

10-1-1968

Fort Butler: The Fort That Almost Was

Robert W. Frazer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Frazer, Robert W.. "Fort Butler: The Fort That Almost Was." *New Mexico Historical Review* 43, 4 (1968).
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol43/iss4/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Mexico Historical Review by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sarahrk@unm.edu.

FORT BUTLER: THE FORT THAT ALMOST WAS

ROBERT W. FRAZER

A NUMBER of western army forts which never actually existed have been accorded a pseudo-life by occasional reference in print, or, more particularly, by their appearance with some regularity on maps. Some of these so-called forts were military stations which bore an official designation other than fort but were termed forts in popular parlance. Others represent military reservations which were proclaimed in anticipation of the establishment of forts but upon which, for one reason or another, no forts were ever established. Fort Butler falls within the latter category. In planning Fort Butler excellent arguments were advanced, both to justify the post and its location. It was intended to meet real defensive needs and to improve the efficiency and economy of the military service in New Mexico. The proposal for the establishment of Fort Butler was closely associated with the opinion that Fort Union no longer served a particularly useful purpose. It is probable, though not certain, that had Fort Butler been established Fort Union would have been abandoned. As it was, the outbreak of the Civil War doomed Fort Butler and restored the importance of Fort Union.¹

Brevet Colonel Edwin Vose Sumner assumed command of Military Department No. 9 on July 19, 1851. He carried with him instructions from Secretary of War Charles M. Conrad to "use every effort to reduce the enormous expenditures of the army in New Mexico," coupled with the suggestion that costs would be reduced and the effectiveness of the service enhanced if the troops were removed from the towns and stationed closer to the frontier.² Sumner observed his instructions with extreme literalness. Economy

became the watchword of his administration, an economy which was, in fact, penurious. Brevet Brigadier General John Garland, who succeeded Sumner as commander of the department in the summer of 1853, wrote of his predecessor:

. . . his energies have been misapplied, and he has left the Department in an impoverished and crippled condition. . . . His great, and sole aim appears to have been to win reputation from an economical administration of his Department: in this, he will be found to have signally failed, if all his acts are closely looked into—his economy run [*sic*] into parsimony. . . .³

Troops were removed from towns, except Santa Fe, and there the garrison of Fort Marcy was drastically reduced. By the time Sumner relinquished his command on June 30, 1853, six new forts and one cantonment had been established, and he had found it expedient to reoccupy Albuquerque and to place a garrison at Los Lunas.

The first new post established by Colonel Sumner, and the only one to exist for more than a decade, was Fort Union. It was intended to protect the eastern approaches to the settled portion of northern New Mexico and to serve as headquarters and general depot for the department. It would, according to Sumner, be "directly on the line of communication with Missouri" and would give him "more direct control, over all the affairs of the Department."⁴ Thus, Fort Union, at its inception, became the most important post in the department, but its importance began to be whittled away almost at once. Even though Sumner had declared it his headquarters, he spent comparatively little time there. On January 1, 1852, he announced that it was "indispensably necessary" to move his headquarters to Albuquerque "in order to be nearer the new posts in the Indian country."⁵ General Garland, who considered Albuquerque "the dirtiest hole in New Mexico," moved the headquarters again, this time back to Santa Fe, where it had been originally.⁶

Two things were characteristic of the posts established during Sumner's tenure. Most of them were improperly located, either for their own defense or to accomplish most efficiently the purpose for which they were intended, and all were poorly constructed.⁷ They were erected by the troops in the cheapest possible manner and began to deteriorate even before they were completed. Fort Union was no exception. The buildings were built of lumber, much of which was felled and sawed by the troops, and some were provided with wooden, some with earthen roofs.⁸ Colonel Joseph K. F. Mansfield, who inspected Fort Union in August 1853, found no fault with the construction of the post, though he did point out that it was "too close under the Mesa for a tenable position against an enterprising enemy."⁹ A year later Captain Langdon C. Easton, the quartermaster at Fort Union, wrote, "The post is built of pine logs with the bark on, the logs laid on the ground without any durable foundation. It is decaying very rapidly and will require constant repairs to keep it in order."¹⁰ The process of physical deterioration continued. When Colonel Joseph E. Johnston inspected Fort Union in August 1859, he stated that, with two exceptions, all of the buildings "were built of green pine logs. They are now much decayed—so much so that none of them are worth repairing. . . ." Even a comparatively new storehouse was "from careless construction or bad materials . . . an unfit depository for valuable property."¹¹

Not only was Fort Union poorly constructed, but, as soon as Sumner left the department, the question of its suitability as a general depot was raised. Major Ebenezer S. Sibley, chief quartermaster of the department, expressed the opinion that a more centrally located depot, perhaps one in the vicinity of Albuquerque, would appreciably reduce expenses.¹² Actually, General Garland had already decided to remove the general depot for commissary and quartermaster stores to Albuquerque.¹³ Only the ordnance depot remained at Fort Union, and even this was to be challenged. In 1860, when the erection of a new ordnance depot was authorized, Colonel Thomas T. Fauntleroy, then in command of the de-

partment, stated flatly that under no circumstances was the Mora Valley the location "which should be selected for one moment as the site of the arsenal in this Territory." As indication that the early abandonment of Fort Union was contemplated, Fauntleroy wrote that the site was:

. . . on the extreme border of the D[e]partment the greatest distance from the greatest number of Posts in a most exposed situation & wholly unsafe without troops. If [the ordnance depot is] there you must have all the organization and expense of a separate post costing the government an annual expense of from forty to fifty thousand dollars a year unnecessarily.¹⁴

As long as Sumner commanded the department he urged that the transportation of military stores be accomplished by government trains.¹⁵ The quantity of stores brought into the department was reduced appreciably and was imported, in part, in army wagons, while the distribution of stores within the department was handled almost exclusively by quartermaster trains.¹⁶ With General Garland in command the army reverted to the practice of transporting all supplies to New Mexico by contract. The first such contracts, three in number, were made in September 1853, and provided for the transportation of stores from Fort Leavenworth to Fort Union for sixteen cents per pound.¹⁷ The first contract for transportation to the depot at Albuquerque was made in April 1854, at the somewhat more favorable rate of \$10.80 per one hundred pounds. A week later another contract was made for the transportation of stores to Fort Union for \$7.96 per one hundred pounds.¹⁸ In 1855 contracts were made to deliver stores to Fort Union at so much per hundred pounds per hundred miles, the rate varying from \$1.14 to \$3.60, depending on the season of the year. From Fort Union the stores were to be transported to any other post in the department from May through August at \$1.40 and the rest of the year at \$1.80, again per hundred pounds per hundred miles.¹⁹ Similar contracts were made up until the Civil War, each succeeding contract providing some reduction in rates.

All of this gave the impression that Fort Union was still functioning as a general depot, but this was not the case. In 1859 the quartermaster at Fort Leavenworth reported that during the past two years not a pound of freight had been shipped from Fort Leavenworth to any point in New Mexico other than Fort Union. "At Fort Union the stores to go beyond that point are re-shipped."²⁰ This was true in the sense that stores sent from Fort Leavenworth were invoiced to Fort Union. General Garland's instructions had been specific in regard to the disposition of these stores: Only the "limited quantity" intended for Forts Union and Massachusetts and for Cantonment Burgwin were to be deposited at Fort Union.²¹ Colonel Johnston provided an explanation of the procedure in his inspection report of 1859. The quartermaster and commissary stores were consigned to Fort Union, but as soon as new trains could be provided by the contractors the quartermaster stores were moved on to the depot at Albuquerque. From Fort Union the commissary department sent supplies to the posts north of Albuquerque and forwarded the rest to the general depot.²²

The fact was that neither Fort Union nor Albuquerque was completely satisfactory as a general depot. Fort Union, easternmost post in the department, lacked the efficiency which a more central location provided. On the other hand, stores sent to Albuquerque, despite the intent, were distributed to Forts Union, Marcy, Massachusetts (or its successor, Garland), and Cantonment Burgwin. Thus some stores were hauled back over a part of the route already traversed, adding to the expenses of the department. This gave rise to criticism from time to time, notably after Colonel Johnston reported that when he inspected the depot at Albuquerque the quartermaster stores for Fort Union, "just received from that place . . . were ready to be returned by the road over which they had come."²³

In the thinking of an economy-minded army Fort Union had another serious defect. Colonel Sumner did not bother to investigate carefully the titles to the sites on which he chose to establish posts. The reservation declared for Fort Union lay on land claimed by Alexander Barclay and Joseph B. Doyle.²⁴ After a series of un-

pleasant incidents, the claimants took the matter to the district court in Taos.²⁵ The army lost, and found itself in the unhappy position of having to pay rent for land which Sumner had assumed to be a part of the public domain. In 1854 Barclay and Doyle leased to the army sixteen square miles centered about the flag pole of Fort Union's parade, with the right of access thereto, except across land under cultivation, for twelve hundred dollars per annum.²⁶ General Garland, who considered the rental extravagant, was reluctant either to rebuild or repair the post under these conditions.²⁷ He went so far as to appoint a board of officers to examine the country near the junction of the Mora and Sapello Rivers and in the vicinity of Wagon Mound for a more satisfactory site,²⁸ but without result.

Finally, the effectiveness of Fort Union as a military position was questioned. The post was located near the junction of the mountain and Cimarron branches of the Santa Fe Trail. In the years prior to its establishment attacks by Indians upon travelers in the area had been common. On one occasion a party carrying the mail to Santa Fe had been completely wiped out and the mail scattered and partly destroyed. This was the country of the Jicarilla Apache who, even though they were few in numbers, were blamed for the atrocities. It was also a region crossed at times by parties of Ute and Comanche Indians. The presence of Fort Union greatly lessened the Indian menace in the general area. By the close of the decade the Jicarilla were no longer considered to require watching, being reduced in numbers and thoroughly subdued.²⁹ The Utes, who, in any case, had rarely been troublesome, were on good terms with the United States. The Comanche and Kiowa were the principal danger along the eastern fringes of New Mexico and their usual range was farther to the south, beyond the effective control of Fort Union.

All of these factors, the decayed condition of Fort Union, its displacement as headquarters and general depot for the department, the changing needs for Indian defense, had greatly decreased the initial importance of the post. The time was approaching, if not already at hand, when it would have to be either rebuilt or re-

placed, and economy seemed to weigh in favor of the latter. In 1858 General Garland reported:

The country east of the Pecos River as far as the Canadian has been recently surveyed down to the western boundary of Texas, and is represented to be a fine country for agricultural purposes. It embraces a favorite haunt of the Comanche and Kiowa Indians, who occasionally depredate upon the eastern settlements of New Mexico. There is a mail route established from Neosho, Missouri, to Albuquerque, which must of necessity, pass near the entrance of Utah Creek³⁰ into the Canadian. Near this point it is desirable . . . to establish a military post, with a garrison of not less than four companies. . . .³¹

This was the first proposal for establishing a permanent post in the Comanche and Kiowa country, although a short step in that direction had been taken with the placing of a garrison at Hatch's Ranch on the Gallinas River, northeast of Anton Chico, in 1856.³² Nothing further was done until 1860 when a complete reorganization of the department was ordered by the Headquarters of the Army. The companies of the Third Infantry serving in New Mexico, together with regimental headquarters, were transferred to the Department of Texas. They were replaced by the Fifth and Seventh Regiments of Infantry, three companies of the Tenth Infantry, and two companies of the Second Dragoons, relieved from duty in Utah, considerably augmenting the military force in New Mexico.³³ There were in the department at the beginning of the year nine forts, one cantonment, and three other regularly garrisoned positions. Of these it was contemplated that all but three would be broken up, and that four new forts would be established.³⁴ For three of the new forts, the locations of which had already been determined, garrisons were soon dispatched.³⁵

The fourth of the new forts, for which the site had not yet been selected, was Fort Butler.³⁶ It was intended to control the Comanche and Kiowa Indians and to serve as general depot for the department. The orders for reorganization provided that it be established on the Gallinas near the crossing of the Fort Smith road, or,

preferably, on or near the Canadian. From mid-spring until early autumn 1860, a column of Mounted Riflemen was in the field conducting operations against the Comanche, as, indeed, troops had been doing for the past several summers.³⁷ In April 1860, two companies, E and K, of the Eighth Infantry were designated as the "infantry garrison" of Fort Butler and ordered to Hatch's Ranch to await further instructions.³⁸ A sutler was appointed for the projected post. Contracts were made to supply Fort Butler with beans and flour, 100,000 pounds of flour to be delivered at Fort Butler or near Hatch's Ranch on or before October 31, 1860, and 246,000 pounds to be delivered at Fort Butler during the ensuing year.³⁹

Despite these preliminary steps, Colonel Fauntleroy, now in command of the department, moved very slowly to establish the new post. In April 1860, he informed William Pelham, first Surveyor General of New Mexico, that he had set aside a ten-mile square reservation on the Canadian River.⁴⁰ Before the month was out, however, Fauntleroy and several members of his staff examined the proposed sites and concluded that neither the Canadian River nor the crossing of the Gallinas offered a suitable location for a post. At this time Fauntleroy recommended that the depot be established either at Tecolote or the "Pecos Church" and that Hatch's Ranch be purchased or rented for the fort.⁴¹ In June, after further investigation, he reported that there was "no situation on the Canadian" feasible for a post because of the lack of wood for fuel and timber for construction. The Gallinas, at the Fort Smith road crossing, would not do because of "the deficiency of wood and water & the *hopeless* complication of the title of the land." Finally, he ruled out Hatch's Ranch because of the clouded title to the land and the great cost of obtaining it. Fauntleroy now proposed that Fort Butler be established at Tecolotito, some four miles above Anton Chico on the Pecos. There the land, which was divided into many small private holdings, could be acquired for between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars. "There is no other place to be procured," he wrote, "and unless this spot is purchased, the loca-

tion of the desired post of Fort Butler will from necessity be postponed another season."⁴²

On November 11, 1860, Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Benjamin Stone Roberts, Mounted Riflemen, was instructed to examine once again the country along the Canadian River to a distance of about sixty miles from Hatch's Ranch and select a site for Fort Butler near both the river and the Fort Smith road:

The Post will be the station of four companies of Cavalry and two of Infantry. The main Depôt for all of the Ordnance, Quartermasters, and Subsistence stores of the Department will also be there; and will be distributed from there, and in selecting the site you will have due regard to the convenience of wood, water and grass sufficient for such a post. As soon as you find a suitable site you will have laid off a Government reservation of ten miles square, with the Canadian River dividing it as equally as possible.

Once the site was selected, Roberts was to assume command of Company K, Eighth Infantry, stationed at Hatch's Ranch, and employ it "for any purpose connected with the establishment" of Fort Butler.⁴³

Almost at the moment Roberts was being dispatched to select the site, Colonel Fauntleroy was in receipt of a circular from the Office of the Adjutant General of the Army, admonishing him to keep his expenditures "within the portions of the appropriation for the fiscal year, so applicable." For his quartermaster department, with its many and varied expenses, the appropriation for 1860-1861 was \$452,460.95, only two-thirds of the sum believed to be necessary.⁴⁴ This led Fauntleroy to proclaim in apparent frustration:

I am now in the very *crisis* of a war with the Navajoes where the great body of the troops operating, have to be supplied at a distance of quite two hundred miles, requiring an almost incalculable amount of transportation at costs perfectly frightful—with the Kiowas & Comanches on the whole eastern border of the territory extending for

five or six hundred miles, unsubdued & swearing vengeance against the settlements. With four new posts to build at remote points from the Depôt of supplies, themselves calling for an immediate outlay for that specific object of at least two hundred thousand dollars; under these circumstances, I know not what to do.

He had been, he said, preparing to determine the specific location of Fort Butler and put "it in the most active state of erection." Now he was placed in the dilemma of choosing between a badly needed campaign against the Kiowa and Comanche and the construction of the post he had been ordered to establish. "The cost however of the post must now compel me to pause—& to ask instructions."⁴⁵

On December 8, Captain Roberts reported the results of his examination. He found the road, leading some fifty-six miles almost due east from Hatch's Ranch to the Canadian River, "an excellent natural highway." The Fort Smith road crossed the Canadian River near the northwestern extremity of the Mesa Rica, which extended for several miles along the right bank of the river. On the left bank a series of lower, broken mesas pressed in on the river, causing it to flow, narrower and swifter, between high banks and cliffs, for about six miles through the "angostura." Below these narrows the mesas receded and the valley widened out. It was here that Roberts fixed the site for Fort Butler. As he described the location it was an almost ideal setting:

About two miles from the lower end of the "Angostura" I have selected the site for the location of Fort Butler. It is central on a long succession of Bosques of cotton wood, almost conterminous for a distance of about three miles. Three of these Bosques are quite large, and I have estimated the number of large cotton wood trees in the three, at about 5000; a very large supply for this region of country. Within five miles wood for the purpose of fuel is inexhaustible. The water is the purest I have seen in New Mexico, and has never been known to fail. Even in the season of extreme drought, the volume flowing through the pass, does not appear to have been lessened, although it has failed above and below. This fixed regimen of the river,

along this cañon, suggests the important fact, that its supply of water is not dependant on the snows in the mountains at the sources of the river, but comes from springs at the bases of the Mesas that form the pass. There is close at hand abundant sand stone for building, and the bottom soil is adapted to the composition of strong adobies. The fall of water through the Angostura is ample as an hydraulic power for mills and machinery on quite a large scale. It makes artificial irrigation for all the bottom lands below, embracing several thousand acres of agricultural valleys, simple and economical. The grasses of the bottom, and the swelling steppes that rise from it, are the nutritious gramma and the rich buffalo tuft. The swales that open out into the Mesas furnish grass for the scythe.

Taking all the advantages of this point into consideration, the water and water power, its supply of fuel, its cultivable lands; its grasses and bosques of cotton wood trees for shade, its stone for building purposes and its strategic position, I do not hesitate strongly to recommend it for a large military post. It holds the passes into the Comanche country, and protects the settlements on every stream this side of the mountains. It is on the nearest line of travel to the first productive region within the states and is of essential military necessity for the protection of Emigrants crossing the plains by the Fort Smith road. Its distance to the lands of the friendly Creek Indians is *within four hundred miles* and water, timber, grass and roads are notably better on this, than any other overland route to the states on the Pacific coast.

Having thus described what would appear to be a most excellent site for a military post, Roberts injected one disparaging note. It was a "military key to the Comanche country" but a poor location for a general depot. Large numbers of public animals would of necessity be stationed at the depot. Moreover, the protection afforded by the fort would attract private herds to the adjacent pasturage. This assemblage of animals would constitute an invitation to the Indians to prey upon public and private herds alike, and a large military force would be required merely to protect property. Further, the position was not "geographically convenient" for the distribution of supplies to the other posts in the department. Roberts recommended instead that Hatch's Ranch, or a point in its vicinity, be selected for the depot.⁴⁶

Colonel Fauntleroy, however, approved the site below the angostura for both the fort and depot. He proposed to occupy it at once and, despite the lateness of the season, expected that by the time stores reached the department from Fort Leavenworth in 1861 adequate storehouses would be available to receive them.⁴⁷ He set aside a reservation of one hundred and twenty square miles, roughly bisected by the Canadian River,⁴⁸ and, on December 26, 1860, he instructed Second Lieutenant Lafayette Peck, Eighth Infantry, to go at once to Albuquerque "and procure such supplies as are required for the immediate establishment of Fort Butler."⁴⁹ This, as it happened, marked Fort Butler's closest approach to existence. In May 1861, a "talk" was arranged with the Comanche Indians at "Fort Butler, or as they call it Mesa Rica," and beef cattle and other subsistence stores were sent from Fort Union to regale the Indians,⁵⁰ but by that time any possibility that Fort Butler would actually be established had ended.

The rapid approach of the Civil War completely disrupted the department. Colonel Fauntleroy was ordered to report to the Headquarters of the Army in Washington, but, even though arrangements were made for his compliance,⁵¹ he chose to go instead to Virginia to offer his services to the Confederacy. His successor, Colonel William Wing Loring, Mounted Riflemen, who assumed command of the department on March 22, 1861,⁵² was, like Fauntleroy, a southerner. He held the command for only three months before he too departed to serve the South. During his brief tenure the department underwent further disruption. Loring approved the site selected for Fort Butler "on account of the influence it will give us over the Comanches whose favorite haunts are upon that [the Canadian] River and within striking distance of where Fort Butler is to be." It was not, however, in his opinion, a suitable point for a general depot, and he requested authority to locate the depot elsewhere.⁵³ In March 1861, four square miles of Hatch's Ranch were leased by the army for one hundred dollars for one year, plus five dollars per month for "each room" on the ranch,⁵⁴ but it was not developed as a depot. Rather, in July 1861,

Fort Union again became the general depot for quartermaster and commissary stores.⁵⁵

This was a time for abandoning, not establishing posts. On June 11, 1861, Loring turned the "general charge" of the department over to Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Edward R. S. Canby, Tenth Infantry.⁵⁶ In July the Confederates occupied Fort Bliss and launched their invasion of New Mexico. Canby was fully occupied by his efforts to raise volunteer companies in anticipation of the withdrawal of the regular army troops,⁵⁷ and in preparing to defend the department. There was no time for, nor interest in, Fort Butler when many posts were being either abandoned or evacuated and their garrisons pulled in to meet the Confederates.

Only after the arrival of the California Column, under the command of Brigadier General James H. Carleton, in September 1862, and the complete expulsion of the Confederates from New Mexico, could attention again be devoted to the control of the Indians. Carleton, as commander of the department,⁵⁸ moved vigorously to suppress Apache, Navajo, Comanche, and Kiowa depredations. He too considered a post on the Canadian essential to the control of the Plains Indians. Strangely, he ignored the already proclaimed Fort Butler reservation. Instead, under his direction, a site was selected on the right side of the Canadian River near the mouth of Pajarito Creek, north of present Tucumcari. There, on August 15, 1863, was established what was at first called Camp Easton but was soon designated Fort Bascom. The land thus occupied was privately claimed.⁵⁹ It was leased until Fort Bascom was abandoned in 1870 and the reservation returned to the lessor in January 1871. Thus it was that Fort Butler, which existed as a name and as a reservation, never existed as a fort.

NOTES

UNLESS otherwise specified all footnote references are to materials in the National Archives. The following abbreviations are used throughout: RG, Records Group; DNM, Department of New Mexico; OQM, Records of the Office of the Quartermaster General; OAG, Records of the Office of Adjutant General; USAC, Records of United States Army Commands.

1. Even so, Fort Union was twice relocated, first in 1861 and again in 1863. The ordnance depot continued to occupy the site of the original post.

2. Conrad to Sumner, April 1, 1851, *Annual Report of the Secretary of War, 1851*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., Sen. Exec. Doc. 1 (Washington, 1851), pp. 125-26. The name of the department was officially changed to the Department of New Mexico on Oct. 31, 1853.

3. Garland to Col. Samuel Cooper, Oct. 28, 1853, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

4. Sumner to Brevet Lt. Col. William W. S. Bliss, Aug. 3, 1852, *ibid.*

5. Sumner to Col. Roger Jones, *ibid.*; Orders No. 6, Jan. 9, 1852, RG 98, USAC, DNM, General Orders.

6. Garland to Cooper, July 30, 1854, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent; Orders No. 27, Sept. 6, 1854, RG 98, USAC, DNM, General Orders.

7. Albuquerque and Los Lunas occupied rented facilities so that any shortcomings in their construction cannot be blamed on Sumner.

8. Brevet Maj. Ebenezer S. Sibley to Brig. Gen. Thomas Jesup, Sept. 1, 1852, RG 92, OQM, Consolidated Correspondence File.

9. Robert W. Frazer, ed., *Mansfield on the Condition of the Western Forts, 1853-54* (Norman, 1963), pp. 15, 32-38.

10. Easton to Jesup, Aug. 2, 1854, RG 92, OQM, Consolidated Correspondence File.

11. Johnston to [Lt. Col. Lorenzo Thomas], Aug. 24, 1859, OAG, Letters Received, Main Series, Microcopy 567, Roll 595.

12. Sibley to Jesup, Dec. 6, 1853, RG 92, OQM, Consolidated Correspondence File.

13. Garland to Thomas, Nov. 27, 1853, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

14. Fauntleroy to Cooper, April 29, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Records Relating to Indian Affairs, Box 39.

15. Sumner to Lt. Col. Thomas Swords, Oct. 25, 1851; Sumner to Jones, Oct. 25, 1851, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

16. Almost three months after his arrival in the department Garland reported, "The empty storehouses left by my predecessor are not yet filled. . . ." Garland to Thomas, Oct. 29, 1853, *ibid.*

17. Lt. Joseph H. Whittlesey with Russell, Waddell, and Co., Sept. 15, 1853; Whittlesey with Alexander Majors, Sept. 16, 1853; Whittlesey with James B. Yeager, Sept. 15, 1853, RG 92, OQM, Register of Contracts.

18. Maj. David H. Vinton with Majors and Russell, April 25, 1854; Vinton with Jones Creech and Armistead Dawson, May 2, 1854, *ibid.*

19. Sibley with Majors and Russell, March 27, 1855, *ibid.* This contract was for two years.

20. Capt. Stewart Van Vliet to Jesup, Sept. 16, 1858, RG 92, OQM, Consolidated Correspondence File.

21. Garland to Cooper, April 27, 1856, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

22. Johnston to [Thomas], Aug. 24, 1859, OAG, Letters Received, Main Series, Microcopy No. 567, Roll 595.

23. Johnston to [Thomas], Aug. 18, 1859, *ibid.*

24. Barclay obtained the land in 1848 from James M. Giddings and Robert Brent, whose claim was based on the Scolly Grant. He sold a half interest in the property to Doyle in 1852. Justice of the Peace Record Group No. 1, Mora County, p. 98. Microfilm copy in the New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe. Actually, Fort Union was not on the Scolly Grant but on the Mora Grant. After the fort was abandoned the reservation reverted to the claimants of the grant on April 1, 1894.

25. Three cases were tried, one against Brevet Major James H. Carleton for trespass, one against Sumner and Major Gouverneur Morris for "ejectment," and one against Sumner and Carleton for trespass. The defendants lost all three cases and were ordered to pay fines and costs. By the time the decisions were rendered Sumner and Morris had left the department. The court proceedings are in RG 98, USAC, DNM, Unentered Letters Received, 1854.

26. Indenture between Barclay and Doyle and Maj. Daniel H. Rucker, March 22, 1854, RG 92, OQM, Register of Contracts.

27. Garland to Cooper, April 27, 1856, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

28. Special Orders No. 27, April 1, 1856, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Special Orders.

29. See Johnston to [Thomas], Aug. 24, 1859, OAG, Letters Received, Main Series, Microcopy No. 567, Roll 595.

30. Ute Creek joins the Canadian a few miles west of the present town of Logan, New Mexico.

31. Garland to Thomas, Aug. 8, 1858, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

32. Troops had been stationed in the vicinity of Hatch's Ranch in connection with operations against the Comanche in 1855. On Oct. 10, 1856, a company of Mounted Riflemen was ordered to take winter quarters at the ranch. Special Orders No. 132, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Special Orders. From that time on troops were stationed there almost continuously into 1861. The owner of the ranch, Alexander Hatch, usually permitted the military to occupy his land, which was on the Antonio Ortiz Grant, without charge.

33. General Orders No. 6, March 12, 1860, RG 94, OAG, Headquarters of the Army, Orders and Circulars.

34. The posts to be abandoned were Forts Buchanan, Defiance, Marcy, Union, Craig, and Fillmore, Cantonment Burgwin, and the Posts of Los Lunas, Albuquerque, and Hatch's Ranch. After listing the posts to be established and retained General Orders No. 6 stated specifically "All other posts, now occupied in the Department of New-Mexico, will be abandoned." *Ibid.*

35. These forts, for which names had not yet been selected, were Breckinridge, Floyd (McLane), and Fauntleroy (Wingate). See Special Orders No. 52, April 29, 1860; Special Orders No. 79, July 8, 1860; and Special Orders No. 98, Aug. 17, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Special Orders.

36. The name Fort Butler was specified in General Orders No. 6. Though it is not so stated, it has been assumed that the post was named in honor of Benjamin Butler.

37. The campaign of 1860 was the most impressive which had been undertaken, involving columns from the Departments of the West and Texas as well as New Mexico, eighteen mounted companies in all. See Lt. Col. Henry L. Scott to Fauntleroy, March 10, 1860, OAG, Letters Received, Main Series, Microcopy 567, Roll 619.

38. Special Orders No. 42, April 10, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Special Orders. Company E was later transferred to Fort Fillmore, but Company K was stationed at Hatch's Ranch until January 1861. See Special Orders No. 5, Jan. 20, 1861, *ibid.*

39. Special contract made by Brevet Lt. Col. John B. Grayson with Tomás C. de Baca, June 12, 1860; Special contract made by Lt. Thomas K. Jackson with Simeon Hart, June 28, 1860; Special contract made by Grayson with Boice and Desmarais, Sept. 22, 1860, RG 192, Records of the Office of the Commissary General of Subsistence, Register of Contracts, 1848-63.

40. [Lt. John D. Wilkins] to Pelham, April 4, 1860, RG 98, USAC,

DNM, Unentered Letters Received, 1860. A month later Fauntleroy modified the reserve to consist of eighteen sections in Township 13, N. Ranges 30 and 31 E. [Fauntleroy] to Register and Receiver of Land Office, May 1, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

41. Fauntleroy to Cooper, April 29, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Records Relating to Indian Affairs, Box 39.

42. [Fauntleroy to Cooper] June 10, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Unentered Letters Received, 1860.

43. Brevet Capt. Dabney H. Maury to Roberts, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

44. Capt. James L. Donaldson to Fauntleroy, Nov. 13, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Received.

45. Fauntleroy to Cooper, Nov. 12, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

46. Roberts to Maury, Dec. 8, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Received.

47. Fauntleroy to Cooper, Dec. 16, 1860, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

48. Although the reservation was not occupied for military purposes it was retained until July 22, 1884, when it was turned over to the Interior Department by presidential proclamation.

49. Special Orders No. 184, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Special Orders.

50. Col. William W. Loring to Lt. Alexander McRae, April 25, 1861; Maury to Capt. Thomas Duncan, May 2, 1861, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

51. Special Orders No. 31, March 27, 1861, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Special Orders.

52. Orders No. 9, March 22, 1861, RG 98, USAC, DNM, General Orders.

53. Loring to Thomas, April 7, 1861, RG 98, USAC, DNM, Letters Sent.

54. Lease, Roberts with Hatch, March 5, 1861, RG 92, OQM, Register of Contracts.

55. Orders No. 22, July 20, 1861, RG 98, USAC, DNM, General Orders.

56. Canby to Asst. Adj. Gen., June 11, 1861, *The War of the Rebellion, A Compilation of the Official Records*, series 1, vol. 1 (Washington, 1880), p. 606.

57. On June 14 all companies of the Fifth and Seventh Infantries and two companies of the Tenth Infantry were ordered from the department to Fort Leavenworth with the least possible delay. Orders No. 12, June 14, 1861, RG 98, USAC, DNM, General Orders. This left only the Regiment

of Mounted Riflemen and four companies of Second Dragoons in New Mexico.

58. The Department of New Mexico was dissolved on July 3, 1861, and the area merged with the Western Department. It was reestablished on Nov. 9, 1861, and continued to exist until June 27, 1865, when it was finally abolished. Raphael P. Thian, *Notes Illustrating the Military Geography of the United States* (Washington, 1881), pp. 79-80.

59. The land, which lay on the Pablo Montoya Grant, was claimed by John S. Watts, prominent in New Mexico's judicial and political life.