New Mexico Historical Review

Volume 53 | Number 3 Article 2

7-1-1978

Acculturation and Assimilation in Colonial New Mexico

Robert Archibald

ACCULTURATION AND ASSIMILATION IN COLONIAL NEW MEXICO

ROBERT ARCHIBALD

ACCULTURATION, the combination of cultural elements; and assimilation, the absorption of individuals into another culture, were hallmarks of the Spanish conquest of the Americas which have drawn the attention of much recent scholarship. Anthropologists and historians have engaged in an elusive quest for models or theories which adequately explain the attitudes and processes of racial mixture begun when Columbus and his men set foot in the Antilles. Examination has been complicated by the multiple racial groups, Indian, European and African, each having its own impact upon the other. European attitudes toward Africans and Indians were not identical, and multiple variables have made for widely differing theories and arguments to explain attitudes toward race in contemporary Latin America. Race in Latin America, most students would agree, has become a social as well as an ethnic concept.[1]

In pursuit of understanding of concepts of race in Latin America, major contemporary Latin American countries have had much attention directed toward colonial backgrounds. Limited attention has been focused on the edges of Spain's far-flung frontier provinces. Little interest, in particular, has been directed toward those portions of the Spanish Borderlands now included in the United States. Yet historians of the Borderlands, particularly of New Mexico, have long been aware that the same processes of acculturation and assimilation took place on the very edge of Spanish civilization in the New World. This lack of attention is understandable. Raw frontier society was less complex in the Borderlands than in Mexico proper. Institutions on the frontier were streamlined, social distinctions were somewhat blurred and

0028-6206/78/0700-0205$01.30/0

society had a fluidity which did not exist in more settled areas. Because of frontier conditions, and failure of colonists from Mexico to transport the whole fabric of their society to New Mexico, this northern salient of New Spain did not represent a microcosm of Spanish society in Mexico. New Mexico did, however, have similarities and peculiarities in relations with native peoples which this paper will examine.

The legal framework regulating treatment of Indians was basically uniform throughout Spain's New World empire. The New Laws of 1542 spelled out the naive hope of the Spanish Crown "that the Indians should not be made slaves, but that they should be treated as vassals of the Crown of Castile." The ideals expressed in this document remained a utopian hope never fully implemented. The conquest of the New World was dependent upon cheap labor, and, indeed, the quest for slaves both lured Spaniards to new frontiers and impelled rapid exploration of frontier areas. Thus, despite the New Laws, Spanish enslavement of Indians continued, predicated upon the concept of a "just war." Legal definitions of a "just war" were drawn up at the Crown's request shortly before 1514. In effect, this document, through the famous *Requerimiento*, justified war against non-Christian Indians, or any Indians who had taken up arms against Spain. The "just war" provided a mechanism whereby non-Christian Indians in New Mexico were enslaved in the seventeenth century. Initially this applied to Pueblo Indians only when they were in revolt, since they were nominally Christian. In fact, although illegally, Pueblo people were enslaved. Seventeenth century New Mexico was brutal. Indian slaves were an item of personal wealth, as well as commerce, when sold into mines of northern New Spain. This nefarious exchange stimulated wide-ranging slaving expeditions out onto the eastern plains in search of *Indios Bárbaros* who could be legally enslaved. Indians sold by New Mexicans into Nueva Vizcaya mines were obviously never incorporated into seventeenth century New Mexican society. There is evidence, however, that the dual processes of acculturation and assimilation were contributing to New Mexican society at this early date. Occupants of Acoma Pueblo provoked a Spanish attack in 1599, after submitting to Spanish authority in the previous year. A "just war" was

undertaken against them and in the trial which followed, girls under twelve years of age were given to Fray Alonso Martínez to be distributed in New Mexican households where they were Christianized, while boys under twelve years of age were given to Captain Vicente de Zaldívar for the same purpose.[2] In April of 1601, the Piro Indians of Abó Pueblo revolted. Captain Zaldívar was sent against them and two hundred were taken captive. Each soldier was given one captive.[3] Throughout the seventeenth century, however, not all enslaved Indians were shipped south for profit. Some remained in New Mexico and cultural amalgamation began. However, complete census records are non-existent and documentation is sparse.

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 is a watermark after which the view of New Mexican society becomes more clearly focused. After reconquest by Don Diego de Vargas, Pueblo Indians were not enslaved, nor were they, as a rule, forcibly brought into Spanish society. They were, and remain, a group apart.

Nomadic and non-Christian Indians continued to trickle into Spanish New Mexican society through war or ransom. The just war concept has already been examined. The colonial legal code known as the *Recopilación* of 1681 spelled out a Christian obligation to ransom captive Indians enslaved by other Indian tribes.[4] Ransomed Indians were assigned to an owner who was responsible for Hispanicizing and Christianizing them. Ransomed Indians had incurred a debt, and according to the *Recopilación*, they were to work out their debts by services to their creditors. This provision of the *Recopilación* gave impetus to a mutually beneficial exchange between Plains tribes and New Mexicans, and was the first step whereby non-Pueblo Indian people became participants in the social, political and religious life of colonial New Mexico. Growing royal opposition to the use of Indian slaves in the mines of New Spain, the incredible mortality rate of Indians in such service, and importation of African slaves, effectively curtailed the market for New Mexican captives.[5]

The Plains Indian and New Mexican trade in Indian captives had origins before the Pueblo Revolt. In the 1650s, for example, Fray Alonso Posada, in charge of Pecos mission, reported that Apaches were bringing captive Indians and robes from Quivira to

exchange for horses.[6] Precedents were set early and a trade flourished which was institutionalized in the eighteenth century.

Enslavement of Pueblo people began during the reconquest. Because of their revolt, Pueblo people could be legally enslaved in a just war. The governor at El Parral, Don Bartolomé de Estrada, wrote to the Viceroy suggesting that enslavement of the rebels would be an effective inducement to convince settlers to recolonize New Mexico. He recommended that all captives over age sixteen be enslaved.[7] Captives later taken by Don Diego de Vargas were the beginning of a large Indian servant population which developed in the eighteenth century.

Trade with Comanches, Apaches, and Utes was a most fruitful source for augmenting New Mexico's servant population. This exchange is well documented and was mutually beneficial. The Comanches were major participants in this trade. Dependence was the most effective method available to the Spanish to exert even minimal control over the dangerous and powerful Comanches. This trade received royal sanction as early as 1694. In 1694 some Navajos returned to the Spanish province from an expedition to the east with captive children whom they beheaded after the Spanish refused to pay ransom. This atrocity so shocked the Spanish King that he ordered use of royal funds to save such unfortunates.[8] Trade in slaves was thus made attractive to Indians. Plains Indians, particularly Comanches, soon learned that a threat to kill captives would quickly force Spaniards to pay ransom even though government funds were rarely available.

Trade in captives was formalized in the early eighteenth century with establishment of a regulated annual fair at Taos Pueblo. The fair was a major annual event and took place in July or August. For weeks in advance, settlers gathered axes, hoes, wedges, picks, bridles, machetes and knives for trade. In exchange there were slaves, referred to by Fray Pedro Serrano in 1761 as the "gold and silver and richest treasures for the governor," and anyone who might have the price for a profitable exchange.[9] The price for individual slaves depended on sex, with females commanding higher prices than males. In 1776 a young female Indian between twelve and twenty years could be traded for two good horses and some trifles, while a male slave was worth only half as much.[10] All sales

of captives were to Hispanic New Mexicans, since in 1732, Governor Gervasio de Cruzat y Góngora issued a *bando* prohibiting sale of Apache captives to Pueblo people and imposing penalties.[11] Governors did, however, favor the trade because redeemed captives were educated and "brought into the fold of the church" and because otherwise Comanches would kill the captives. Clerics defended the practice for the same reasons.[12]

The status of ransomed Indian captives in Spanish society was not without legal protection. In addition to the *Recopilación*, which spelled out in considerable detail the legal rights of conquered peoples, there was the papal bull, *Sublimis Deus*, issued in 1537, which declared the American Indians to be human and consequently capable of salvation.[13] These captives were not chattel. Thus, without question, Ute, Apache and other servants were baptized.

Legal status of captives varied. In all cases servitude was temporary, however long, and servant or slave status was not inherited, as it came to be in the English colonies. It was a form of debt servitude which could extend indefinitely, but was carefully circumscribed legally with rights and remedies available to servants.

Mistreatment, for example, often resulted in immediate legal remedy. An offended servant had recourse to alcaldes and the governor. Failure on the part of the master to carry out his responsibility to Christianize servants was cause for removing his servants. Captives could complain directly to authorities if they felt abused, or citizen or missionary could intervene and initiate a complaint.[14] In 1766 an Indian servant of Gregoria Baca complained of ill-treatment to the missionary of San Ildefonso, who in turn petitioned the governor for her release.[15] Justice was not one-sided. Two Indian women who complained of ill-treatment in 1763, outlining excessive beatings and denial of life's necessities, were refused freedom. Nevertheless their owners, Tomás and Isabela Chávez, were put on trial and forced to defend themselves from these charges indicating substantial legal rights of Indian servants.[16] Murder of a servant was not punishable by death, but was severe. In 1745, Pedro García of Albuquerque charged the Lieutenant Alcalde of having killed his Indian servant. The

alcalde was found guilty, deprived of his office and fined.[17] In 1741 Manuel Martín and Salvador Torres were found guilty of attempting to kill an Indian servant. The pair was imprisoned and ordered to pay fifty pesos.[18]

Prices current for female servants, as opposed to male servants, and the preponderance of females in available census records suggests many purchasers were in the market for concubines.[19] This, too, had a legal remedy. In 1740 Antonio de Ortega was charged with raping his Indian servants and was accordingly found guilty. Such occurrences were commonplace.[20] Indian servitude was also protected in law and in practice. Escape was equated with apostasy from Christianity and was dealt with severely. In 1741, Luis Quintana, an Apache slave, fled New Mexico taking two other servants with him. Quintana was apprehended and tried. The hapless refugee was found guilty and sentenced to two hundred lashes and two years labor in the Chihuahua mines since he appeared to be the instigator of the crime.[21] The master, Juan de Tafoya, was not awarded any damages for loss of his servants. Escape was difficult since officials in bordering provinces were on the lookout for fugitives and would return those apprehended to their place of origin.[22]

Servants were also subject to those rules and regulations governing behavior in civilized society. Servants were charged with adultery, horse theft, burglary, and physical abuse. Particularly serious was theft from a tribal Indian, since it might endanger the security of the entire province: Juan de la Cruz Valdez was found guilty of stealing a horse from a Ute Indian in 1761 and was sentenced to fifty lashes in front of the offended Indian and exile from the province.[23] An Indian servant, liberated from servitude, could be returned to his previous condition for crime. In 1763 Don Joachín Pino brought suit before the alcalde of La Cañada against Juan de Piro, an Indian, for burglary. The ex-servant was found guilty and sentenced to hard labor for the plaintiff, Don Joachín.[24]

A transition from Indian servant to free citizen took place frequently. The term *genízaro* was applied to these marginal people who were ethnically non-Pueblo and frequently Plains Indians, but culturally Hispanic. Servants were liberated when debts were paid, when manumitted by their masters, or when removed by of-

ficials for mistreatment or failure to be instructed in the tenets of faith and Spanish civilization.

These *genízaros* were settled in frontier towns to protect interior settlements of New Mexico. They played a major role in warfare against Plains tribes, as interpreters, scouts, and as a general early warning system.

The origin of *genízaro* settlements was exactly described by Fray Miguel de Menchero in 1744.

> They [the Comanches] sell people of all these nations to the Spaniards of the kingdom by whom they are held in servitude, the adults being instructed by the Fathers and the children baptised. It sometimes happens that the Indians are not well treated in this servitude. The missionaries informed the governor of it, since many were deserting and becoming apostates. The governor ordered that all Indian men and women neophytes who received ill-treatment should report it and if the case were proved he would provide relief. A number of cases were appealed to him and he assigned them to Valencia and Tomé. There are over forty families under care of the father at Isleta. This settlement dates from 1740. The people engage in agriculture and are under obligation to go out and explore the country in pursuit of the enemy, which they are doing with great bravery.[25]

A need to bolster frontier defenses and a growing and apparently disgruntled Indian population, combined with gradual diminishing of the Comanche threat, made possible the planting of a number of frontier towns in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The *genízaros* themselves were frequently without land or livelihood in Spanish New Mexico and were reduced to poverty and vagrancy.[26] Frontier settlements provided a risky, but certain means of acquiring land. New Mexicans considered these people "children of the enemy" and would not admit them to their towns. According to Fray Damián Martínez, *genízaros* were reduced to living without "land, cattle, or other property with which to make a living except their bows and arrows."[27] *Genízaro* settlements were subsequently founded at Abiquiu, Belén, and after 1790 east toward the Plains at San Miguel del Vado, San José del Vado, La Cuesta and Anton Chico. Many other settlements contained a high

percentage of *genízaro* residents and in Santa Fe, the capital, the *genízaro* population was congregated in the barrio of Analco.[28]

An interesting phenomenon soon became apparent in these frontier towns. Comanche and Kiowa *genízaros* in settlements along the Pecos established contact with nomadic tribesmen and induced some to take up residence among them. In 1812, José Cristóbal Guerra, a San Miguel *genízaro* of Comanche extraction, represented a number of families in his petition to the Bishop of Durango for a resident priest. His description led the Bishop to believe that "Comanches are joining San Miguel and San José and getting baptized, so that these towns are expected to become the most populous in New Mexico."[29]

Contemporary New Mexicans and visitors of Spanish background had little but contempt for *genízaros*, only recently removed from nomadic life on the plains.[30] A description in 1776 by Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez observed that although *genízaros* of Santa Fe were "servants among our people, they are not very fluent in speaking and understanding Castilian perfectly, for however much they may talk or learn the language, they do not wholly understand it or speak it without twisting it somewhat."[31] He further observed that *genízaros* of Abiquiu did not practice pagan rituals, but were nevertheless weak, gamblers, liars, cheats, and petty thieves and in view of their great weaknesses they typified what happens when idleness becomes the source of evil.[32] The visitor also noted that some *genízaros* at Belén had small plots of arable land while others had nothing, supporting themselves by chance alone.[33]

Numbers of *genízaros* itemized in various census reports were never large. An anonymous report of 1765 listed 677 for the entire province.[34] Most census information available does not carefully distinguish *genízaros* from general population. The Domínguez report of 1776 does this sporadically. The most complete census for the Spanish period, that of 1790, provides invaluable information on marriage customs, social mobility and position, economic status, and social attitudes, but it too is inaccurate and inconsistent in its ethnic classifications.[35] This census carefully lists ethnic identifications for much of the Rio Abajo area, but does this intermittently for the Rio Arriba. Part of the inconsistency is due to in-

ability of census takers to be able to identify ethnic origin with any accuracy, a problem which also developed in Mexico due to intermarriage and the cumbersome multiplicity of terms used to distinguish succeeding generations of offspring.

Occupations of *genízaros* within New Mexican society were varied and included servants, day laborers, farmers, wool carders, weavers, spinners, sweepers, shepherds, muleteers, and vagabonds. Most common occupations were servant, day laborer, and farmer, suggesting low socio-economic status for these detribalized Indians. Servants worked in households where the master classified himself as Spaniard or, less often, as *mestizo*. Defining transitional status, servants were generally designated with previous tribal affiliation—Apache, Navajo, Ute, or Comanche.[36] Because of close relationships with former tribesmen, *genízaros* were employed in the military and as interpreters. Manuel Mestas, Ute interpreter and *genízaro*, was used and paid by the governor for his services. In 1805, it was Mestas, living in Abiquiu who warned officials of impending Ute attack.[37] These detribalized natives were also utilized as interpreters for various Apache tribes.[38] *Genízaros*, wise in the ways of war of their nomadic tribesmen, provided essential services in defense of the besieged New Mexican colony. Before 1808 *genízaros* served in the militia in various campaigns against hostile Indians. In that year a body of them were organized and a *troza de Genízaros* came into being commanded by a corporal from their own ranks.[39]

A careful examination of marriages made by *genízaros* in colonial New Mexico makes evident the same process of "whitening," modified by economic status, so often alluded to in Latin American sociology. The New Mexican census categorized people's ethnic affiliations on the basis of Spanish background. Although this may have been only guesswork, it was true that people themselves thought in these terms. Primary ethnic categories included: Spanish, *mestizo*, *coyote*, mulatto, *genízaro* and Indian, in that order. Social status and status of one's children, particularly in the case of males, were affected by whether marriage was with a person from a higher or lower status group. Marriage with a person from the same group had no effect upon social standing. The census of 1790 makes clear that males classified as Indians most

often married detribalized Indians while these *genízaros* most often married *mestizos*. Rarely did a male *genízaro* marry an Indian. Such a marriage would have lowered the status of his children. The gradual "whitening" process is evident. Juan Francisco Saavedra, a *mestizo*, and his wife, who was also a *mestizo*, lived in Belén. His mother, a widow, lived with them and was classified as a *genízaro*. She almost certainly had married a *mestizo*, and thus the children were *mestizo*. Luis López of Albuquerque, a *mestizo*, had his *mestizo* wife's mother living with him. She was enumerated as an Apache. There are other examples. *Mestizos* frequently married Spaniards and children were accorded Spanish status. Thus, within two generations, the offspring of detribalized Indians could be Spanish for social purposes. Ethnic classifications had more to do with perceived social position than with ethnic origin.

Available censuses are fragmentary, but they do suggest a lower *genízaro* and Indian servant population than other documents lead researchers to expect. This is due to the transitory status of Indians and *genízaros* living within the New Mexican community. A detribalized Indian who married a person from another social classification did not pass his ethnic affiliation to his offspring.

Economic occupations also entered into the formula of ethnic and social identity. Indians were generally servants in Spanish or *mestizo* households, with some exceptions. *Genízaros* were day laborers or small farmers, sheepherders, and in a few cases, artisans. High governmental offices, such as alcalde mayor, as well as classifications as rancher were reserved for people enumerated as Spanish, while *mestizos* occupied an intermediate position.

Despite seemingly arbitrary ethnic classifications and an economic heirarchy which roughly followed ethnic lines, colonial New Mexico was not a closed society. Marriage and economic success were certain roads to improved status. The transitory nature of Indian and *genízaro* classifications indicate a highly effective means of Hispanicizing, Christianizing and ultimately incorporating native peoples into New Mexican society. Colonial New Mexican society provided newly incorporated native peoples with opportunities for upward mobility and gave their children's children hope for social acceptability at the highest levels of colonial society.

NOTES

1. On race in Latin America, see Mangus Mörner, *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America* (Boston, 1967); Marvin Harris, *Patterns of Race in the Americas* (New York, 1964); David Brian Davis, *The Problem of Slavery in Latin America* (New York, 1966).

2. George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey, trans., *Don Juan de Oñate: Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628*, 2 vols. (Albuquerque, 1953), 1:477-78.

3. Hammond and Rey, *Don Juan de Oñate*, 2:1115.

4. *Recopilación de leyes de los reynos de las Indias. Mandadas imprimir y publicar por la Majestad católica del rey don Carlos II* (Madrid, 1681), libro VII, leyes III and XVII.

5. Conditions for slaves in the mines of New Spain were graphically described by Toribio de Motolinía, *History of the Indians of New Spain*, trans. Francis B. Steck (Washington, 1951), p. 93.

6. S. Lyman Tyler and H. Daniel Taylor, trans., "The Report of Fray Alonso de Posada in Relation to Quivira and Teguayo," *New Mexico Historical Review* 33 (October, 1958):301-3.

7. Don Bartolomé de Estrada to the Viceroy, El Parral, July 22, 1680, in Charles Wilson Hackett, trans., *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, 1680-1682*, 2 vols. (Albuquerque, 1942), 1:45. Also see Governor Pedro Reneros de Posada, *bando*, October 6, 1687, Spanish Archives of New Mexico (SANM). Microfilm edition, State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe.

8. Alfred B. Thomas, *After Coronado* (Norman, 1935), pp. 13-14.

9. "Report of Reverend Fray Provincial, Fray Pedro Serrano, to Viceroy, The Marqués of Cruillas, 1761," in Charles W. Hackett, ed., *Historical Documents Relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya and Approaches Thereto, to 1773*, 3 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1923-1927), 3:486.

10. Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez, *The Missions of New Mexico, 1776*, trans. Eleanor B. Adams and Fray Angélico Chávez (Albuquerque, 1956), p. 252. Also see R. M. Magnaghi, "The Indian Slave Trader: The Comanches, A Case Study" (Ph.D. diss., St. Louis University, 1971), pp. 135-41.

11. Governor Cruzat y Góngora, Santa Fe, December 6, 1732, SANM.

12. Governor Tomás Vélez Cachupín to the Marquez de Altamira, January 14, 1751, in Charles Wilson Hackett, ed. and trans., *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas . . .* , 4 vols. (Austin, Tx., 1931-46), 3:332.

13. Lewis Hanke, "Pope Paul III and the American Indians," *Harvard Theological Review* 30 (April, 1937):89.

14. Declaration of Fray Miguel de Menchero, Santa Barbara, May 10, 1794 in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, 3:401-2.

15. Fray Joachín Rodríguez, San Ildefonso, April 14, 1766, SANM. Also see F. J. Athearn, "Life and Society in Eighteenth Century New Mexico, 1692-1776" (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, Austin, 1974), pp. 210-13.

16. Complaint of Two *Genízaro* Women, Albuquerque, October 12-15, 1763, SANM.

17. Lieutenant Alcalde Francisco Gutiérrez, Albuquerque, October 5-16, 1745, SANM.

18. Proceedings against Manuel Martín and Salvador Torres, Santa Cruz, June 4-10, 1741, SANM.

19. Domínguez, *The Missions of New Mexico*, p. 252.

20. Proceedings against Antonio de Ortega, Santa Fe, June 4-10, 1741, SANM.

21. Proceedings against Luís Quintana, Santa Fe, July 8-31, 1741, SANM.

22. In 1807, for example, a *genízaro* Indian of San Miguel del Vado was apprehended in Chihuahua and returned to Santa Fe. Isidro Rey to Governor Real Alencaster, El Paso del Norte, March 2, 1807, SANM.

23. Proceedings against Juan de la Cruz Valdés, Santa Fe, March 29-May 6, 1761, SANM.

24. Joachín Pino vs. Juan de Dios, Santa Cruz, October 18-March 14, 1763, SANM.

25. Declaration of Fray Miguel de Menchero, Santa Barbara, May 10, 1744, Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), Historia 25. Trans. in Hackett, *Historical Documents*, 3:401-2.

26. Poverty stricken and vagrant *genízaros* were rounded up to form new settlements. See Robert R. Archibald, "Cañon de Carnué: Settlement of a Grant," *New Mexico Historical Review* 51 (October, 1976):313-28.

27. Fray Damián Martínez to Fray Juan Agustín de Morfi, 1792, AGN, Historia 25.

28. Charles L. Kenner, *A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relationships* (Norman, 1969), pp. 62-64. Descriptions of *genízaro* settlements are included in various documents and secondary material. For a description of the Barrio de Analco see "Geographical Description of New Mexico written by the Reverend Father Preacher Fray Agustín de Morfi in 1782" in Alfred Barnaby Thomas, *Forgotten Frontiers* (Norman, 1932), pp. 91-92. Also Domínguez, *New Mexico in 1776*, and Eleanor B. Adams, trans., *Bishop Tamarón's Visitation of New Mexico* (Albuquerque, 1954). A discussion of the foundation of Abiquiu is in J. Richard Salazar, "Santa Rosa de Lima de Abiquiu," *New Mexico Architecture* 18 (September, 1976):13-19.

29. See Fray Angélico Chávez, *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, 1678-1900* (Washington, 1957).

30. New Mexicans of Spanish descent carefully distinguished themselves from *genízaros*. See Fray Angélico Chávez, "Early Settlements in the Mora Valley," *El Palacio* 62 (November, 1955):319.

31. Domínguez, *New Mexico in 1776*, p. 126.

32. Domínguez, *New Mexico in 1776*, p. 259.

33. Domínguez, *New Mexico in 1776*, p. 208.

34. Donald C. Cutter, trans., "An Anonymous Statistical Report on New Mexico in 1756," *New Mexico Historical Review* 50 (October, 1975):347-52.

35. There are various censuses for eighteenth century New Mexico of differing degrees of accuracy. The 1790 census, although incomplete and inconsistent, is

the best and has been used as a basis for this work. This enumeration is by jurisdiction and is in SANM. The following information is from this document unless otherwise noted.

36. Kiowa, Wichita, and Pawnee, although sold into servitude in New Mexico, are not listed in the 1790 census.

37. Governor Real Alencaster to Comandante General Salcedo, Santa Fe, September 1, 1805; November 20, 1805. Comandante General to Real Alencaster, Chihuahua, December 13, 1805. Governor Real Alencaster, Santa Fe, to Salcedo, April 1, 1806. All in SANM.

38. Fernando de la Concha, "Advice on Governing New Mexico, 1794," *New Mexico Historical Review* 24 (July, 1949):236-54.

39. Comandante General Salcedo to Governor Maynez, Chihuahua, August 12, 1808 and Governor Maynez to Comandante General Salcedo, Santa Fe, June 20, 1809, in SANM.