883—had become a white Apache chief, and led the last of the renegades on raids throughout Sonora. Similar to renegade stories

106 Robinson, Apache Voices, 100.
in the United States, these tales were prone to exaggeration and fictionalization. The most incredible story concerning these bronchos, however, happens to be true.

In October 1926 Apaches ambushed Mexican rancher Francisco Fimbres and his family in Sonora’s Bavispe Valley. They slit his wife’s throat and kidnapped his three-year-old son Geraldo—allegedly in retaliation for local Mexicans’ kidnapping an Apache girl. Consumed by revenge, Fimbres became “the maddened dark Angel of the Apaches.” He hunted and killed Apaches without discretion, cutting down “braves, squaws, and papooses.” In order to rescue Geraldo and mount a total assault on the remaining Apaches hidden deep within the Madres’ canyons and caves, Fimbres traveled to Douglas, Arizona, to put together a well-armed posse in 1929.

Local newspaper, the *Douglas (Arizona) Daily Dispatch*, picked up the story and began to promote the “Fimbres Expedition” as the “last great Apache hunt.” The expedition turned into a business endeavor for opportunists on both sides of the border.


By 1930 the Great Depression had hit the residents of Douglas, and the city’s Chamber of Commerce used the national attention garnered by Fimbres’s tragedy to promote the venture as a City Slicker-esque tourist experience. They advertised in national newspapers and sent invitations to “Gentleman’s clubs.” The New York Times Herald reprinted part of the expedition’s announcement:

The wild Apaches are now quartered in the Canyon of the Caves in the Sierra Madre mountains 168 miles from Douglas. . . . Now it is populated only with wild animal life and wild Apache Indians who hold captive the little Fimbres boy whose recovery the expedition hopes to bring about. Bears, bobcats, monkeys, parrots and many other animals and birds not commonly found abound here. Here in this vast expanse roam the remnants of the tribe of Geronimo, Cochise and the other Indian chieftains whose names decorate some of the bloodiest pages of the history of the south west frontier. Those are the things that hint the thrills that members of this expedition will experience and, withal, at small expense and but little danger, because without question the strangling tribe will be convinced of the advantage of surrendering the kidnapped boy when made aware of the force the expedition will present.110

Another advertisement promised, “The expedition will be composed of business men of as fine character as the Rough Riders and the objective will provide sufficient thrills to make it a pleasant memory for life.”111 One hundred-sixty volunteers from all over the country sent in the requisite $50 deposit to spend their summer camping, hunting, fishing, and murdering Apaches in the majestic scenery of “Old Mexico.”112


111 Meed, They Never Surrendered, appendix 2, 161; and Goodwin and Goodwin, Apache Diaries, 21–23.

112 “Officials Scent Publicity Stunt in ‘Expedition.’”
The practice of Wild West tourism was already in full swing by the late 1920s. Oregon hosted the Pendleton Round-up and Deadwood, South Dakota, Dodge City, Kansas, and Globe, Arizona, all held Frontier-days celebrations. In October 1929, Douglas’s neighbor—and rival in an ongoing battle for county seat—Tombstone began its annual “Helldorado” festival. Tombstone hoped tourist dollars would revitalize the depressed economy and secure their place as Cochise County’s government headquarters. During Helldorado the “town too tough to die” transformed back to its 1880s boomtown glory: townsfolk dressed as cowboys, prospectors, and pioneers; horses and wagons filled the streets; and actors recreated the gunfight at the OK Corral. In an instance of Western myth-meets-reality, at the height of the Fimbres affair, Tombstone decided to hire six Apache men from the reservation to dress in traditional garb and “ballyhoo” about the town. Although a proposal to have the Apaches chase a “terrified family through the streets” was rejected in 1929, the following year’s festival included Apaches massacring a wagon party.113

The Fimbres Expedition, of course, took this Old West nostalgia to another level. Far from historical reenactments and campy performances, the American men registering for the expedition wished to experience the mythic “regenerative” power of frontier violence firsthand.114 According to historian Laura McCall, “‘sheer dullness of urban-industrial culture’” and a “growing sentimentalization and feminization of American


114 For the concept of the frontier as a place of regenerative violence, see Slotkin, *Regeneration through Violence*. 
culture” (evidenced by prohibition, women’s suffrage, and protests against racial discrimination) prompted white males to embrace mythic, western-masculine archetypes as an “antidote to urban malaise.”

By attempting to embody the “Indian fighter” figure, these men—somewhat similar to the Apache scouts—sought to fulfill traditional and imagined gender roles; exercise their physicality; draw vitality from “justifiable” violence; reinforce their racial superiority; and, perhaps most importantly, escape the daily boredom and monotony of modern America.

A letter from prominent Arizona pioneer, businessman, and author of The Dread Apache (1916) Merrill P. Freeman to his friend William F. “Buffalo Bill” Cody in 1910 perfectly encapsulates this nostalgic, Turnerian sentiment over the end of the Frontier period:

The frontier life, my dear colonel, seems to establish a fraternal link between those who have had the good fortune to have enjoyed it. I say good fortune because those who have not already had the privilege have lost the opportunity. The frontier with its strenuous calls, its freedom from the conventionalities that hamper the old and settled communities, has passed never to return. A new generation of frontiersmen cannot spring up. In all the broad land, there is no longer the place for producing him. The buffalo has gone and the buffalo robe will soon only be found in the museum. The boned arrow, the moccasin, the tepee and the wigwam are going. . . . How at times, “A Call of the Wild” seems to take irresistible possession of me! The Wild West Show has my earnest wishes for a most prosperous season, but for all of its receipts, I would not surrender the glorious privilege of having been a part of that early life.

Coexisting with the fear of a vanishing masculinity, however, was the long-held but amorphous belief in the “Vanishing American.” As historian Brian Dippie explains in

115 McCall, Across the Great Divide, 5.

116 Merrill P. Freeman to Col. W. F. Cody, letter, 27 May 1910, AZ 215 Correspondence 1907–1915, UASC.
his classic work, *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (1982), nineteenth-century-white Americans believed Indians were a rapidly dying race. They felt sentimentality for the disappearing “noble savage,” but the vanishing American myth conveniently freed them from any real responsibility to save the Indians, for extinction was inevitable. By the turn of the century, however, Native populations began to rebound and Americans had to “deal with the unprecedented problem of a non-vanishing American.” Reformers now advocated for Indian assimilation through land allotments, education, and abandonment of tribal ways under the Dawes Act (1888)—an abject failure that disastrously led to the loss of two-thirds of Native land by 1934.

Not easily deterred from long-held mythologies, whites then shifted their concerns from a vanishing population to an Indian culturally vanishing under assimilation. This belief fueled a boom in anthropological work and “salvage ethnography.” Among those trying to record Indian culture and history before it “vanished,” were anthropologist Morris E. Opler, ethnographer Grenville Goodwin, and Norwegian explorer Helge Ingstad. Opler conducted interviews with over thirty Chiricahua men and women on reservations starting in 1931; he produced dozens of articles and books on Apache folklore, religion, kinship, economics,

---

and linguistics which scholars continue to utilize today. Goodwin and Ingstad conducted ethnographic research among Apaches in Arizona during the 1930s. Each found themselves intrigued by the Fimbres affair (as well as Massai and the Apache Kid), and made trips into the Sierra Madres looking to make contact with the “Lost Apaches.” Although neither Goodwin nor Ingstad found any bronchos, they did locate recent evidence of the Apaches’ existence and produced valuable ethnographic work on Western Apaches and White Mountain Apaches, respectively.

The culturally vanishing American also prompted the U.S. government to reassess its failed Indian policies. Six years prior to the Fimbres Expedition, the Indian Citizenship Act (1924) declared all Natives born within the United States American citizens. Although anti-Indian sentiment continued to exist in the era prior to WWII, sympathetic filmmakers, authors, and reformers, as well as Native groups such as the Society of American Indians, began to influence Anglo American attitudes. By the late 1920s, progressives pushing social and political reforms planted the seeds that resulted in greater Indian sovereignty through the Indian Reorganization Act in 1934.

---

118 For example, see Opler, *An Apache Life-Way*.


120 The Indian Reorganization Act (1934), also known as the “Indian New Deal,” reversed the Dawes Allotment policy of 1887 and gave Natives autonomy on a tribal basis.
Thus, modernity, pro-Indian legislation, and an increasingly sympathetic society should have rendered the Fimbres Expedition an antiquated and illegal venture from the start. But the enterprise had two factors that made it more acceptable to the American public. First it was to take place in Mexico. In the twentieth century (and, one could argue, beyond), Americans viewed Mexico as place of a lawlessness, danger, freedom, and machismo. According to cultural and gender scholars, as the American Southwest rapidly populated and domesticated, “Old Mexico” became a surrogate Wild West Frontier in American imaginations and popular culture.121 Second, the “prey” was Apaches. For Americans, the Indians found on modern reservations, entering the workforce, and fighting for the United States in WWI were not the “Indians” of their imaginations. Apache bronchos, however, personified the “wild” Indians of a bygone era and provided urban white men with one last set of mythic Indian “savages” to pit their perceived waning masculinity against. Furthermore, Americans had always described Apache renegades in animalistic terms—coyotes, wolves, bucks, bronchos—and now they viewed them as the “big game” on this “gentleman’s safari.” As one expedition applicant wrote, “I have hunted big game in many parts of America, but I am sure shooting an Apache Indian would give me a greater thrill than any heretofore shot at.”122


122 Jeff Biggers, In the Sierra Madre (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 83.
Fimbres cared little if his rescue mission turned into a safari, big carnival, or “media circus,” so long as patrons supplied him with guns and vigilantes. But political pressures, U.S.-Mexican weapons smuggling, and a Mexican government wary of armed Americans entering into their country ended the expedition before it began.\textsuperscript{123}

Undeterred, Fimbres gathered a small Mexican posse, including his bereaved father-in-law, and continued the search for Geraldo—murdering any Apaches they came across. In 1931, Fimbres massacred an Apache party that allegedly included the infamous “Indian Juan.” After the grisly deed, a gleeful Fimbres headed down from the mountains. Only a short time later he spotted Geraldo—hanging from a tree, still warm, with his skull crushed in. What little sanity Fimbres had left vanished, and he spent the next four years hunting down the rest of the broncos.\textsuperscript{124}

Although rumors persisted of “wild” Apaches in the Sierra Madres for decades, solid evidence dwindles after the 1930s. Logging, new roads, and population encroachment would have made it impossible to hide for much longer. The Apaches likely either died out, or joined and married into other Native or Mexican communities. Although Fimbres strove to exterminate the “Lost Apaches,” his actions helped to bring about a renewed popular and anthropologic interest in the bronchos.

In the Southwest, the legacy of the broncho and lost Apaches continues to this day. In 1924, the U.S. Congress designated a portion of the southern Arizona desert the

\textsuperscript{123} For further information and reproduced documents detailing the diplomatic pitfalls and illegal activities that thwarted the expedition, see Meed, \textit{They Never Surrendered}, 104–29.

\textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 138–39; and Goodwin and Goodwin, \textit{Apache Diaries}, 57.
“Chiricahua National Monument Wilderness”—the scenic highlight of which is “Massai Point.” In 1980, congress also designated a section of the San Mateo mountains in New Mexico the “Apache Kid Wilderness,” based on rumors it was the location where local ranchers had killed the outlaw.\textsuperscript{125}

The Apache bronchos captured American imaginations for decades. Unlike Geronimo and other Apaches who were able to tell their version of events to popular audiences in the twentieth century, the bronchos’ own stories remained silent and shrouded in mystery. Instead, white Americans and Apaches alike coopted the bronchos’ image to promote their own agendas or truths. The broncho myths influenced not only contemporary public opinion, but portrayals of Apaches in the public imagination for years to come.

Chapter Two

Box Office Bronchos: Apache Renegades in Popular Media

Figure 9 Burt Lancaster as Massai in Apache (1954), United Artists.

In the decades after the broncho period, Massai and the Apache Kid became the subjects of literature, film, and a myriad of historically-based works. Like other mythic figures of the West, their “true” stories pale in historical importance to their enduring image in the public’s imagination. The dialectic relationship between romanticization and vilification of Apache renegades in popular memory only intensified when it reached mass fictional media. This chapter will examine appropriations of Apaches in film and literature, and how contemporaneous political and cultural attitudes influenced their portrayals.
Noble Braves and Apache Devils

As discussed in chapter one, “imperialist nostalgia” for the “vanishing Indian” and “noble savage” proved popular among whites in the Progressive era. Gender scholars argue this nostalgia for the “unconquered” Indian and open frontier stems from, in essence, a masculine identity crisis by Anglo American males in the face of rapid urbanization.

One way to combat this uncertainty, according to historian Joane Nagel, was to emulate "the manly strength and courage of Native Americans."126 American Indian–themed men’s organizations such as the League of the Iroquois, the Improved Order of Red Men, and

---

the Boy Scouts provided one such outlet for what historian Phillip Deloria calls “playing Indian.”

Another popular avenue for imaginary Indian escapades were Western novels. Certainly many early twentieth-century literary works resembled the anti-Indian dime novels of the nineteenth century, but many influential authors proved either sympathetic to Native Americans or regretted their absence from “the wilderness.” In his analysis of Frederic Remington’s work, historian Richard Slotkin argues that the artist and author saw the “exhaustion” of the Indian as “a permanent loss of the material conditions that fostered the growth of a vigorous and heroic American race.” This is evident in Remington’s *John Ermine of the Yellowstone* (1902), Charles King’s *An Apache Princess* (1903), Zane Grey’s *Vanishing American* (1925), and Edgar Rice Burroughs’ *The Princess of Mars* (1917), *The War Chief* (1927), and *Apache Devil* (1933).

---


In response to scholarship commenting on Anglo American cultural attacks and appropriations of Native representations, Deloria discusses how Native people tried to project their own ideas of Indianness. See Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

128 Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation*, 162–63. Slotkin argues “red-blooded fiction” novels are “not chiefly concerned with loss of democratic opportunity entailed by the closing of the frontier, but with the potential loss of opportunities for exercising the peculiar warrior virtues of the Anglo-Saxon race.”
Edgar Rice Burroughs was a private in the seventh cavalry at Fort Grant, Arizona, during the late nineteenth century. His experience searching for Massai, the Apache Kid, and other bronco Apaches greatly influenced his writing, which often centered on white men’s adventure in the wilderness. In the first of his “Barsoom” series, *The Princess of Mars* (1911), the novel’s strapping hero, John Carter, embodies the role of the “red white man.” Carter claims lineage from Pocahontas and spent many years among the Sioux learning their warrior virtues. His years in the wilderness sculpted him into the epitome of strength and manhood. But with the exhaustion of the frontier, Earth no longer needs his warrior attributes, so he is magically transported to Mars, where he finds a “new barbarian wilderness” to master.

The story begins with Carter traveling to Apacheria, for it is the last place where he can exercise his hypermasculine energies. Apaches are villains here, and their ruthlessness and formidability will be mirrored by the cruel “Green Maritians” later in the book. In his analysis of *The Princess of Mars*, Slotkin overlooks Burroughs’ juxtaposition of the Sioux and Apache tribes, which illustrates the cultural perception that the plains tribes were “nobler” than Apaches.

Burroughs infers that the Sioux are reasonable, honorable, and desire peace with whites, by accepting Carter, a grown man who is able to come and go as he pleases, into their tribe. Throughout twentieth-century book and film—from Charles King’s *A

---

129 For Burroughs’ involvement in the hunt for the Kid and Massai, see John Taliaferro, *Tarzan Forever: The Life of Edgar Rice Burroughs, the Creator of Tarzan* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2002), 42.

Daughter of the Sioux: A Tale of the Indian frontier (1902) to John G. Neihardt’s Black Elk Speaks biography (1932) to Arthur Penn’s Little Big Man (1970) and Kevin Costner’s Dances with Wolves (1990)—plains tribes and their eloquent chiefs are more often associated with fighting to preserve their way of life. The Apache resistance, however, is thought to stem from vengeance and inherent blood-lust. The Sioux inhabit the rolling grasslands of the Great Plains and the picturesque Black Hill mountains. They hunt the mighty buffalo, and construct impressive teepees. Apaches are seen as marauders, relying on raiding, eating horseflesh, and living in caves and crude wickiups. Their unforgiving desert homeland personifies their fortitude and hostility with its scorching heat, barren landscapes, and threat of laceration from flora and fauna alike. The desert landscape is the predominate setting for Western films in the twentieth century because it acts as a symbolic and literal barrier between savagery and civilization. Only the strongest of Anglo males can tame the harsh land and its equally foreboding Apache inhabitants. While the romanticization of the “pacified” Sioux had already begun after Wounded Knee, the Apache bronchos continued to elicit vitriolic headlines into the 1930s. Whereas, male Sioux characters are more often stereotyped as noble, wise, and feminized Indians. These traits were largely absent from Apache depictions, until the film Broken Arrow appeared in 1950.¹³¹

Burroughs’s Apache novels The War Chief (1927) and its sequel Apache Devil (1928) are the earliest examples of a heroic Geronimo in literature. The stories initially appeared in Argosy All-Story Weekly. According to historian Paul A. Hutton, Burroughs

¹³¹ Broken Arrow, directed by Delmar Davies (20th Century Fox, 1950).
intended to make the series a trilogy, but became “exasperated” by Argosy’s criticism of Geronimo’s “positive portrayal” and never finished the third book.

In *War Chief*, Geronimo kidnaps and adopts a white boy, who in time becomes a great war chief named Shoz-Dijiji. Shoz-Dijiji, like Carter, falls into the “white Indian” formula. In fiction, white men who “become” Natives are depicted as ultimate masculine warriors: combining the ferocity of the Native brave with the intelligence and racial superiority of the white male. Unlike other monolithic portrayals of Apaches as villains and Anglo frontiersmen as heroes, Burroughs writes that: “Apaches are human, and as individuals of other human races vary in characteristics, so Apaches vary. The Apaches were neither all good, nor all bad.”\(^{132}\) Conversely, he paints “nearly all other pioneers” as “ignorant, illiterate, and unwashed. They had nothing of the majesty and grandeur and poise of their savage forbearers; the repressive force of civilization had stifled everything but the bare, unlovely germ of savagery.”\(^{133}\)

---


\(^{133}\) Ibid, 8.
Although sympathetic to Geronimo, Burroughs does not shy away from playing up Apache vengeance. By the second book, *Apache Devil*, Shoz-Dijiji is a brutal perpetrator of raiding and warfare, trying to convince his father Geronimo not to surrender to the white man. His militant stance, however, begins to soften once he falls in love with a white woman.\(^{134}\)

At least one of the covers for *Apache Devil* misleads readers by implying Shoz-Dijiji is the last “broncho” on the warpath: “The Apaches were tamed, broken—except for the one warrior who would never surrender!” (see fig. 11). The cover boasts a muscular, bare-chested Apache donning a breechcloth and brandishing a pistol and rifle. He has cut down two white men who seemingly never had a chance against this Native He-Man. The text and image celebrates Apache endurance and violence, but white readers may easily project themselves into the title character, for this “last” Apache hero is actually a white man.

Western novellas, comic books, and historical novels featuring Apaches continued to be popular through the 1960s, but a media capable of reaching and influencing a much wider audience, film, offers greater insights into cultural perceptions of this mythologized tribe.

Celluloid “Savages”: Apaches Make their Film Debut

Native Americans have been featured in film since the dawn of moving pictures.\textsuperscript{135} In 1894, Thomas Edison filmed \textit{Sioux Ghost Dance} featuring Native dancers from Buffalo Bill’s Wild West Show. Silent-film director D. W. Griffith —most famous for his 1915 groundbreaking and racist epic \textit{Birth of a Nation}—created over thirty melodramas centered on Native American story lines. In contrast to his treatment of African Americans in \textit{Birth}, Griffith’s portrayals of Indians (played by non-native actors), largely sympathetic and sentimental, spoke to the immorality and injustice of white oppression. Although Griffith portrayed some Indians as villains, most of his films focused on romance and perpetuated the “noble savage” stereotype.\textsuperscript{136} According to Gregory S. Jay, the difference between Griffith’s degrading African American and sympathetic Native American characters may be “superficial.” Both narratives ultimately propound ideas of “white supremacy.” The convenience of a “vanishing” Other “lessened


the need for the kind of vicious caricature” typical of African American and earlier Indian depictions. “Nostalgia for the Noble Savage,” argues Jay, “was largely a luxury commodity made possible by the lack of everyday contact between white America and Native Americans, especially in urban areas where cinema audiences were growing.”137

Although not always universally beneficial for Natives, seemingly well intentioned legislation for American Indians in the 1920s and 1930s—such as the Indian Citizenship Act in 1924, which granted all Native persons American citizenship; and the Wheeler-Howard Act in 1934, which reversed Dawes Allotment policy and allowed for tribal self-government—shows the conflicted views of an America that offered Native inclusion while it continued to project stereotypical images of Indians in popular culture.

By the 1930s, the Great Depression led film studios to focus on socially conscious topics set mainly in urban cities. Gangster films were popular and centered on greed, corruption, and the decay of society.138 Scripts centering on Native Americans were not taken as seriously as the gritty noir dramas, and fell into cheap “B” productions. One exception was Alan Crosland’s The Massacre (1934).139 According to film scholar Edward Buscombe, the sympathetic story of a contemporary Sioux who travels to Washington, D.C., to advocate for Indians’ rights, was the result of Warner Bros. support for Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal.140 Apaches, meanwhile, continued to act as the

---


138 Herzberg, Savages and Saints, 43.

139 The Massacre, directed by Alan Crosland (Warner Bros., 1934).

villain to the soldier and settler. The “A” western made a comeback with John Ford’s
*Stagecoach* (1939). In this classic, Ford casts Geronimo’s band of Apaches as the
deadliest menace in the West, and set the stage for Monument Valley to become the
formulaic setting for “Indian territory,” even for plains tribes. Also in 1939, *Geronimo!*
featuring “Chief Thundercloud” (Victor Daniels) as the titular character, once again
depicts Apaches as evil marauders. The portrayal of Apaches in this film exemplifies an
emerging motif in cinema in which American Indians act as metaphorical “other” for any
feared, oppressed, or victimized racial, social, or political group. Historians have argued
that the Apaches in *Geronimo!* are stand-ins for German fascists. Other examples
include Apaches as the communist fifth column in *Arrowhead* (1953); the Paiute titular
character in *Tell Them Willie Boy Was Here* (1969) represented the misunderstood youth
culture of the late 1960s; and Cheyennes symbolized the Vietnamese in *Little Big Man*
(1970). As stand-ins, however, true Native histories and representations remained
invisible, manipulated and buried under political agenda.

World War II slowly ushered in an increase of more sympathetic portrayals of
Native Americans, as depictions of genocidal white men lost favor in the Holocaust era.
Native soldiers such as Ira Hayes helped to create positive feelings toward Native

141 *Stagecoach*, directed by John Ford (Walter Wanger Productions, 1939).

142 Hutton, “Was Geronimo a Terrorist?” 28; *Geronimo!*, directed by Paul Sloane

143 *Arrowhead*, directed by Charles Marquis Warren (Nat Holt productions, 1953); *Tell
Them Willie Boy Was Here*, directed by Abraham Polonsky (Universal, 1969); and *Little
Big Man*, directed by Arthur Penn (Stockbridge/Hiller, 1970).
Americans from Anglo American citizens and cultural producers. Even John Ford, known for casting Natives as foe, responded with a more nuanced approach to his Apache “villains” in *Fort Apache* (1948). Here the Indians—and Cochise in particular—prove more honorable than some of the corrupt Anglo officials. Although Cochise wishes for peace, he cannot trust the dishonest U.S. government and glory-hungry Lt. Col. Owen Thursday (Henry Fonda). Native depictions were mercurial, however, and as Westerns quickly became one of Hollywood’s and television’s most popular genres there was no shortage of productions in which Natives continued to play villainous foils for cowboy heroes.


Post–World War II, the civil rights movement began to gain steam in the United States, but filmmakers and production studios shied away from promoting liberal ideologies—social equality, tolerance, and a perceived antigovernment agenda—in the McCarthy “Red Scare” era. A popular avenue for covertly commenting on civil rights, especially for African Americans, was to employ Hollywood’s favorite all-purpose allegorical Other—the American Indian.

---

144 I will refrain from delving into the Western filmography of John Ford, which has been thoroughly dissected by scholars and film buffs in myriad works. For examples, see William Darby, *John Fords Westerns: A Thematic Analysis, with a Filmography* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 1996); and Gaylyn Studlar and Matthew Bernstein, eds., *John Ford Made Westerns: Filming the Legend in the Sound Era* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001). I will also forgo an analysis of John Wayne’s relationship with Indian characters for the same reason.
One such film exploring contemporaneous issues of miscegenation and racism is Delmer Daves’s *Broken Arrow* (1950). Although *Arrow*’s screenplay, based on Elliot Arnold’s novel *Blood Brother* (1947), is credited to Michael Blankfort, it was actually written by Albert Maltz. Maltz was one of the “Hollywood Ten”—screenwriters and directors jailed and blacklisted from the film industry after they refused to cooperate with the House Un-American Activities Committee’s investigations, and denounced its anti-communist hearings as a violation of their First Amendment rights. Maltz’s progressive views, coupled with Arnold’s sympathetic story, made *Arrow*, scholars argue, the first film to portray Indians in a truly positive light.

*Broken Arrow* is based (loosely) on the historical relationship between the great Chiricahua chief Cochise and Tom Jeffords, the superintendent of mail in Arizona Territory, and their efforts to create a peace between whites and Apaches. The movie opens with Jeffords (Jimmy Stewart) riding on horseback through the Arizona desert. Jeffords begins to narrate through voiceover; he

![Figure 12 A Herculean Cochise keeps grizzled white men at bay while Jeffords protects the helpless, light-skinned Indian damsel in distress.](image)

explains that the story he is about to tell “happened exactly as you’ll see it. The only difference is when the Apaches speak you will hear it in our language.” He says he came to the territory to prospect for gold and silver, but one day he received message that Tucson’s new colonel wanted to speak with him. On his way, Jeffords happens upon a wounded Apache boy and nurses him back to health. “My mother is crying, my father look for me I think,” the boy tells him. Jeffords ruminates: “It never struck me that an Apache woman would cry over her son like any other woman. Apaches are animals, we all said.” A group of Apaches see Jeffords with the child and begin to attack, but the boy jumps up screaming, “This white man is my friend!” The warriors are suspicions of the white man’s intentions, and question him as to why he did not take the boy’s scalp for a reward. Jeffords says that it is “not his way to fight.” “You are a woman maybe?” they accuse. “It is well known that Apaches do not take scalps either, and they are not women,” Jeffords responds.

This exchange exhibits a departure from previous Western films by incorporating accurate anthropological and historical information—Apaches generally did not scalp. Furthermore, the dialogue implicates non-Natives of brutality by alluding to the historical bounty the Mexican government placed on Apache scalps. Although works of fiction, both Brother and Arrow include authentic Apache cultural practices. In Brother’s author’s note, Arnold even thanks Morris Opler for granting him permission to paraphrase from the anthropologist’s work.\textsuperscript{146} Anglo-mythmakers have long used scalping as a device to illustrate the brutality of Indians. Jefford’s statement distances the

\textsuperscript{146} Arnold, \textit{Blood Brother}, ix–x.
Apaches from this prototypical “savage” practice, while still insinuating that these “manly” warriors are formidable. Likewise, Jeffords compares himself to the Apaches, reaffirming his own masculine identity despite his inclination for nonviolence.

The Apaches let Jeffords go because they “have a sense of fair play,” but they immediately ambush, kill, and torture a group of white scalp-hunters passing through “Apacheland.” “But this was war,” Jeffords explains. “There was terrible cruelty from both sides.” During his meeting with the new colonel, Jeffords defends Cochise and the Apaches, insisting the Indians “did not start this war” and no one asked white men to come to Apache territory in the first place. Jeffords abhors the war’s violence and intolerance, so he decides to learn the Apache language and rides alone into Cochise’s stronghold for a parlay. This act of courage greatly impresses Cochise who embodies all the stature and diplomacy of a European monarch. The two become friends, and strike a truce allowing the mail to pass through Apacheland unmolested.

Cochise, played by Jewish New Yorker Jeff Chandler, acts as the “noble savage”—friend to the white man, accommodating, sympathetic—but he is also a multi-dimensional human being. Articulate, reasonable, wise, and strong, this Cochise marked a significant departure from the blood-thirsty marauding Apache of popular lore, while remaining a powerful masculine figure.\(^\text{147}\) Cochise is square-jawed, muscular, and towers above the other Apaches. His prowess as a military leader instills fear and respect among

\(^{147}\) Other sympathetic portrayals of Cochise (and Native Americans in general) had previously been showcased in film, most notably in John Ford’s *Fort Apache* (1948). But these depictions were often patronizing, focusing on the victimization of a primitive people and failing to give Native characters depth or humanity.
the U.S. military and white settlers. Military skill and intelligence showcase virtues not presented in most films depicting Indian warriors up to this time. Historian Jacqelyn Kilpatrick points out that “inept [Native] fighters in previous films . . . [are] defeated by a pack of Boy Scouts (Scouts to the Rescue, 1939) or even held off by a woman wielding a pea-shooter (Bad Bascomb, 1946).”

Cochise’s leadership is unique in that he is not only portrayed as a formidable war chief but also as a sensible negotiator for peace.

Chandler’s Cochise has blue eyes and slightly lighter skin, which is more pronounced contrasted against Daves’ cast of White Mountain Apache actors.

“Blankfort” (Maltz) writes in the foreword to his screenplay: "The Apaches are today, as they were yesterday, a vigorous and handsome people. It is both practical and advisable that they be used in the cast." The translation of Apache into English allows Cochise to speak intelligently and eloquently, a departure from the stereotypical Native pidgin speak of other contemporaneous westerns. According to producer Julian Blaustein, "The overall purpose was to capture a sense of the Indians culture and identity, as it is not too different from our own. We have treated them as people, not savages, have tried to show that the

148 Kilpatrick, Celluloid Indians, 59.

149 One interesting exception is the portrayal of Teese by Iron Eyes Cody. Cody is most famous for his role as “the Crying Indian” in the famous “Keep America Beautiful” Public Service Announcement of the early 1970s. Although he claimed Native American descent, Cody was actually full-blooded Italian.

only real 'heavies' are ignorance, misunderstanding and intolerance. In short, none of our Indians say 'Ugh!'”¹⁵¹

In *Arrow* the villains are white settlers encroaching on Apacheria and unwilling to adhere to Jeffords’ and Cochise’s peace treaty. In 1950 a reviewer for the *New York Times* stated: “In what appears an honorable endeavor to clear the public's mind of the traditional notion that the American Indian was an unprincipled and uncivilized brute . . . [in] *Broken Arrow* . . . the Indians come off better—much better—on the whole, than do the whites. As a matter of fact, one might wonder from this exhibit . . . whether it isn't the white man, not the Indian, who should be regarded as "good" only when he is dead.”¹⁵²

The role reversal was not lost on Native audiences either. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, after a special screening of *Arrow* at Twentieth Century Fox’s projection room, a young Indian boy “remained silent for several minutes.” Once pressed for a reaction he said, “For the first time in my life I am proud to be an Indian.”¹⁵³

For white audiences, Jeffords is appealing in the role of “white savior.” Historian Brian Klopotek describes the “white good guy” in films as providing “a safe surrogate for white viewers” to identify with. The savior “validates heroic white masculinity” and

---


¹⁵³ Scheuer, “Indian's Culture Captured in Film.”
suggests the demise of the Indians lies at the “hands of a few corrupt pioneers or
government types.”

Arrow also introduces an Apache villain to counter Cochise’s “noble savage.” The
ignoble versus noble Indian dichotomy has existed since James Fennimore Cooper pitted
Uncas (friend of the white man) against the loathsome Magua in Last of the Mohicans
(1826). In this incarnation, Cochise implores his people to abandon their traditional
raiding practices and adopt the ways of the white man: “The American government will
give us cattle. We will raise them and trade them for our needs.” “The answer of a
woman,” a young warrior (played by Canadian Mohawk actor Jay Silverheels) objects.
Cochise refutes: “The Americans keep cattle but they are not soft or weak . . . it is not
easy to change but sometimes it is required.” With this, a handful of strong renegades led
by the warrior vote to leave Cochise. “I leave my name also,” the warrior says, “I am
ashamed to be a Chiricahua. . . . I will take the name my Mexican enemies have given me
. . . from now on I am Geronimo.” In petitioning for peace and assimilation Cochise
cements his nobility but feminizes himself in the eyes of his warriors by relinquishing
masculine Apache freedoms. Conversely, Geronimo’s penchant for war reinforces the
stereotypical relationship between violence and Native hypermasculinity. True to the
ignoble archetype, Geronimo is vengeful, indomitable, and hostile to whites. The good
Indian/bad Indian dynamic of Cochise and Geronimo flourished throughout the 1950s
with Chandler and Silverheels reprising their roles as the noble Cochise (The Battle at

154 Brian Klopotek, “I Guess Your Warrior Look Doesn’t Work Every Time,” in Across
the Great Divide: Cultures of Manhood in the American West (New York: Routledge,
2001), 253.
Apache Pass, 1952; Taza, Son of Cochise, 1954), and the villainous Geronimo (The Battle at Apache Pass, 1952; Walk the Proud Land, 1956) respectively.\textsuperscript{155}

While discussing peace terms with Cochise, Jeffords falls for a young Apache girl named Sonseeahray (Debra Paget). When we first see Sonseeahray she is preparing for the Sunrise Ceremony, in which pubescent Apache girls embrace womanhood and, for four days, become a mythical healer named (ironically) “White Painted Lady.” That both Indian leads are played by white actors reveals much about cultural acceptability and cinematic symbolism in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{156} Paget dons brown contacts and her skin is heavily tanned with makeup. Sonseeahray’s skin lightens noticeably throughout the film as she and Jeffords fall in love and he teaches her about white society (see fig. 13). Historian Richard Slotkin surmises that this tactic “visualizes the premise of ‘tolerance,’

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{figure13}
\caption{A whiter shade of pale. Sonseeahray’s skin visibly lightens as she falls for Jeffords.}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{156} Paget was a relative unknown at the time, while Chandler had played several roles but was not yet a star. Native performers banded together to form the Indian Actors Association in 1936 and demanded that Hollywood hire “real” Indians to play Indians. The American Indian Citizens League of California joined the fight in 1947 to protest discrimination against Native actors. Aleiss, Making the White Man’s Indian, 54–57. See also Aline Mosby, “Darnell, Sheridan, Other Part-Indians on the Warpath Against Hollywood Judge,” Toledo (Ohio) Blade, 11 March 1947.
which ask[s] acceptance of the Other by (in effect) denying difference.”

Sonseeahray appears to Jeffords as the prototypical “Indian princess”—virginal, beautiful, exotic, naïve, and innocent: “The world is so big and I know so little,” she opines. Female counterpart to the “noble brave,” the Indian princess stereotype is most famously associated with Pocahontas. True to that legend, the princess usually falls in love with a white man, becomes “civilized,” sometimes converts to Christianity, has lighter skin than others in her tribe, and almost always sacrifices herself for her lover. She represents an Eve figure in America’s Edenic “virgin land,” enabling the white man to become its “new Adam.”

Jeffords and Sonseeahray marry but their bliss is short lived.

Two years before Broken Arrow premiered in 1950, the California Supreme Court struck down its anti-miscegenation law, declaring it unconstitutional. California was the first state since Ohio in 1887 to repeal such a statute, fanning the anti-miscegenation


debate in America. The potentially controversial depiction of an interracial marriage is resolved quickly, however, when a white posse of angry miners ambush Cochise and Jeffords. Sonseeahray dives onto a wounded Jeffords to protect him and grabs his knife. As she lunges at the attackers, she is shot dead.

Although, white men (soldiers, not rogue miners) kill Sonseeahray in *Brother* as well, Jeffords is not with her at the time; making Maltz’s version not only more dramatic but also more reminiscent of the Pocahontas/Smith legend. Jeffords vows revenge but Cochise will not let Sonseeahray’s death negate the “broken arrow” of peace he has brokered for their peoples. Her murder also elicits the sympathies of the military and white locals, resulting in greater tolerance. As Jeffords rides off into the sunset, his voiceover proclaims, “As time passed, I began to know that the death of Sonseeahray put a seal on the peace.” Anthropologist S. Elizabeth Bird argues, “The Indian Princess became an important, nonthreatening symbol of white Americans’ right to be here, because she was always willing to sacrifice her happiness, cultural identity, and even life for the good of a new nation.” Slotkin asserts *Arrow’s* “formulas permitted the audience to indulge, and congratulate itself on, a ‘liberal’ attitude toward non-whites without having to abandon the fundamental assurance of their own superiority.”

Indeed, although *Arrow* marked a significant turning-point in Western cinema by presenting Natives in general and Apaches in particular in a positive light, a fundamental

---


shortcoming keeps it from achieving an even more progressive status. In Arrow, Cochise is not the story’s protagonist, as he is in Arnold’s Brother. In fact, Jeffords does not become a major character in Brother until chapter nine. Arrow keeps Cochise’s motivations fairly simple: he wants peace for his people. He does not commit any acts of aggressive violence, only self-defense—the worst instances of Apache violence in the film are perpetrated by warriors he cannot control. Film critic John Howard Reid argues, Cochise is “so good and noble” he is not a “believable fictional character.” Maltz’s script never touches on Arnold’s depictions of the chief’s depression, drinking, and disillusionment; “all ‘negative’ but humanizing elements of the character in the novel.”¹⁶³ For example, in Brother Cochise is haunted by the memory of a Mexican man he killed: “It was nothing. I have done it often. I ordered him buried and covered with ants. There was something in his face. I have never forgotten it.”¹⁶⁴ This scene portrays Cochise as a complex individual, more introspective and sensitive than the “blood-thirsty” Apache, but not the pacifist depicted in Arrow.

Jeffords’ narration in Arrow, likewise, undermines Cochise’s and the Apache characters’ agency in telling their own story. Film scholar Jose Armando Prats argues, in “pro-Indian Westerns, the white voice absents the Indian by presuming to represent him. Intending to draw the Indian from the margins of conquest’s tale, it instead presides over the story of the Vanishing American.” Prats’s analysis of Lieutenant John Dunbar (Kevin Costner) in another “pro-Indian” film, Dances with Wolves (1990), also applies to


¹⁶⁴ Arnold, Blood Brother, 424.
Jeffords in *Arrow*: “The Indian's ‘voice’ is never heard so clearly and so eloquently as when it speaks through this white man who is both the last Indian and the ‘first’ American.” The next film this paper takes under consideration, *Apache* (1954), however, is told entirely from its Apache protagonist’s viewpoint, and presents a more morally ambiguous character.

In 1953, Congress passed House Concurrent Resolution 108 which signaled a new governmental policy committed to the termination of American Indian tribes. Part of the federal government’s policies of integration and termination involved implementing an urban relocation program that provided financial incentives and job opportunities for Natives in urban centers across the country. Historian Donald Fixico explains that the loyalty of Native American soldiers in WWII and Korea convinced the U.S. government to terminate federal-Indian trust relations, effectively ending “their status as wards of the United States.” During a confrontation with Menominee leaders over termination, Fixico quotes Senator Arthur Watkins of Utah as saying: “All you have to do is agree now to grow up . . . you are no longer children . . . ask to be regarded as first-class citizens.” This legislation was followed by Public Law 280 (1953), which granted certain states jurisdiction over civil and criminal cases in Indian country (i.e. placing juridical power out of tribal governments' hands and into state officials). In promoting
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165 Prats, “His Master's Voice(over),” 15 et. seq.


167 Ibid., 96.
integration, however, the government’s policies undermined Native claims to land and tribal sovereignty, while also diluting Native identities. Unlike the early-twentieth-century desire to cling to the romanticized “vanishing” Indian, “in the fifties,” writes Kilpatrick, “the best Indians were those that had assimilated.”

Interestingly, 1954’s top grossing western, *Apache*, depicted an Apache renegade’s quixotic struggle against subjugation and assimilation. The “Apache” was Massai. Directed by Robert Aldrich, *Apache* stars Burt Lancaster as the proverbial (and literal) “blue-eyed Indian.” Often referred to as “Mr. Muscles and Teeth,” the six-foot-one Lancaster perfectly fit the bill of iconic western masculinity.

Lancaster also coproduced the film. James R. Webb adapted the screenplay from Paul I. Wellman’s novel *Broncho Apache* (1936)—which Lancaster and his co-producer Harold Hecht purchased the rights to in 1952. “All involved,” said Lancaster, “[meant] to make a broader statement on the injustice of racism.” Fittingly, the film premiered just two months after the U.S. Supreme Court ruled segregation unconstitutional in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

The opening frame of the film reads: “This is the story of Massai, the last Apache. It has been retold until it has become one of the great legends of the Southwest.”

---

168 Kilpatrick, *Celluloid Indians*, 56.


introductory text, as well as later lines given by Massai such as, “I cannot stop fighting. I am the last real Apache left fighting in all this world,” perpetuates the popular perception that Apaches 1) exist only in the past and have since vanished, and 2) are only considered real Apaches if they are male, renegade warriors, and “free.”

The first scene takes place as Geronimo and his renegades surrender for the last time. Massai, alone on horseback, gallops in and shoots at an Apache holding a truce flag. “Geronimo does not speak for me,” he declares, “If an Apache cannot live in his mountains . . . he is already dead!” After a fire fight, Massai is captured by U.S. Chief of Scouts Al Sieber (John McIntire). Sieber taunts: “You want us to kill you, don't you, Massai? Out here in front of all your bloodthirsty brethren, so they can sing your praises and start another war in your honor. That'd be a sweet death, wouldn't it, Massai? A warrior's death. But you’re not a warrior anymore, just a whipped Injun.” But as Massai and the other Apaches board the prison train for Florida, Sieber already begins to feel the impact of the vanishing frontier on his own identity: “I’ll miss’em. We had a job to do when bucks were around.”

On the train, journalists take pictures of an emasculated and stoic Geronimo (Monte Blue). With the guards distracted by the photo session, Massai escapes out the window, leaving Geronimo to crack a knowing smile. Massai wanders into the bustling city of “St. Louie.” He walks through the foreign streets, perplexed by the sights and sounds of modernity: store windows, shoe shiners, restaurants, and saloons. Pointedly, Massai pauses outside a Chinese laundry and stares disgustedly at a “Chinaman” performing the “feminine” task of washing clothes.

He then makes his way to Oklahoma, taking refuge in a barn where he meets a
Cherokee farmer. Massai does not understand how an Indian can live “in a white man’s house.” The farmer explains that the Cherokees gave up fighting and now tend crops: “Here the Cherokee is like the white man, there is no difference.” “Then the Cherokee is a woman,” Massai scoffs. The broncho is further repulsed by the farmer’s practice of nontraditional gender roles such as fetching water and capitulating to his nagging wife. Before Massai resumes his journey, the farmer gives him a satchel of corn seeds and advises him to take up the white man’s ways. Massai laughs off this suggestion—“Apaches are warriors”—but brings the sack with him.

Back in Arizona, Massai’s love interest Nalinle (Jean Peters) spurns the romantic advances of Hondo (Charles Bronson), an Apache scout. “Soon I will be made corporal,” Hondo brags. “Yes, your buttons are very shiny,” Nalinle absent-mindedly responds. When Massai finally returns to the fort, he visits Nalinle and her father Santos, who betrays him to the Army, but Massai escapes and wages a bloody revenge on both the soldiers and Apaches. Mistakenly believing Nalinle had also betrayed him, Massai kidnaps her and brutally drags her through the desert. Massai ties her to a tree, refuses her food and water, and throws her to the ground. Yet, when he finally sets her free, Nalinle professes her love and follows him. Massai strikes her and takes her moccasins. Her feet bloody, Nalinle continues to follow by crawling through the dirt and begging: “I am only a woman—bearing children, cooking, sewing, without you I am nothing.” Her pathetic devotion finally wins over Massai, who takes her for his wife.
Eventually Nalinle becomes pregnant and Massai builds them a home in the mountains. At Nalinle’s insistence, Massai gives up his Apache warrior lifestyle and adopts the effeminate white man’s ways he fought so strongly against. They plow the earth, plant the Cherokee’s corn seeds, wear blue jeans, and await the arrival of “little Massai.” Their private paradise is interrupted, however, when Sieber and Hondo locate them by spotting the corn field.

Sieber and Massai battle in the tall corn stalks, Massai overpowers Sieber and is about to shoot when he hears the first wail of his infant son. With Little Massai’s birth, the new father abandons his quest for the proper “warrior’s death” he so desired, sets down his rifle, and walks toward his family. Incredibly, Sieber and his soldiers let Massai go. An officer remarks, “He planted that corn and made it grow, something no Apache ever did before.” Sieber wistfully stares off: “Looks like he called the war off. . . . This was the only war we had, and we ain’t likely to find another.”
The original script called for Hondo to shoot Massai in the back as he walked away; symbolically implying that integration has taken out the “savage” Indian. The production studio (United Artists) however, projected that “killing the hero” would result in a $1 million loss of revenue, and demanded the “feel-good ending.” Aldrich lamented years later, “They cut my ending and had the hero alive at the finish. I felt he could not possibly be re-accepted or survive, for progress had passed him by. I respected his audacity, courage, and dedication, but the world no longer had a place for his kind. . . . It made a joke out of the whole film.” Some critics agreed with Aldrich’s assessment of the altered ending, “Not all the corn is in the cornfields, let me tell you,” cracked the Chicago Tribune. But audiences embraced the film, making it a box office success.

Although the film and Wellman’s novel share many of the same plot points, the endings (both Aldrich’s original and the studio version) and the cornfield mark significant departures from Wellman’s book. In Broncho Apache, Massai remains staunchly anti-assimilation throughout the story. He is driven by vengeance against the white man and his emasculated Apache brethren, whom he sees as traitors. Massai never stays too long in one place, and when Nalinle becomes pregnant, he sends her back to the reservation, for a family would impede his outlaw lifestyle. The climactic shootout in the novel ends with Massai escaping Sieber’s forces. He slips off into desert once more and
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decides to bring Nalinle with him after all. The cinematic changes in *Apache* show that the filmmakers wanted to provide a commentary on historical and contemporary integration policy, and for Massai to act as martyr for racial tolerance.

*Apache* departs from its pro-Apache predecessor, *Broken Arrow*, in significant ways. Unlike *Arrow*, which Jeffords narrates, *Apache* is shown through an Indian’s point of view. Nalinle’s skin appears much darker than Sonseeahray’s. Whereas Sonseeahray plays into “Indian princess” conventions, Nalinle’s degradation by Massai falls into the stereotypical casting of Indian women as “squaws” and foils for defining an oppositional hypermasculine identity. As seen in the movie poster for *Apache* (fig. 15), Nalinle grasps to Massai’s leg like a child begging for attention. Massai ignores her, and hoists his long rifle triumphantly into the air. The tagline blares, “HERE IS A DIFFERENT BREED OF MAN,” and champions him as “Massai the unconquerable.” This text signifies that Massai is—racially, genetically, culturally—Other, and his inherent hypermasculinity cannot be conquered by man or woman.

Folklorist Rayna Green juxtaposes the iconographies behind the “Pocahontas Perplex” of the “Indian Princess” and her “darker twin” the “squaw.” The “squaw” or “drudge” acts as the ignoble female savage. She is highly sexualized, stupid, and often abused. Nalinle, however, does not fall completely in line with typical “squaw” characters, for she exhibits agency in her decisions, influences her husband, and elevates her status within the home. But Nalinle and Sonseeahray act as binaries to showcase contemporaneous gender constructions. Massai’s domination of the obsequious Nalinle may be viewed as the 1950s Anglo male’s desire to be “lord and master” of his household. Sonseeahray’s simple nature and demure femininity represent the perceived
fragility of women, reaffirming the need for a masculine protector and provider. Green argues that both stereotypes are defined in terms of their perceived sexualized identities. In either case, the character’s “relationship with males determines what the image will be.”

The two films’ male Apache leads differ as well. Massai’s use of violence, physicality, and resiliency adhere to Anglo American connotations of prototypical manhood associated with Apache warriors; whereas Cochise embodies the noble, wise, and accommodating Indian more commonly seen in stereotypes of plains Indians. In Arrow, assimilation leads to a certain level of demasculinization for Cochise; in Apache the protagonist adopts white practices yet retains male virility as symbolized in the fertility of his crops and birth of his son. More progressively, in Apache the conflict (displacement and decimation of traditional Apache identities) is not the result of a few greedy and scheming white individuals, but derives from U.S. policy and the effects of Manifest Destiny.

This trend in multidimensional Apache characters would wane somewhat after 1955, as evidenced by Apache-atrocity laden films such as Tomahawk Trail (1957) and Apache Territory (1958), although “good” and “bad” Apache characterizations proved mercurial. By the late 1960s, however, cultural attitudes towards Native Americans in general shifted considerably after the American Indian Movement’s occupation of Alcatraz and the standoff with government agents at Wounded Knee; the counter-
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174 Rayna Green, “The Pocahontas Perplex,” 698–714. The “Squaw drudge” stereotype also plays into the idea that Native men treat women poorly and do not respect them. See also, Marubbio, Killing the Indian Maiden, chap. 2; and Meyer and Royer, Selling the Indian, 80, 162–65.
culture’s embrace of an idealized Native culture; and the publication of Dee Brown’s groundbreaking pro-Indian book, *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (1970).

Figure 16 Although the story bears no resemblance to the “true” story, *Apache Warrior* (1957) was the only film made about the historical Apache Kid.

Figures 17, 18 Apaches on the celluloid warpath: *Apache Drums* (1951) (above), and *Apache Ambush* (1955) (right).
By 1970, American disillusionment (due to the Vietnam War, political assassinations, the Manson murders, a perceived undermining of American values, distrust of government, etc.) began to infiltrate Western films. Again, Natives provided cultural commentators with the perfect metaphor for “the Other,” in particular the Vietcong, in films like *Little Big Man* (1970), *Soldier Blue* (1970), and *Ulzana’s Raid* (1972).

A seemingly significant departure from contemporaneous pro-Indian films, *Ulzana’s Raid*, loosely based on historical events, depicts a group of renegades, terrorizing Arizona Territory with acts of horrific violence. Once again, Robert Aldrich directs and Burt Lancaster stars.

This time Lancaster plays Army scout “McIntosh,” as the “man who knows Indians.” This archetype, most famously embodied by Daniel Boone, is a white man who knows everything about Indian culture and performs Indian attributes better than an Indian. He has usually spent considerable time with Natives in the wilderness, or may have been raised by them. He stands between “savagery and civilization,” sometimes acting as mediator. In this case, McIntosh has become an “Indian hater,” and his knowledge of all-things-Apache makes him a formidable adversary.\(^{175}\)

\(^{175}\) For the “man who knows Indians” characteristics, see Slotkin, *Gunfighter Nation*, 16.
McIntosh and a small group of soldiers led by Lieutenant Garnett DeBuin (Bruce Davison)—a rookie and devout Christian—are sent to capture or kill Ulzana’s Apaches before they reach the safety of Mexico. The hunt for elusive murderous renegades in a hostile environment is meant to parallel the search for the Viet Cong by U.S. troops. According to Lancaster biographer Kate Bufford, Lancaster was “fascinated by the Vietnam echoes in the script by Alan Sharp.” Aldrich and Lancaster battled throughout the shoot over the tone of the film. According to Sharp, “[Lancaster] was intent on what one might call the ‘neo-liberal’ point of view and I think Bob, who was just as much of a liberal at Burt ever was, just wanted to make his movie which was going to be tough enough . . . without adding all this other shit.”  

_Ulzana’s_ tone is dark and nihilistic. Instead of advocating for assimilation and harmony, it accepts that all societies have different belief systems. Lieutenant DeBuin begins the story as an idealist who believes that Apaches “if given the chance” could become Christians. But after a sampling of Apache atrocities (rape, murder, mutilation, a dead “Swede” with his dog’s severed tail shoved in his mouth) he realizes he understands nothing of Apache ways. “What is the reason your people are so cruel?” he asks Ke-Ni-Tay, an Apache scout. “That is how they are. They have always been like that,” the scout matter-of-factly replies. When DeBuin presses Ke-Ni-Tay for Ulzana’s motivations, he explains that on the reservation the Apache’s power is diminished—all he smells is old people and women. In order to regain his power he must take another man’s power by killing him. “Would you kill a man like that?” DeBuin asks. “Here in this land, man must have power,” replies Ke-Ni-Tay.
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Against McIntosh’s advice, DeBuin eventually devises a plan to outwit the cunning Apaches by separating his unit. While DeBuin continues south on Ulzana’s trail, McIntosh and his unit lure the Apaches with horses to head toward the fort. Once the Apaches take the bait, DeBuin and his soldiers are supposed to double back and ambush the Indians. The lieutenant arrives too late, however, and finds McIntosh mortally wounded and his men, and most of the Apaches, dead.

Finally getting the ending Aldrich and Lancaster wanted for *Apache*, Ke-Ni-Tay the scout finds and shoots Ulzana, who kneels and sings in preparation for his fate. McIntosh insists that the surviving soldiers leave without him, and the camera pans away as he smokes a final cigarette and waits to die from his wounds. An appropriately bleak ending to a conflict in which nobody wins.

Although critically a success, *Ulzana* tanked at the box-office. Some misunderstood the general theme of the film, as evidenced by a culturally telling piece in the *New York Times* three years later. Titled “Why Can’t Indians Be Villains Any More,” article author Richard Schickel “gloomily” predicts that *Ulzana* “is probably the last movie of its kind that will ever be made.” The last in which soldiers and “savages had at one another, with no liberal-minded questions asked.” Schickel goes on to lament the debunking of “the white man’s burden,” and the “mafia-like” liberal policy that “we (the whites)” can now only kill “each other” on screen. Schickel’s prediction was correct, Indians no longer play “savages” fighting against “hero” soldiers in an implicit manner; but his assessment that *Ulzana* poses no “liberal-minded questions” is wholly
Schickel does make an intriguing argument in that “The refusal to see the Indian . . . in anything less than a favorable light is as-much a put down [to their humanity].” He sees *Ulzana* and *The Stalking Moon* (1969), which also features “an Apache of no redeeming social value by modern standards,” as “vast improvements” to patronizing contemporaneous works. That these last two “Indian villains” are Apaches provides a fitting, even if coincidental, bookend to the era.

The Western waned in popularity over the next forty years, except for a slight resurgence in the late 1980s-early 1990s. In the absence of war and major civil rights policy, pop culture did not need Natives as allegories. Fortunately, the media began to focus on more contemporary Indian issues: land rights, such as the Black Mesa dispute and uranium mining; preserving tribal customs, such as tribal fishing rights in the Pacific Northwest; Leonard Peltier’s court appeal in 1992; and the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). The era also elicited strong support for multiculturalism and “political correctness.” For American Indians, this meant, for example, more racially sensitive terminology ("Native American" instead of "Indian"), a condemnation of offensive sports mascots, and revisionist takes on history. Although well-intentioned, this hypersensitivity facilitated popular culture’s continued homogenization of tribal identities into a one-size-fits-all mythic Indian—only on the opposite side of the spectrum. Natives featured in Anglo-produced works were by and
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large portrayed as “noble” spiritualists, environmentalists, sages, and pacifists or freedom fighters.\textsuperscript{178}

Once the reigning “Indian villain,” Apaches did not fit as easily into the sympathetic molds of other cinematic tribes—such as the Lakotas in 1990’s Oscar-winning \textit{Dances with Wolves}, or the Tainos in \textit{1492: Conquest of Paradise} (1992). But the long-standing reverence for Apache renegades allowed for at least one revisionist picture about popular memory’s most famous Indian, Geronimo. With few exceptions (\textit{Geronimo}, 1962), earlier films had cast Geronimo as a villainous white-adversary, but in Walter Hill’s \textit{Geronimo} (1993), “the greatest of warriors,” argues historian Paul A. Hutton, “was reduced to a rather mild-mannered Uncas.”\textsuperscript{179}

This was not the filmmakers’ original intension. “I like Geronimo just as he was, a human predator,” remarked John Milius to the \textit{New York Times}, just before \textit{Geronimo}’s premiere in December 1993. The \textit{Apocalypse Now} (1979) screenwriter wrote the initial script for Hill’s film, but scenes depicting predatory actions, such as Apaches “hanging little girls from meat hooks,” never made it into Larry Gross’ revised screenplay.\textsuperscript{180} Instead of treading a more balanced, historically accurate line, Hill decided to make his Geronimo a fairly empty vessel from which the film’s white characters react against.

\textsuperscript{178} More nuanced depictions were found in the emerging genre of Native-produced works, which generally dealt with contemporary Indians. For example, see \textit{Powwow Highway} (1988), \textit{Medicine River} (1994), \textit{The Sun-Chaser} (1996), and \textit{Smoke Signals} (1998).

\textsuperscript{179} Hutton, “Was Geronimo a Terrorist?” 30.

Once again, this is an “Indian” story narrated by and starring a white protagonist, Lieutenant Britton Davis (Matt Damon). Damon’s Davis admires Geronimo and is sympathetic to his plight. The historical Davis, author of *The Truth About Geronimo* (1929), did not share the same sentiments, describing him as “a thoroughly vicious, intractable, and treacherous man.”

The film centers on Davis, Lieutenant Charles Gatewood (Jason Patric), and Al Sieber (Robert Duvall) as they search for Geronimo (Wes Studi, of Cherokee descent) and his renegades after their outbreak from Fort Apache in 1885. Each is sympathetic toward the Apaches in his own way. Gatewood proves particularly enlightened: “Chiricahua are special, even amongst the Apache”; “Chiricahua don’t give their word much, but when he does he keeps it, if you keep yours”; “I am quite content going to my grave knowing I’ve never killed an Apache.” General Nelson Miles (Kevin Tighe) plays the villain (arguably one of the more historically accurate aspects) and knowingly lies to Geronimo about the duration of his exile.

The story is rife with historical inaccuracies—Sieber dies during a gun fight with white scalp hunters, soldiers incite Geronimo’s outbreak from Fort Apache by shooting a medicine man, among others—but Hill defends his dramatic license: “The audience doesn’t go to a film for a history lesson; it wants entertainment.” While liberties are expected, certain changes alter fundamental aspects of the historical story. For instance,


183 Eckholm, “Geronimo, Still with a Few Rough Edges.”
save for Miles and the scalp hunters, the white characters are reasonable, moral, and conflicted by their mission. Even the irascible, “anti-Apache” Sieber heroically sacrifices himself for his Apache scout Chato (Steve Reevis). This device hearkens back to Westerns that allowed Anglo audiences to identify with liberal white characters and pin the Indian “plight” on a handful of evil government-types, instead of a shared national history of racial subjugation. Hill includes scenes in which the Apaches attack defenseless miners and settlers, but excuses this violence because the whites “settled on Chiricahua land.” “This has always been Apacheland!” proclaims Geronimo. Hill makes no mention of Apaches historically raiding in areas not considered “Apacheland.” Hutton surmises, “[Geronimo] had become too dangerous a topic for Hollywood to handle with any realism.”

With such limited screen time, Studi’s Geronimo never receives proper character development. He generally looks more troubled or perplexed than angry—an emotion not only accurate but justifiable. His sense of humor comes through on occasion but only in the company of whites—interactions with other renegades are short and superficial. The final scene, set on the Florida bound train, proves to be Geronimo’s most stirring, but Hill chooses to end the movie on a typical “vanishing Indian” note. “Now my time is over,”
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says Geronimo, as the locomotive heads into the horizon. “Now, maybe, the time of our people is over.”

Chiricahuas did not vanish of course, and many eventually relocated back to the Southwest and continue to live there today. Unfortunately, contemporary Apache characters and stories have been conspicuously absent from the big screen. Fictional, nineteenth-century Apaches appear again in Ron Howard’s *The Missing* (2003), and Jon Favreau’s *Cowboys and Aliens* (2011), but no major work has centered on an Apache in the last twenty years.

In this modern era, portrayals of Indians as villains had gone out of fashion, leaving no place for depictions of violent broncho outlaws. Once two of the most infamous figures in the Southwest, Massai and the Kid have slipped into relative obscurity. Part of the reason westerns have waned in popularity, according to Paul Hutton, is that audiences crave white hats and black hats. Western fans generally do not want to sympathize with their villains, they want to cheer at the villains’ defeat. Hutton argues this is why zombie films are so popular in the twenty-first century.185 Because of the now prevalent sympathy for and historical awareness of the Apaches’ dispossession of land and freedom, they can no longer play faceless, monolithic brutes. A more progressive approach would cast whites as villains to Apache heroes but this has yet to materialize—and would be difficult depict with any realism in simplistic good versus evil conventions. While *Geronimo* (1993) did have a white villain of sorts in Nelson Miles, history prevented audiences from getting their happy ending. To resurrect the Apache-

185 Paul A. Hutton, lecture, “Western Heroes,” spring 2014, University of New Mexico.
western the next generation of audiences and filmmakers will likely have to accept and promote more nuanced portrayals of Apache renegades—or pit them against zombies.
Chapter Three

From Sensationalism to Scholarship:
the Evolution of Apache Renegade Historiography 1900-2013

As filmmakers and novelists reflect and influence the masses, so do historians. Similar to representations in American popular media, portrayals of Apache renegades in historiography are illustrative of larger evolving trends in Native American scholarship and public opinion. Like American Indian historiography in general, there exists an imbalance of written primary sources to draw upon, and pressures from cultural and political forces to contend with. Both have moved from monolithic narratives depicting Indians as the savage enemies of Anglo American civilization, to presenting them as the powerless victims of a racist imperial force, to cultivating more balanced narratives and scholarly inquiries. There are, however, some aspects of Apache historiography distinct from Native historiography as a whole. There are multiple ethnic and national

---

perspectives to incorporate; extreme violence to depict without sensationalizing; and a longer timeline. For historians, the Apache resistance proves a touchy and difficult subject to tackle successfully. As a result, only recently has the topic been handled with a greater sense of objectivity and robust scholarly analysis. This does not, however, discount the valuable contributions made by earlier historians, nor does it suggest that this current scholarship is without deficiencies.

This chapter will look at literature authored by academic and independent historians primarily focusing on the Chiricahua Apache conflict and renegades of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Although this is by no means an exhaustive review of the historical literature on these Apaches, the selections exemplify overarching trends or departures in Apache historiography, showcase authors whose contribution to the field have been invaluable, and are among the most popular and influential. Areas of study that fall outside the scope of this narrow survey include anthropological works, autobiographies/memoirs, military history, reservation and post-WWII Apache history, and greater Chiricahua Apache history.

“Historians”—whether academic, independent, or “buff” (a term to describe the untrained but knowledgeable enthusiast)—in this sense, incorporate primary and secondary sources, analytical interpretation, citations, indexes, and bibliographies into their work, as opposed to literature written by first-hand actors, anthropologists, and contemporaneous journalists.

Large trends have been arranged into three periods: 1900–1970—typified by sensationalized “Wild West” narratives and/or historical monographs predominately told from the Anglo American perspective; 1970–2000—in which the influence of “New Social History” and the “New Western historians” encouraged the incorporation of Native voices and a sympathetic slant; and 2000–2013—which marks a turn toward more balanced, analytical, and thematic discourse. This periodization acts as a historiographical arc, but there are many deviations within the grand trends of each era. The first two sections offer brief surveys of their periods’ literature, while the third section (2000–2013) provides more in depth analysis by breaking the works into thematic categories in order to explore current trends, identify areas missing from the discussion, and determine where the field may be headed. By examining the evolution of methodologies, rhetoric, arguments, frameworks, and subjects of the work produced, we may better understand how historians both influenced and reflected popular perceptions of Apaches in each era.

Like much of the historiography focused on Native Americans in general, the history of Apache renegades has been largely written by Anglo Americans who, before the 1970s in particular, drew the bulk of their primary source material from newspapers and military records with an obvious anti-Apache agenda. As discussed previously,

popular media in this era largely portrayed Apaches as villains, violent ignoble savages, and the last vestiges of a vicious Wild West frontier. These stereotypes coupled with the utilization of biased source material led to an abundance of simplistic scholarship, lacking proper contextualization and prone to exaggeration and Apache vilification. The more better works from this period, however, make some attempt at incorporating balance or even compassion for Apaches into their narratives.

One of the unique characteristics of Apache historiography is the incorporation of myriad first-hand reminiscences of both Americans and Native Americans. Although the historiography of most Indian wars includes accounts by the actors, the abundance of fully realized memoirs, autobiographies, magazine articles, and interviews by locals, frontiersmen, journalists, military men and their wives, captives, and Apache men and women themselves make the Apache Wars one of the most heavily documented events of the U.S.-Indian wars. Because of the late date of the conflict, many participants lived well into the twentieth century, and the publication of their recollections coincided with a surge in popularity for all things Wild West from the 1920s through the middle of the century. Likewise, the existence of living renegades or their immediate descendants provided a valuable counter-narrative for mid-twentieth-century historians to draw from as ethnography and Native oral history became more widely embraced in the profession.

Some of the most important works historians continue to utilize include military memoirs: John G. Bourke, *On the Border with Crook* (1891); Nelson A. Miles, *Personal Recollections* (1897); Britton Davis, *The Truth About Geronimo: Life with Apache Scouts* (1929); Woodworth Clum, *Apache Agent: The Story of John P. Clum* (1936); and George
Crook, *General George Crook, His Autobiography*, ed. Martin F. Schmidt (1946).\textsuperscript{189} For the Apache perspective, historians often consult S. M. Barrett and Geronimo, *Geronimo’s Own Story of his Life* (1906); Jason Betzinez, *I Fought with Geronimo* (1959); and dozens of interviews, published in articles and monographs, with reservation Apaches (such as Samuel E. Kenoi), Apache scouts (such as John Rope, Martine, and Kayitah), and renegades’ immediate family members (such as Asa Daklugie, Alberta Begay, and James Kaywaykla).\textsuperscript{190} Both Anglo and Apache memoirs, intrinsically biased and self-serving to the party involved, justify their actions and advocate their cause. Nevertheless, these reminiscences provide valuable information concerning the history of the wars, Apache culture, and insight into Anglo perceptions of Apaches and vice versa.

After the initial surge of military, frontier, and Apache memoirs, the first important monograph produced by a historian is *Death in the Desert: The Fifty-Years’ War for the Great Southwest* (1935), written by Broncho Apache (1936) author Paul I. Wellman. This works illustrates American trends of expressing more sympathy for


American Indians in the 1920s and 1930s.\(^{191}\) *Death* begins in 1837 with the life story of Mangas Coloradas, the first leader of the Apache resistance against Americans and ends in 1886 with the surrender of Geronimo. The book provides a basic, well-written historical survey, and Wellman, as evidenced by *Broncho Apache*, is relatively sensitive to the Apache plight and tries to present a balanced interpretation of the events that escalated into war. However, Wellman’s predominate use of U.S. Army records and memoirs as his primary source materials demonstrates that even works employing a balanced tone fall short of a balanced narrative.

\(^{191}\) Paul I. Wellman, *Death in the Desert: The Fifty-Years' War for the Great Southwest* (repr. 1935, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987). This sympathy was also seen on a political level. Although not always universally beneficial for Natives, seemingly well intentioned legislation for American Indians such as the Indian Citizenship Act in 1924, which granted all Native persons American citizenship; and the Wheeler-Howard Act in 1934, which reversed Dawes Allotment policy and allowed for tribal self-government, were attempts at rectifying some of the wrongs perpetrated by the U.S. government against Natives. For another contemporaneous example of this sympathetic treatment, see Frank C. Lockwood, *The Apache Indians* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938).
After World War II, the Western boom spurred the production of several popular U.S. West history magazines—*True West* (1953-present), *Real West* (1957-1988), and *Old West* (1964-c. 1990)—which frequently featured articles on Apaches. Throughout the midcentury, these magazines occasionally published contributions from respected historians such as Walter Prescott Webb and Eve Ball, but readers more often found sensationalized stories from writers outside the academy. Articles concerning Apaches were heavy with stereotypical ultra-masculine imagery and hyperbolic headlines (see figs. 22–23).

Monographs, written by authors inside and outside the academy, also employed dramatic storytelling and continued to rely disproportionately on Anglo sources, but many authors strove for a more objective stance. Jess G. Hayes’s *Apache Vengeance: True Story of the Apache Kid* (1954) is a popular narrative history largely sympathetic to the Kid.192
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Hayes—drawing from military and trial records, Arizona newspapers, and biographical accounts—argues that Apache “vengeance” was the product of unjust U.S. policies and repeated atrocities. Although this view is progressive for the 1950s, it is certainly simplistic, not taking into account a long history of Spanish and Mexican-Apache violence, Apache cultural factors, or in the case of the Apache Kid, individual circumstance. *Vengeance* is the earliest work about the Apache Kid from an academic press and is useful for its narrative, but its main contributions are its appendices which reproduce rare court documents, including Massai’s murder indictment.

Although many of these early authors made valuable contributions to the field, especially those individuals conducting interviews with historical actors, the first truly robust survey of the Apache Wars is Dan Thrapp’s *Conquest of Apacheria* (1967). Thrapp was a paleontologist, religion editor for the *Los Angeles Times*, and an authority on the Apache Wars who wrote six books on the subject. He was the first to utilize a large amount of unpublished archival materials from the National Archives and Records Service and Arizona historical societies and libraries which are commonly cited today. *Conquest* is a sweeping literary epic, long praised by historians as the definitive history of the U.S.-Apache conflict. Thrapp’s sources stem from careful, exhaustive research of American, particularly U.S. Army, records. These sources inevitably tend to portray the “gallant” American military men as the true heroes of the conflict. To Thrapp’s credit, however, Apache leaders such as Cochise and Victorio are shown due respect and
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compassion, and he presents white atrocities against Apaches as equally barbaric as Apache-perpetrated violence. Although Thrapp’s classic privileges Anglo sources, and periodically contains language deemed politically incorrect today, many historians and readers continue to characterize this work as “fair and even-handed” and herald *Conquest* as the “gold standard” in Apache historiography.194

Thrapp contributed some of the most well-researched and highly successful (in the academic as well as commercial sense) Apache Wars literature of the pre-1970s era. Like the work of his contemporaries, however, Thrapp’s scholarship suffers from a lack of Native voices. By the late 1970s, cultural changes in American attitudes toward Indians—largely ushered in by the successes of Dee Brown’s groundbreaking book *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (1970) and Vine Deloria’s *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* (1969), and the notoriety of the American Indian Movement—laid the foundation for a more sympathetic and ethnographical approach to understanding the U.S.-Apache conflict.195

Coinciding with shifts in popular attitudes, new movements within the history profession began to shape in the early 1970s. With the emergence of “New Social History” in the 1960s, scholars began to explore the histories of non-elites: women, minorities, the working class, ruralites, and subalterns. By the 1980s, this history “from
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the bottom up” spurred the “New Western History” movement—whose historians studied race, class, gender, and the environment in the American West. Central to the methodology of these fields is the inclusion of marginalized or “lost” voices to produce counter-hegemonic narratives. As a result, the use of Native oral histories and source material became more prevalent in American Indian historiography or “New Indian History.” Although historians of Apaches are not generally celebrated as vanguards of New Western history in the 1970s and 1980s, their work shows that, in fact, not only were several making contributions to the field, they were ahead of the curve.

Two historians producing works ahead of their time in this respect were Eve Ball and Angie Debo. Both were pioneers for women in the history profession, and each incorporated Native viewpoints into their narratives at a time when Anglo perspectives carried the day. They cannot be counted as a product of the New Western History movement, since their work prefigures it—Debo began publishing controversial pro-Indian monographs in the 1930s, and Ball began interviewing Apaches on the Mescalero reservation in the late 1940s—but the intellectual climate during the 1970s and 1980s certainly facilitated the successes of their most important works.

Debo’s *Geronimo: The Man, His Time, His Place* (1976) remains the most popular biography of the legendary leader. Debo attempts to explain Geronimo’s
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actions from his perspective—that of a man who had suffered greatly at the hands of U.S. and Mexican forces. She draws from recorded interviews with Geronimo and his contemporaries, as well as from military and reservation records mined from national and Oklahoma archives. Debo may prove too sympathetic of Geronimo at times (she admits as much in her preface), glossing over the brutal actions carried out by the shaman and his warriors. For instance, her assertion that “he was kind and affectionate to his family” certainly overlooks his documented dismay at the reservation’s “no wife-beating” policy. But the work succeeds in providing a personal and historical context for Geronimo’s motivations.

Eve Ball, expert of Apache culture, preservationist, teacher, and prolific writer, helped pioneer the use of Apache testimonies as authoritative historical sources. She gained the admiration of Apache elders throughout the Southwest, who entrusted her with their oral histories. Her books In the Days of Victorio: Recollections of a Warm Springs Apache (1972) and Indeh: An Apache Odyssey (1980) differ from Debo’s Geronimo in that Ball conducted the interviews with the surviving Apache men and women herself, over the course of three decades. Indeh acts as a social, cultural, and family history of Apaches from the onset of the Wars to the mid twentieth century. In 2003, historian Sherry Robinson compiled more of the late Ball’s research and interviews into Apache
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198 See also Geronimo’s own autobiography as told to S. M. Barrett, Geronimo (1906).

Voices: Their Stories of Survival as Told to Eve Ball. Robinson mined Ball’s massive archival collection to piece the interviews into twenty-six chapters ranging from Apache battles to customs to perceptions of historical figures. Ball had the tendency to “flourish” Native accounts with her own writing style and perceptions, which Robinson attempts to identify and sift out in Apache Voices, although she agrees with Ball’s interpretations for the most part. Ball’s interviews provide valuable insight into Apache culture and history, while illustrating that Native voices are as varied as the people and attempts by other historians to homogenize Native experiences or perspectives results in false conclusions and misinterpretation.

Donald E. Worcester’s The Apaches: Eagles of the Southwest (1981) surveys 350 years of Apache history, from the Spanish conquest to the twentieth century. Worcester was a professor and friend and contemporary of Thrapp, and wrote the forward to Thrapp’s biography of Al Sieber. But unlike his colleague, Worcester draws upon anthropological works to examine Apache warfare practices in a cultural context, presenting a more nuanced approach to understanding Apache motivations. For instance, he attributes violent proclivities in Apacheria to a culture that glorified warriors. From infancy, a boy was reared for warfare. Childhood games were designed to “sharpen his senses, make him adept in the use of weapons, and develop to the maximum, his physical strength and fortitude.”

---
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Borderlands historian which lends particular depth to his discourse on Spanish-Apache relations. Until Worcester’s synthesis, no major work had attempted to tell Apache history as a whole, opting instead to break studies into bands, specific regions, or individuals—Thrapp focused on the Chiricahua, C. L. Sonnichsen on the Mescalero, and Ball on the Mimbres. 202

By the end of the 1980s there was a century’s worth of historiography on the Apaches. The incorporation of Native voices over the previous two decades paved the way for a more authoritative understanding of the Apache point of view, and should have laid the methodological foundation for a plethora of fresh, well-rounded, scholarly interpretations of the Apache Wars. This did occur during the 1990s, but on a surprisingly small scale. Even works of little consequence (generally by “buff” historians) numbered considerably smaller than in previous decades.

One possible explanation for this is that the “culture wars” climate and heightened attention toward political correctness in the early nineties may have dissuaded some

202 C. L. Sonnichsen produced the historical survey The Mescalero Apaches in 1958, but I would also recommend his edited volume Geronimo and the End of the Apache Wars (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986). This compilation of articles and documents, authored by a who’s who of Apache studies, concerns the surrender of Geronimo and end of the last Apache War campaign. Article contributors include historian Edwin R. Sweeney; anthropologist Morris E. Opler; and participant to the surrender, Lt. Charles B. Gatewood. Gatewood’s account is particularly useful for detailing the capture of Geronimo, and it offers insight into the lieutenant’s character. Sweeney’s article utilizes many primary sources from Mexican archives (something unique and much needed in Apache historiography). Sonnichsen looks at the evolving popular perceptions of Geronimo. Opler’s contribution is an interview with Samuel E. Kenoi, a Chiricahua at San Carlos who was sent to the prison camps in Florida after Geronimo’s surrender. The volume also includes an annotated bibliography of writings on Apaches, both historical and fictional. As a whole, the collection helps provide a well-rounded account of the topic.
authors or publishers from attempting narratives that were not overtly “sympathetic.”

Contemporaneous films that romanticized and homogenized historical Native Americans as environmentalists, spiritualists, and pacifists—such as *Dances with Wolves* (1990), *Geronimo: An American Legend* (1993), and Disney’s *Pocahontas* (1995)—epitomize this aspect of the decade’s cultural milieu.

One significant contribution escaping this trend is David Roberts’s *Once They Moved Like the Wind: Cochise, Geronimo, and the Apache Wars* (1993).²⁰³ This relatively balanced and less value-laden study of Apache history marked the best survey of the Apache Wars since Thrapp’s *Conquest of Apacheria*. Roberts’s book is sweeping and vivid, at times evoking the purple prose found in pre-seventies-era texts. He gives the reader a comprehensive understanding of the wars’ principle actors by deeply drawing on first-hand accounts and autobiographies by Natives, scouts, and military figures, as well as from the work of Ball, anthropologist Grenville Goodwin, Thrapp, Sonnichsen, among others. Roberts, a magazine editor and author of work on various topics, does not deliver anything groundbreaking in terms of research or analysis, but *Once* offers an accessible starting point that an interested scholar or layman should consult in order to grasp the Wars’ narrative and chronology.

The nineties also marked the emergence of independent historian Edwin R. Sweeney as the new leading authority on the Apache Wars. Noted for his exhaustive research, Sweeney’s efforts set a new standard for academic history on the Apaches. He produced a half-dozen books on Apaches over the course of the decade, the most

acclaimed being two biographies, *Cochise: Chiricahua Apache Chief* (1991) and *Mangas Coloradas: Chief of the Chiricahua Apaches* (1998). Sweeney’s objective in *Cochise* and *Mangas* is to prove that Apaches were no more or less brutal than their American and Mexican adversaries. His unique contribution to the field is his use of untapped Mexican archival documents that present fresh sources and perspectives to this well-covered subject. Sweeney dominated the scholarly Apache history field throughout the decade, but other efforts by less acclaimed authors did make their way to market.

In the context of heightened political correctness and the proliferation of more culturally sensitive historical monographs, some might deem Douglas V. Meed’s *They Never Surrendered: Bronco Apaches of the Sierra Madres, 1890–1935* (1993) an anachronism. In *They Never Surrendered*, Meed, a journalist and an independent historian, provides a survey of Apache renegade activities in the Sierra Madres of northern Mexico during the early twentieth century. The book is significant for attempting to fill a void in the history of the broncho Apaches’ post–Apache War period. Meed cites southern Arizona newspapers, the anthropological works of Goodwin, Helge Ingstad, and Morris E. Opler, and military correspondence from the National Archives. Meed’s writing, despite being published in the late twentieth century, evokes much of the one-dimensional “barbaric savage” stereotypes of earlier historians and writers. He greatly overlooks the depredations and subjugation perpetrated against the Apaches,
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proving more sympathetic to their adversaries: “It was a war of genocide in Mexico. . . .
If the Americans had endured a half century of Apache barbarism, the Mexicans had
suffered devastation and slaughter for more than 100 years. Apaches had created a living
hell.”  He compares the Apaches to plains tribes, who, unlike the Apaches, have “a
concept of honor.”  Meed ends the book with the incredible accusation that the
descendants of the renegades in Mexico have succeeded in exacting “Geronimo’s
revenge” upon the Americans by producing opiates to fuel the American drug war.
Despite its publication during a time that generally portrayed Indians as “victims,” They
Never Surrendered showcases not an anachronism, but an enduring tradition of literature
focused on Wild West lawlessness and the racialization of violence, commonplace within
every period of Apache historiography.  

The turn of the millennium brought with it a renewed interest in Apache history
and a shift toward more analytical scholarship. It also ushered in a move away from
grand narratives about the Wars and toward microhistories and thematic concentrations
with clear theses and new modes of historical discourse. Through the prism of Apache
history, scholars explore aspects of race, captivity, gender, justice, Borderland violence,
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208 Meed, They Never Surrendered, 9–10. Meed has also been accused of sensationalism
by Monica Perales in her award winning book Smeltertown: Making and Remembering a
Southwest Border Community. Perales criticizes his article “Murder in Smeltertown” for
language characterizing Mexicans in the El Paso barrio at the turn of the century as
“banditos,” and murderous “rurales” who were “marked by the ‘crippling disease’
associated with Mexican bodies,” Monica Perales, Smeltertown: Making and
Remembering a Southwest Border Community (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina
Press, 2010), 161–62.
transnationalism, U.S. military and governmental practices, cultural brokers, and popular and historical memory. This final section, will examine recent trends in Apache historiography and discuss where the field is headed.

Perhaps the most difficult issue in writing any history is balance and objectivity. Dee Brown’s work marked a pendulum swing in how historians tell Native American histories. Americans became more sympathetic to the Indian “plight”; and simplistic, biased, and racist Anglo versions of these histories gave way to narratives relayed through the Native perspective. Some historians have argued, however, that this shift moved beyond telling a more-balanced history and into the realm of hagiography.

Although historians did make considerable strides toward producing balanced narratives in the later part of the century, they fell short in myriad ways: neglecting to perform a critical analysis of Native oral accounts; overlooking Native agency and simply portraying Indians as victims; failing to incorporate Hispanic and other regional Indian perspectives; and continuing to privilege Anglo American sources.

Two monographs that attempt to avoid these shortcomings are Karl Jacoby’s *Shadows at Dawn: An Apache Massacre and the Violence of History* (2008), and Edwin R. Sweeney’s *From Cochise to Geronimo: The Chiricahua Apaches, 1874–1886* (2010).209 *Shadows* explores the massacre of 144 Aravaipa Apaches, mostly women and children, at Camp Grant in Arizona on April 30, 1871. *From Cochise* surveys the U.S.-Apache Wars starting with the Chiricahua resistance’s most effective chief, Cochise, to
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the surrender of its last leader, Geronimo, in 1886. Despite the inherent problems in writing Apache Wars history—lack of Native-written source material; biased reporting; and faulty memories—Jacoby and Sweeney’s inclusion of American, Mexican, and multiple Native perspectives make *Shadows* and *From Cochise* two of the most robust works on Apaches from the late nineteenth-century to date.\(^{210}\)

In *Shadows*, Jacoby, a professor of history at Columbia, explores the events that triggered the horrific Camp Grant Massacre of 1871, the contemporaneous public reaction, and the ways in which the tragedy has been remembered or forgotten. This innovative work examines the event from the perspectives of each side involved: American, Mexican (or los vecinos), Tohono O’odham, and Aravaipa Apache (or Nnee). Jacoby argues that violence against Indians is an overlooked aspect of American history, and when it is remembered, the story told is the American version. His goal is to “lead readers toward a deeper revisioning of the American past.”\(^ {211}\)

*From Cochise* displays the strong archival research Sweeney is known for, but he also utilizes more ethnohistorical and anthropological source material to create a binary of Apache and Anglo accounts, which lend the text a greater sense of authenticity and
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\(^{210}\) Award-winning author and independent historian Louis Kraft produced one of the century’s first attempts at a multi-perspective work with *Gatewood and Geronimo*. Kraft examines Lt. Charles Gatewood’s final campaign to capture Geronimo. He argues that Gatewood, along with two Apache scouts, should receive credit for the Apache’s final surrender as opposed to Gen. Nelson Miles—the source of a long simmering feud between Apache Wars buffs. Although the work is meant to be a comparison of the perspectives of both Gatewood and Geronimo, Gatewood takes up most of the book’s real-estate. Kraft thoroughly mines the Gatewood Collection at the Arizona Historical Society, as well as many other archival documents to present the most comprehensive work on Gatewood and this pivotal campaign to date. Louis Kraft, *Gatewood and Geronimo* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000).

Sweeney’s goal is to present the Apache Wars from as many personal recollections as possible, and provide a new lens from which to understand Chiricahua actions. Sweeney makes a surprising recantation early in *From Cochise*, stating that his earlier descriptions of Apaches as “intrinsically warlike” in his Cochise biography were inaccurate. He now sees the Apaches’ “evolution from friend to foe” of the Americans as the result of “systematic abuses . . . or by egregious acts of treachery that took Apache lives.” Only after these betrayals “did they go to war.”

This statement may mislead some readers, for Sweeney neglects to clarify the distinctions between “warfare” and “raiding”—a practice that was, indeed, intrinsic to the Apache way of life before the arrival of the Americans, and undoubtedly considered “warlike” to those on its receiving end. While this revision may harken back to the “sympathetic swing” of the 1970s-1990s, Sweeney does not shy away from presenting contradictory archival evidence to Native oral accounts. For example, Sweeney challenges historians who have propagated stories about Victorio’s sister, Lozen, as a great warrior. Sweeney traces all the information about the female fighter back to an interview of James Kaywaykla conducted by Eve Ball. He was only three or four years old at the time of the events, yet remembers conversations with “remarkable clarity.” Since Sweeney has not come across any other descriptions of Lozen as a warrior during his decades of research, he concluded that Kaywaykla’s story is likely fiction—a blatant dismissal of a Native account was seldom dared in the previous era.
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Jacoby, however, does not question his sources throughout the text; he simply presents each side’s version of events. He explains that the divided-perspective format of the book is not meant to “evade issues of historical interpretation but rather to highlight them.” This allows the readers “to become active participants in . . . finding meaning in our elusive past” by having to “grapple with an array of different interpretations.”

*Shadows* is an academic work that is also engaging to a popular audience, and *From Cochise* is perhaps the most comprehensive scholarly overview of the Apache Wars (numbering 706 pages) ever produced. In the foreword to *Shadows*, historian Patricia Nelson Limerick argues: “When it comes to the number of perspectives, interpretations, rationalizations, memories, omissions, and evasions . . . that come into play in the history of the encounter between Indian peoples and Euro Americans, ‘two sides’ [to a story] is an astonishing undercount.” Ultimately, *Shadows* and *From Cochise* are both books about perspective. Both authors incorporate myriad viewpoints in order to tell their story, and in doing so succeed in presenting a well-balanced narrative rarely seen in Apache historiography.

Two superb contributions joining *Shadows* in the thriving field of Borderlands history are Mark Santiago’s *The Jar of Severed Hands: Spanish Deportation of Apache Prisoners of War, 1770–1810* (2011) and Lance R. Blyth’s *Chiricahua and Janos*:
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Both works examine the turbulent relationship between the Apaches and the Spanish in northern New Spain and provides an in-depth look at the successes and failures of Spanish Indian policy, the varied responses by Apache groups, and how violence played a central role in both war and peace.

Santiago, director of the New Mexico Farm and Ranch Heritage Museum in Las Cruces, New Mexico, provides a rich contextual examination of Spanish Indian policy. He centers his analysis on New Spain’s dual policy of “the mailed fist and the velvet glove,” which entailed both the reservation system (establecimientos de paz) and unrelenting war from 1770–1820. Santiago argues that the greatest incentive for Apache accommodation under this policy was protection from deportation and slavery. He traces the routes of colleras (chain gangs of Apache slaves) on their way to exile in Mexico City and Cuba. Descriptions of these death-plagued expeditions illustrate why many Apaches chose surrender and accommodation to avoid such a fate for themselves and for captured loved-ones.

Blyth, deputy director of the Office of History at the U.S. Northern Command and a research associate professor at the University of New Mexico’s Latin American and Iberian institute, examines the relationship between the communities of the presido (Spanish garrison) of Janos in northern Chihuahua and the Chiricahua Apaches in the

region. Blyth argues that “violence is instrumental in establishing, maintaining, and changing relationships both within and between communities.” He portrays violence “as a readily available tool in the human survival toolkit.”  He argues that Janos is a case study of a Borderland “community of violence,” where the centrality of violence “drove relations—both conflictive and cooperative,” making it the “primary option” and perhaps the “only means for both settler and native communities.”

By showing both the negative aspects and “potential positive outcomes for the individuals and communities involved,” Blyth hopes “to help us understand and account for violence better, both in the Southwest Borderlands and in others—yesterday, today, and tomorrow.”

Clear influences by other contemporary Borderlands and Indian history scholars, including James F. Brooks, William F. Griffen, Karl Jacoby, Samuel Truett, Ned Blackhawk, Brian Delay, Richard White, and Pekka Hämäläinen, are evident throughout the texts. Santiago’s and Blythe’s methodologies both draw heavily on qualitative and quantitative data in Spanish sources: governmental and military records and correspondence, diaries, receipt books, muster rolls, and law/policy decrees. Santiago’s use of archival sources is heavier than that of Blyth, who relies greatly on secondary sources (especially in later chapters where he extensively cites Sweeney). But Santiago’s almost complete omission of Apache sources leaves *The Jar of Severed Hands* less balanced. Blyth certainly suffered from the same dearth in written Apache source material, but instead of leaving out the Chiricahua viewpoint, he draws from
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anthropological sources, namely Morris E. Opler’s *An Apache Lifeway* (1941), to tease historical meaning from Apache mythologies and cultural practices.

Neither Blyth nor Santiago sees peaceful negotiations as a driving force in Chiricahua-Spanish relations. But while Santiago is primarily concerned with the use of violence and exile as a tool for punishment and deterrence, Blyth sees it as a cultural necessity. He argues that fighting not only drove negotiations, trade, treaties, economics, and survival, but also social relations. This sociocultural angle is one of the book’s more interesting elements, as Blyth explains how violence “established a path to adulthood and marriage” for both young Apache and Spanish men. For Apaches being a strong warrior led to status, and goods secured through raiding illustrated his ability to provide for a family. Blyth says the young Hispanic men at Janos similarly sought valor in combat against the Apaches to prove maturity, acceptance from the community (and his superiors who had to grant permission for wedding ceremonies), and financial stability. Blyth’s explanations of inter-Indian migrations through marriage, the treatment of captives, warfare, kinship, logic, mythology, revenge practices, and gender roles allow the reader to get to know the Chiricahuas on a more personal level, and understand their varied responses to Spanish actions. The book’s treatment of Chiricahua women—especially their participation in violent acts—is particularly insightful.

Both books demonstrate trends in Borderlands historiography by striving for a less value-laden assessment of Spanish and Apache relations and by portraying graphic violent actions, perpetrated by both sides, in an objective, contextual manner.
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Contributing to the lightly covered topic of Apaches and the U.S. judicial system is Clare V. McKanna’s *White Justice in Arizona: Apache Murder Trials in the Nineteenth Century* (2005). McKanna looks at murder trials that led to convictions of Apaches during the late nineteenth century. McKanna’s thesis is simple: justice in Arizona Territory was strongly anti-Apache, resulting in unfair trials and sentences. He questions the application of American legal codes onto a culture with different values and traditions, especially concerning acts of retribution. McKanna, a lecturer in American history and American Indian Studies at San Diego State University, has authored several books on race and the justice system, including *Homicide, Race, and Justice in the American West, 1880–1920* (1997), and *Race and Homicide in Nineteenth-Century California* (2007), and *Court-Martial of Apache Kid, the Renegade of Renegades* (2009).

*White Justice* picks up in post–Apache Wars Arizona where public sentiment is still strongly anti-Apache. McKanna selects four Apache murder cases—Captain Jack (1888), Gonshayee (1888), Nahdeizaz (1887), and Batdish (1890)—to illustrate the inability for Apaches to receive fair trials. In all but one case, Batdish’s, the question was not whether the man committed the killing but rather if he should be considered guilty of “murder”—rather than self-defense or manslaughter.

The Major Crimes Act of 1885 dictated that Indians could no longer settle disputes by tribal means for seven major crimes: rape, assault, burglary, larceny, manslaughter, arson, and murder. For Apaches, this greatly affected long-held cultural practices of atonement and retribution. As evidenced from *Massacre*, fear of Apache
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violence ensured a perception by whites that Apaches were inherently dangerous, loathsome, and untrustworthy. This racial prejudice made an acquittal near impossible for an Apache defendant facing a white jury, judge, and sheriff. In addition to the obstacles of race, cultural differences, and recent historical animosities, McKanna explains that there were two other factors working against Apache defendants: class and language. The destitute Apache defendants were issued a court-appointed attorney. McKanna explains that these were often inexperienced civil, not criminal, attorneys who erred in allowing their clients to take the stand in their own defense. This proved problematic during cross examination for questions and answers were often lost in translation—which required two interpreters: one to convert English to Spanish, then another to translate Spanish into Apache, and vice versa.

McKanna’s sources include court testimonies; military and Apache memoirs; reservation, army, and Indian commission reports; prison records; and anthropological work from Goodwin, Basso, and Ball. McKanna also brings in some national and transnational comparisons to murder cases involving the Dakotas, Australian Aborigines, and Ojibwa wendigo (demonic possession) killings in Canada. In the end, it is McKanna’s use of data charting territorial conviction rates by ethnicity (‘white defendants’ not guilty verdicts were three times the Apache rates”) and trial-length comparisons (proceedings for three of the case studies lasted one day, and one lasted a half a day) that lead to McKanna’s unsurprising conclusion that “the criminal justice system failed to extend equal treatment to Apache defendants.”222 The author’s use of
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quantitative analysis, transnational/tribal comparisons, and focus on race and class make White Justice indicative of Apache historians producing more sophisticated work in the new millennium.

The significance of cultural brokers has long been an area of interest in Native American historiography. Often these intermediaries are portrayed as helpful harbingers of peace or devoted diplomats, but English historian Allan Radbourne’s Mickey Free: Apache Captive, Interpreter, and Indian Scout (2005) presents an agent more colorful and complex. Al Sieber once described Free as “half Irish, half Mexican and all son of a bitch.” Radbourne’s careful research and skillful writing helps give Mickey Free, a multicultural scout and interpreter, his due as an integral figure in the Apache Wars and its aftermath. Free was actually Mexican, born Felix Telles. His kidnapping by Apaches from his Irish stepfather’s farm sparked the series of events known as the “Bascom Affair” or “Cut the Tent” which led to the outbreak of the Apache Wars. Radbourne relies heavily on primary source material: military records, newspapers, and recollections from Free family members. Mickey Free is a necessary addition to Apache historiography as it not only traces the life and contribution of this legendary individual, but Free also acts as a case study for interracial captivity, Apache scouts, and cultural interpreters.
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224 The quote is popularly attributed to Sieber, the original source of which, according to Paul Hutton was found in a letter by Britton Davis to another officer. Paul Hutton to author, personal comm., 27 March 2014.

225 Historian Paul A. Hutton’s forthcoming monograph on the Apache Wars also centers greatly on Mickey Free’s significance to the conflict. For other examples of works on kidnapping and slavery in the Southwest, see James Brooks, Captives and Cousins:
Building on the work of Radbourne and the acclaimed scholarship of James Brook’s *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* (2002), Victoria Smith’s *Captive Arizona, 1851–1900* (2009) argues that cross-cultural captivities, and the captivity narratives they produced, significantly shaped Arizona history. Smith, a professor at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln and the only Native historian (of Cherokee, Delaware, and Lumbee descent) included in this essay, draws primarily on contemporaneous newspapers, captivity narratives and biographies, and archival interviews to illustrate these attitudes. Smith deftly charts the public’s outrage and interest to each kidnapping based on the race, class, of gender of the captive and captors involved. This work is beneficial to the understanding of racial prejudices in the Southwest during the Apache Wars, but is also a testament to the abilities of Natives, Anglos, and Mexicans to acculturate to other racial and ethnic groups. Smith examines famous Arizona captives, such as Olive Oatman, Mickey Free, and Charlie McComas to illustrate their kidnapping’s impact on anti-Apache attitudes and the escalation of violence in the U.S.-Apache wars. Smith also includes lesser known narratives, such as “the Harris girl,” a white woman taken by Chiricahuas in 1873, who, after her “rescue” three years later, chose to return to the Apaches. Such episodes crossed cultural, racial,
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and sexual divides in territorial Arizona, and complicated monolithic depictions of Apaches as inhumane and cruel, especially toward women.

Anti-Apache mythology inflicted damaging and long-lasting effects on Apaches, in both the political (the removal of nearly five-hundred Chiricahuas from the Southwest) and cultural (repeated villainous portrayals in popular media) realms. Although an all-encompassing inquiry into how these perceptions affected the Apache population as whole has not yet been attempted, two recent works have provided insight into the changing images of Geronimo. The first is a timely magazine article by historian Paul Andrew Hutton. “Was Geronimo a Terrorist? SEAL Team 6, Bin Laden and the Irony of History,” appeared in the July 2011 issue of the Western-buff magazine True West, the piece appeared only two months after U.S. SEALS killed Osama Bin Laden in a mission code named “Geronimo.” The public outcry surrounding the use of the Apache leader’s name to signify the terrorist target prompted Hutton to examine the changing interpretations of Geronimo as a cultural figure. Hutton provides an overview of the “Popular Culture Wars” by analyzing textual, visual, and symbolic representations of Geronimo in film, television, comic books, novels, and currents events. He claims that early westerns portrayed Apaches as “more cruel and savage than plains tribes”; and changing cultural attitudes throughout the twentieth century took the “character” of Geronimo from villain to hero to “mild-mannered Uncas.” As a magazine article meant for a broad audience, Hutton’s piece does not delve into broader analyses of pertinent
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issues such as gender constructions, Apache agency, and racial identity, but his
specificity of media focused solely on Apaches provides a valuable contribution to
popular culture studies inclined toward the essentialization of Native groups.

William M. Clements’s *Imagining Geronimo: An Apache Icon in Popular Culture*
(2013) posits that, contrary to historiographic belief, changes in Geronimo’s image have
not followed a chronological, unidirectional pattern. From the 1870s, his image “wavered
between two extremes”: the “red devil” and the “embodiment of freedom.”

Although Clements concedes that the overarching trend has been from negative to positive in
general, Geronimo has always been a complex figure in popular culture.

Clements is a professor emeritus for Arkansas State University where he taught
cultural anthropology, folklore, Native studies, religion, and literature. He presents
eamples from literature, film, poetry, songs, newspapers, memoirs, art, photography,
and military documents to show their role in crafting Geronimo’s image. Clements starts
his catalogue of Geronimo in popular culture with contemporaneous newspaper and
military accounts filled with negative rhetoric. He does insist, however, that “other
perspectives existed concurrently and began to supplant the demonization.”

*Imagining Geronimo* includes an enlightening presentation of Apache opinions of Geronimo in the
form of excerpts from memoirs and interviews by Betzinez, Kenoi, Sam Haozous, and
Aravaipa Apache scout Sherman Curly. These excerpts show that, unlike modern-day
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Apache’s more celebratory stance, many of the great warrior’s people held him in contempt during his lifetime.

Clements’s chapters on film and literature—including an unnecessarily long section on poetry—offers little new analysis on the changing interpretations of Geronimo, Apaches, and Natives in these mediums, and are helpful more for their filmography and bibliography compilations than as pieces of analysis.

*Imagining Geronimo*’s most interesting sections—“Geronimo Goes to the Fair,” “Geronimo’s Spiritual Pilgrimage,” and “The Face of Geronimo”—all deal with the leader’s agency in crafting his own public personae. These chapters chronicle Geronimo’s entrepreneurial and/or publicity efforts at fairs and expositions, his participation at Theodore Roosevelt’s Inaugural parade, dictating an autobiography, posing for photographs, and converting to Christianity. Clements argues that Geronimo was a savvy individual who sought opportunities to earn income and to gain sympathy for the Apaches so they might be sent back to the Southwest. Although the chapter on his religious conversion seems the most out-of-place in the book, Clements makes a convincing case that Geronimo’s conversion was not purely for show, but a pragmatic decision that the “white men’s religion worked more effectively… [in the] white man’s world.”

Clements searches for reasons behind the movement toward “canonizing” Geronimo by exploring formulas and archetypes in literature and mythology, and discusses how Geronimo represents the fundamental American value of freedom. He
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shies away, however, from exploring in depth historical context, and, most surprisingly, makes few links to Anglo American attitudes towards gender—the ultra-masculine rhetoric and imagery exhibited in depictions of Apaches would be particularly illustrative of a society nostalgic for a mythic, virile West. Although Clements succeeds in showing that, indeed, both positive and negative perceptions of Geronimo have coexisted since the Apache Wars, he does not convince the reader that anachronisms in greater cultural trends are significant, because he does not explore their broader psychological implications. Ultimately, Clements’s book acts as a list of examples of how Geronimo has been imagined but falls short in explaining why he has been imagined in those ways. This question should be the focus for historians of mythic Apaches moving forward.

One last monograph about the controversial shaman, Robert Utley’s biography *Geronimo* (2012), attempts to objectively present the life and times of this enduring figure and his people, and revise the public’s perception once again. Unlike the most successful biography of Geronimo, Debo’s *Geronimo: The Man, His Time, His Place* (1976), Utley’s Geronimo comes off far less sympathetic. Utley simultaneously presents Geronimo as a liar, murderer, wife-beater, and drunk, and also as strong leader, an enigmatic shaman, a fierce and capable warrior, and a family-man. Undoubtedly a complex individual, Geronimo emerges from Utley’s pages neither as the hero “New Indian History” readily casts him as, nor as the monster the press and public condemned him to be during his own time.

Utley is a former chief historian of the National Park Service and the author of sixteen books, including works on other mythic western figures or topics: George Custer, Wounded Knee, Billy the Kid, the Texas Rangers, and the mountain men. His other

Utley presents graphic descriptions of Apache degradations in Mexico and the American Southwest. Unlike Sweeney, he repeatedly makes distinctions between raiding and warfare, challenging popular mythologies that Geronimo and his “renegades” were simply fighting to protect their homeland against American and Mexican/Spanish intruders. Utley asserts that these Apaches were indeed trying to protect traditional life ways, but this included raiding—the pillaging, kidnapping, and often murder of “innocent” ranchers and villagers in Mexico, far from Apache ancestral homelands. “Warfare” often entailed brutal acts of vengeance for Mexican and American atrocities perpetrated against Apaches. Grasping the magnitude of such violence provides a more nuanced understanding for the motivations of the U.S. government’s treatment of the Chiricahuas.

Utley does not lump all Apaches, Chiricahuas, or even “renegades” into one homogenous category. He depicts chiefs Mangas Coloradas and Cochise as wise,

---


capable, and reasonable; the Apache U.S. scouts are given due credit for their invaluable role in tracking Geronimo’s band; and he sympathizes with the majority of Chiricahua, like Chief Chatto, who lived a peaceful existence at San Carlos reservation, only to be designated prisoners of war by the U.S. government and shipped across the country. For this tragic development, Utley places most of the blame on Geronimo’s exploits. Utley also details the many Anglo personalities, villains, and allies involved in the Apache Wars, but the book proves far less of an indictment of these figures than a critique of Geronimo’s romanticized legacy. The book also tends to gloss over the often deplorable conditions at San Carlos, leading the reader to believe that reservation escapes were solely due to drunken paranoia and unruliness.

_Geronimo_ is a significant book that helps to revise the revisionism that took place after the publication of Brown’s _Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee_ (1970). _Geronimo_ will not please everyone, and surely will not be the last interpretation of this complex and enduring figure, but it does prompt readers to question whether the heroes of our collective imagination warrant reexamination.

Apache historiography has always had the power to reach a popular audience. Thus historians have undoubtedly contributed to perceptions of Apache warriors in the public’s imagination. How these (mis)representations created ramifications for actual Apaches, both in their treatment by Americans and in their place in popular culture, certainly warrants further exploration. Although Apache Wars historiography has taken large strides toward scholarly respectability in recent years, there are many areas in which it falls short of academic expectations. Although plenty exists behind closed doors, the field suffers from a lack of public intellectual, contestation and exchange. While authors
frequently borrow and build upon each other’s research sources, explicit challenges, dialogue, and debate between colleagues rarely presents itself in academic journals or monographs. Although the field has begun to incorporate alternative frameworks and focuses outside of military history, biography, and survey, topics such as masculinity, essentialism, women’s histories, Apaches in Mexico, the post-war period, and the lasting impact of renegades on Apache (and Anglo American) identity have yet to be adequately explored.

Apache renegade history—like most Native and frontier history—will always appeal to a popular audience interested in romantic Wild West drama, exercises in courage and endurance, sensational violence, and legendary figures. Although these aspects may be inherent in the Apache Wars’ history, perhaps the next period of Apache historiography will also incorporate more innovative methodologies, lively scholarly debates, balanced narratives, and objective analysis.
Conclusion

On a recent episode of the PBS program *Finding Your Roots*, which traces the ancestral pasts of celebrities, *Entourage* actor Adrian Grenier tells host Henry Louis Gates Jr. that he most identifies with the Apache part of his heritage. Later in the program Gates informs the actor that he has discovered that Grenier does not, in fact, have *any* Apache blood, but is almost wholly Hispanic, and even has an ancestor who was a conquistador on one of Juan de Oñate’s expeditions. The news greatly upsets Grenier: “I don’t identify with that spirit. I would like to think that I was part of a more peaceful ancestry.”

Collective memory is a fluid and cyclical phenomenon. It is culturally and generationally subjective, and is as equally impressionable as it is influential. Once demonized by Euro Americans, Apache renegades’ violent reputation has been replaced with romanticism and reverence in present times.

Although much of the country rejoiced at the end of the U.S.-Indian Wars, for many Anglo Americans, men in particular, the completion of this epic chapter in American history was bittersweet. Regardless of whether or not these men had ever stepped foot west of the Mississippi River, the idea of a western frontier as place where heroic, masculine energies could be exercised influenced popular culture, public policy, and conceptions of a national identity.²³⁴

Central to this American mythogenesis, Native adversaries acted as obstacles standing in the way of Anglo American’s “manifest destiny.” None were as formidable in white imaginations as Chiricahua Apache renegades. But with Geronimo’s surrender and the loss of Apache autonomy, the media fixated on the last holdouts of a rapidly disappearing way of life.

Beginning with James Fennimore Cooper’s *Last of the Mohicans* (1826), Americans have romanticized the idea of the “last” of the American Indians. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, myths propagating a vanishing Indian race infiltrated everything from dime novels to congressional reports.²³⁵ Although popular media decried broncho “atrocities,” a binary of vilification and appreciation existed from the beginning. Anglos saw broncho Apaches as the last vestiges of a “savage frontier,” thus Massai and the Kid earned mythical status to those aware of their existence.

In popular culture we rarely see depictions of historical Natives who accommodated, of life on the reservation past or present, or of contemporary vibrant Indian communities and individuals. Although Native producers of film, television, and literature have been on the rise over the last few decades, non-Natives continue to produce the majority of works about Native Americans. Evident from these sources, Americans remain fixated on mythic Indian warrior attributes, and prefer their Natives frozen in time. Historically, the interplay between myth and reality led to consequences

²³⁵ See Brian Dippie, *The Vanishing American: White Attitudes and U.S. Indian Policy* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1982). Dippie argues that the notion of the Indian’s inevitable extinction—physically and/or culturally—influenced every stage of Anglo American cultural, intellectual, and political thought concerning Natives from 1812 to 1945.
for actual American Indians—legally, economically, socially, and culturally; and rendered authentic Native identities invisible. For Apaches, this meant unjust trials, a prolonged exile from the Southwest, public condemnation well into the twentieth century, stereotyping, and cultural appropriation. Thus, historians and producers of popular media played a significant role in the lives and collective memory of Native groups in general, and Apaches in particular.
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