AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 11:3 (1987) 75-92

Review Essay

History Comes to the Navajos: A Review Essay

WILLIAM H. LYON

Through White Men's Eyes; A Contribution To Navajo History: A Chronological Record of the Navajo People from Earliest Times to the Treaty of June 1, 1868. J. Lee Correll, editor, Window Rock: Navajo Heritage Center, Sponsored by the Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health Education and Welfare under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and by the Arizona Bicentennial Commission, 1979. Prologue, Acknowledgments, Line Illustrations, Photographs, Bibliographies, Indices, Documents (reprinted in volume VI). Six Volumes. $225. Now available from the University of Arizona Press.

I

Until the 1950s the profession of history had been remarkably derelict in the re-telling of the Navajo and Hopi past. Beginning in the 1880s self-trained scholars, such as the army surgeon Washington Matthews, intensively studied Navajo culture. He was followed by institutional or university scholars of the Boasian school—Gladys Reichard, Clyde Kluckhohn, Edward Sapir, themselves students of Franz Boas, but also Leland Wyman, Franc Newcomb, and Father Berard Haile, who were not trained as anthropologists, but who nevertheless belong to the second

William H. Lyon is a Professor of History at Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

generation of Navajo scholars. However, they evinced little interest in Navajo history. Boas insisted on the collection of a vast body of contemporary data which did not lend itself to historical analysis. Meanwhile, except for Frank Reeve in the late 1930s, historians did not enter the field.

For a while in the 1950s and 1960s, however, Navajo history prospered, under federal, tribal, and university auspices, written by historians and anthropologists. Whether that efflorescence has withered—permanently—is a matter for debate, but that we had a significant period in the writing of Navajo history can hardly be doubted. Most representative of that flowering and an inspiration to several other historical productions is J. Lee Correll's *Through White Men's Eyes*, six volumes of documentary evidence, covering Navajo history from the beginning of historic times to the treaty of 1868.

These are, if I may say so, luscious volumes. They are oversized (12''×9''), pleasantly printed with wide margins, richly illustrated with line drawings by Jack Phasteen and include a generous number of historic photographs of the time from various archives. At the end of volume six is a collection of original sources: the texts of Spanish, Mexican, and American treaties and of councils with the Navajo, the monthly post returns of Navajos and Apaches held in captivity at Fort Sumner, and Indian captives held in service in two Colorado counties (a supplement, actually, to the data on New Mexico counties located in the body of this chronicle), and finally an extensive biographical profile of major characters of that time. Some of this information has been presented before, as in David Brugge and Correll, *The Story of the Navajo Treaties with Texts in English*[1], and Brugge, *Navajos in the Catholic Church Records of New Mexico, 1694–1875.*[2]

II

This massive project began in a sense with the Navajo Claims Commission, which was created by a Congressional act in 1946. From the beginning the gathering of information for that project was in the charge of well-known scholars. Professor George P. Hammond of Berkeley handled documentary research, and hence made an important contribution to this collection. Clyde Kluckhohn of Harvard assembled ethnographic materials until his death in 1961, when David DeHarport took over the task.

Richard Van Valkenburgh directed archaeological investigations. In 1952 he hired Correll who became involved in extensive archaeological surveys in disputed land areas. Correll succeeded Van Valkenburgh on his death in 1957 to head research activities, and the next year he hired Editha Watson and David Brugge. Together the three constituted an influential historical team. They created an extensive microfilm collection of wide-ranging documentary sources, recording more than 1,500 archaeological sites of the Navajos and their neighbors, and more than 500 tapes of elderly Navajos. This wealth of material is located in the Navajo Nation Research Library, in Window Rock.[3]

But of course the *piéce de resistance* is the chronological text, the arrangement of documentary excerpts in calendrical sequence. It is not, therefore, a narrative in the traditional sense, but a series of reports by contemporary observers. Those actors are left to speak for themselves in all their myopic vision; Correll rarely offers a gloss to help the reader along. There is a tendency to use published documentary collections (i.e., secondary works) for the Spanish and Mexican periods. For the American period he draws from the original sources of the State, War, and Interior departments, from the National Archives, and from New Mexico newspapers. It is a mine of information, but what can we do with it?

Through White Men's Eyes was an outgrowth and expansion of Correll's *Historical Calendar of the Navajo People,*[4] published in 1968 to commemorate the centennial of the Navajo treaty. The 1960s was a busy time for the trio. During the decade Correll and Brugge collected church parish records in New Mexico, paying particular attention to the baptisms of Navajos from 1694 to 1875. That data is presented in *Through White Men's Eyes,* although it is not analyzed in the profound and revealing way Brugge has done in the publication of 1968, (reprinted by the Navajo Community College Press in 1985). The baptisms are used to analyze Indian slavery or servitude among the Hispanics, a supreme example of reconstructing an otherwise elusive subject. As I have already noted, Brugge and Correll also collaborated on all the Navajo treaties. Correll also wrote articles for the *Navajo Times,* cited in the bibliographies of *Through White Men's Eyes,* and he and Brugge also prepared biographies of prominent Navajo figures: Brugge on Zarcillos Largos[5] and Correll on Bai-a-lil-le,[6] and Sandoval,[7] which are in their own way definitive.

Editha Watson joined the two archaeologists to bring to the team her editorial skills, but she already had sufficient experience among the Navajos to become an original contributor. (Her most important research was on Navajo sacred places, a work still incomplete on her death. A more comprehensive edition may be published by Stephen C. Jett, who inherited her notes.[8]) The three of them collaborated on a two volume *Navajo Bibliography . . .*, which supersedes all works of its kind, though it is now slightly outdated.[9]

Correll's magnum opus was so expensive to publish that he had trouble finding a publisher. Volume One was printed with very low standards,[10] but he finally secured federal subsidies for a complete rendition, and he did see the new volume one before his death. A diabetic and in poor health, he died in 1979 at the age of 62, the year that the set was published.[11] Because the Navajo Heritage Center does not have the marketing facilities to distribute the volumes, the University of Arizona has acquired all copies for sale.

III

The trouble with Navajo history, as we all know, is that only the white man kept the records on which it is based. Correll is quite conscious of this problem in choosing the title for this set; he means to imply that the record is one-sided, even prejudicial. It is difficult to reconstruct Navajo history on an objective basis since the Navajos bear silent witness to their distant past.

In our time historians have looked beyond the biased record and have been sympathetic to the Navajo side. They have assumed the Navajos were goaded into desperate, retaliatory action against an arrogant, domineering Hispanic-Anglo culture. Innocent Navajos were finally herded into a concentration camp in an unsuccessful attempt to obliterate their culture. Correll has given those of us who do not ordinarily have access to the available evidence an opportunity to re-evaluate, or at least reflect, on this point of view.

What are the impressions of one who re-assesses Navajo history from early historic times to 1868? To begin with, the Navajo situation was an enormously complex one. It was not merely white man versus red man. It was a complicated interplay of Navajo ricos (rich men), Navajo ladrones (poor or bad men),

Hispanics, Anglos (army officers, soldiers, public officers, civilians), Pueblo Indians (Hopis, Zunis, Lagunans, Acomans, and many other riverine peoples), and non-Pueblos (Utes, Coyoteros, Mescaleros, Gilas, Comanche, and other Apaches). No one has yet attempted to analyze the motives of each of these groups, nor describe the images they had of themselves or of each other. Too often the story is about Anglo greed and Navajo victimization.

Reading Correll, one can form tentative hypotheses about motivation which call for further exploration. The Anglo was devoted to absolute observance of the rule of law and to the sanctity of property. If, in his view, the Navajo violated the public order, then it was easy for the Hispanic of New Mexico to convince his new leaders that punitive action must be taken. In a sense the Anglo was caught in the middle between the Hispanic and Pueblo Indian on the one hand and the Navajo on the other.

While I must respect Correll's familiarity with the sources, I think it is arguable whether the military was motivated more by prejudice against the Indian than the civilian, as he says.[12] The army officer was a professional who knew the limits of his profession. The professional plays the game by the rules and does not allow affairs to get out of control or to degenerate into orgies or massacres. Army officers often deplored the unprincipled plundering of the Hispanics.[13] The officers, at any rate, viewed the situation as professionals and not from any motives of economic self-interest or revenge.

The officers also did most of the historical writing, outproducing the civilians. Therefore, their views are better known than any of the other participants. The common soldier, on the other hand, is almost as silent as the Navajo ladrone. We need to know more about his treatment of the Navajo, the degree of fraternizing, the degree of his hostility. Perhaps the massacre of Navajos at Fort Fauntleroy in 1860 is an indication of his attitudes, but since the personnel involved were probably Hispanic volunteers, this may not reflect the attitude of the regular Anglo soldier.[14] We know there was some inhumane treatment on the road to Fort Sumner,[15] and yet at Fort Sumner there was some fraternizing which resulted in the spread of syphilis.[16] More than one soldier, among them Thomas Keam, became a "squaw man" who left descendants in Navajo country who are still living there today.

The Hispanic and the Pueblo Indian were motivated by blood revenge. They conducted punitive expeditions to reclaim sheep, cattle, and their captive sons. They feared the Navajos would burn down their plazas. The Hispanic was engaged in a mild form of expansionism in the 1700s and the 1800s, and land acquisition at the expense of the Navajos was possible a motivating factor. The Navajos became special victims of private Hispanic forays, much to the army's annoyance, after Canby had subdued them in 1860. There was much bad blood between the Hispanic civilian and the military. The army abhorred militia and volunteers.[17] The New Mexico legislature memorialized the War Department against James Henry Carleton, charging that he actually protected the Navajos, and was responsible for blaming Mexicans for Indian depredations in the first place.[18]

It is harder to explain the motivations of the free or wild tribes, of which the Navajos were one. War-making seems to have been a part of their folk culture. Why the Navajos would cross the Rio Grande and travel the long distance to eastern New Mexico and to Texas to fight the Comanche is hard to understand. And vice versa. In the 1850s the Utes were especially menacing to the Navajos.[19]

Correll gives us little help with incentives of the Anglo common soldier, with the Hispanic, the Pueblo, or the non-Pueblo groups. There is some evidence for the Navajo leaders or ricos, but very little for the pobres, about whom the leaders were often ignorant. The upper class Navajo wanted peace; the lower class Navajo wanted to replenish his herds and obtain subsistence. Both groups accepted captive Mexicans as servants or slaves. Revenge was a possible motive for the Navajo. That seems to be the reason for the murder of the Mormon missionary George A. Smith and the promise to kill two more of Jacob Hamblin's party as recompense for the murder of three Navajos.[20] Did Navajos raid when the weather turned bad and their crops failed or their stock starved on the barren pastures? That seems a possibility. During the peaceful period from 1851 to 1858, observers noted that there were plentiful crops; during the period of hostilities after 1858, they noted the failure of crops. Raiding was, perhaps, a means of subsistence. The whole question of weather and its bearing upon Navajo hostilities needs to be studied.[21] Did the Navajos strike at Hispanic and Pueblo communities in retaliation for capture of their people by private miliatry companies? That

may have been a motivating factor, but the evidence is not convincing. Did Navajos engage in hostilities as a way of life? The whole gamut of Navajo motivations deserves to be studied and analyzed.

As for images, the Anglo held views of progress and of civilization which would not let the Indian be. The conventional wisdom of that day, following the ideas of Auguste Comte and especially Lewis Henry Morgan, depicted society as going through stages of development to a higher destiny. Morgan postulated three stages: savagery, barbarism, and civilization.[22] These views were *de rigueur* in that time, just as the theories of Albert Einstein, or more appropriately, Lewis Leakey, are in vogue today.

So the Navajos were perceived as savages who ought to be put on the road to civilization. The Anglo military had a remarkable opportunity to test that idea by incarcerating them at Fort Sumner and turning them into village farmers. The effort failed, with what impact on Anglo perceptions it is hard to say.

Just as we fail sometimes to understand the intellectual and cultural constructs which govern the actions of historical figures, we also seem to avoid looking at the territorial and national backdrop. It would be very difficult to understand the Navajo situation without understanding the turbulent New Mexico politics. Indian superintendent James Collins owned a newspaper in Santa Fe which he used to excoriate Colonel Thomas T. Fauntleroy.[23] And so the conflict with the Navajos became politicized. We need to set Navajo history in the New Mexico Territorial context. And in the national context also. The great controversies of the 1850s and 1860s almost escape the reader of these documents.

Another image of the Navajos, held perhaps more by the civilians than by the military, was of Navajo military dominance, even in the Rio Grande valley itself.[24] The Navajos seemed able to strike at will and were able to elude pursuers. Much of the New Mexican bitterness toward Navajos stemmed from sheer frustration at Navajo military prowess. And also at Navajo wealth, which appeared to be greater than for any other group of people in New Mexico.

The historian would like to know the extent of casualties and stolen stock (this latter was the principal form of property depredation). Hispanics submitted requests for reparations, but the Anglos thought the requests were highly inflated. I tried to count

the number of battle deaths to determine whether this had a bearing on the course of the conflict. But I finally realized that any figures would be inaccurate since Navajos, despite their corpse taboo, carried their dead off the battlefield. It was also impossible to know whether or not combatants were mortally wounded. Moreover, the law requiring depredation reporting was allowed to lapse between 1856 and 1862.[25]

Anglo officers often viewed Navajos with great respect. They frequently saw the leaders as worthy opponents if not friends. Some saw them as amiable and carefree.[26] Navajo women at Fort Sumner were viewed as highly industrious and devoted to the work ethic, as compared to the Ute or Apache women.[27]

Zarcillos Largos' speech to Alexander Doniphan in 1846 employed irony, a device which was probably lost upon the Colonel.[28] Many Anglos were culture-bound and had no appreciation of the Navajo plight. Yet occasionally a white man—a Major John S. Simonson,[29] a Colonel George Sykes,[30] Indian Agent Samuel Yost,[31] a Major Electus Backus,[32] or an Agent Silas Kendrick[33]—broke through the layers of custom to perceptively understand the Navajo condition.

Another piece of conventional wisdom held by the Anglos was that, although they realized that Navajos utterly lacked political unity, a fact they found very hard to understand, they still insisted in dealing with *all* the Navajos through one chief. They ultimately understood that Navajo leaders had only local authority, yet they reluctantly conceived of a political system in which the tribe did not have a single leader. The practical corollary to that was the tragic maxim that the whole tribe, the innocent as well as the guilty, must be punished for the sins of the few.[34] Most Navajos probably wanted peace; they all suffered grievously for the depredations of a minority among them.

What of Navajo images? We must speculate here, and look into Navajo culture as we came to know it decades later. The concepts of *dine'*—the people—and *ana'i*—the non-Navajo or enemy—gave the Navajo a sense of solidarity and tribal pride. The Navajos held themselves aloof from other peoples. Illness, for instance, might be contracted from too much contact with the aliens. The ceremony Enemyway is an attack on the alien cause of illness.[35] Perhaps in its own way this sense of self-confidence—the equivalent of the Hebrew "chosen people"—contributed to the perpetuation of the conflict.

IV

Correll's six volumes are not likely to be read as a narrative but more probably consulted by serious investigators. Can these volumes of edited documents be relied on as a basic source for the researching historian? It will have its limitations for the scholar. For a work of this kind it is regrettable to say that typos abound. It is disconcerting to see Thomas Keam's middle name repeatedly misspelled—it is "Varker" not "Varner," and at least once his last name is spelled with an "s"—"Keams!"[36] Although my use of the index was limited, I believe that it is grossly inadequate and full of omissions. The reprinted documents in volume six are not indexed at all. There are enough editorial lapses, including misplaced materials, obvious to the uninitiated eye to instill caution in the seeker of accuracy. A generous use of ellipses signifies much material omitted. Brackets are usually not employed for editorial comments, which sometimes causes confusion in the reader's mind.

There is not much cross-referencing of the same events which are (sometimes) placed in exact chronological order of the date of reporting rather than the date of occurrence. In other words the accounts of different observers of the same event are not located together under the date of occurrence and are not always reclaimable from the index or cross-referenced in the text. The weary researcher will have to do his own searching. As a remedy for the lack of guides for the investigator, topics or headings should have been printed at the side of each entry or paragraph in the very wide and glorious margins—in the white space.

One of the attractive features of this set is the numerous photographic portraits and reproductions of contemporary sketches. Not so the maps, two of which are either un-captioned or unreadable, even with a magnifying glass.[37] Jack Phasteen's line drawings are illustrative but not informative. A number of the photographs are only peripheral to Navajo history (Charles Debrille Poston,[38] for instance) and need not have been included. The portraits might well have been dated; many of them must have been taken after 1868.

The two most striking photographs to me were of Jesus Arviso[39] and of Manuelito and his favorite wife Juanita.[40] Arviso is represented by two pictures, one taken in 1874 and the other about 1927, when he was about 80 years of age. The first shows

him young, handsome, virile. (No wonder he could attract more than one wife!) The second shows him ravaged, unkempt, beleagured, no longer the cool and confident person of his younger years. This contrast between the younger and older Arviso is captivating—and saddening. Manuelito is most often photographed as a fierce, defiant brave. Two of his portraits show him bare-chested and battle ready. But we also see him and Juanita in a more blissful state, in a larger group, a candid and heartwarming portrayal.

V

Most Navajo history writing covers the period to 1868. Much less has been written about the post-Fort Sumner era, particularly the period from 1868 to 1920, and I will not attempt to analyze here works of the later period. Many of the historians, who were part of the great awakening of the 1950s and 1960s, wrote of the Navajos before 1868 and were associated with Correll and Brugge. The two mentors not only made their own contributions but inspired many others as well. Frank McNitt, Clifford Trafzer, John P. Wilson, and Lynn Bailey were four who relied directly on the team's resources, consulted their files, and traded information with them. Two other scholars, part of the Correll-Brugge milieu, wrote general histories. Richard Van Valkenburgh's general history of the Navajos was reprinted as part of the Indian Claims Commission report. Robert Young, working for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, shared certain sources with the group, especially old agency letterbooks which Van Valkenburgh had retrieved from a warehouse at Fort Defiance many years before.[41] Another historian operated independently. Frank Reeve's articles in the *New Mexico Historical Review* are a monumental contribution to Navajo history, and, as professor of history at the University of New Mexico and editor of the *Review*, he had access to the state records center, as did Correll, Brugge, and Watson. He is the first professional historian to enter the field in the 1930s. Operating still farther out on the periphery of Correll, Brugge, and Watson, but well within the same tradition, were three university scholars, Gerald Thompson, Lawrence Kelly, and Jack Forbes.

The most impressive of these associates is Frank McNitt. His *Navajo Wars*[42] has obvious connections to Window Rock, re-telling and interpreting much of the documentary information found in

Through White Men's Eyes. McNitt believes that Spanish-Mexican-American contacts were continuous and unchanging, but then says that American encroachment on Navajo lands became a new cause of hostility after 1846. By 1861, he insists, the Navajos had only two options: unconditional surrender or extermination. Furthermore, Americans did nothing to end Indian slavery. This in spite of the fact that he finishes his narrative in 1861, before any anti-slavery or anti-peonage efforts were made—before the Emancipation Proclamation. It is a conclusion I do not believe Brugge would agree to.[43] American treaties, he avers, were worse than any that the Spanish had written.[44] McNitt, like many of the commentators in Correll's documents, believes that Henry L. Dodge was the most successful Navajo agent and was largely responsible for the peace of the middle 1850s.[45] But as I read of Dodge's subservience to harsh Anglo military and civilian objectives, I wonder if his role should not be re-evaluated. Major W.T.H. Brooks, commander at Fort Defiance, McNitt considers haughty and unyielding. His destruction of Manuelito's livestock at the nearby haying camp caused the retaliatory murder of Brook's Negro slave, Jim, which in turn was the spark that ignited a six year war between the Navajos and the U.S. Army.[46] But the motives of Jim's murderer are not clear. McNitt also declares that his central thesis is that there is a direct link between Hispanic slave forays and Navajo retaliations. Navajo reprisals increased as slave raids increased.[47] I suggest that perhaps this is too simplistic.

Clifford Trafzer became interested in the Navajo when he worked on a graduate degree at Northern Arizona University. That interest was only heightened when he assumed a position on the faculty at Navajo Community College in Tsaile. There he immersed himself in the study of Navajo culture, and soon he was knocking on the door of Brugge and Correll. He published a number of smaller works on the Navajo, and then finally the longer *The Kit Carson Campaign*, a sequel to McNitt's *Navajo Wars*. (McNitt had actually pre-empted Trafzer's larger study.)[48] *The Kit Carson Campaign* is written very much in the McNitt tradition. For instance, while Trafzer does incorporate the views of Kelly (see *infra*) which paints a troubled and reluctant Carson,[49] and he pays obeisance to the sympathetic biographers of Carson,[50] he emphasizes Carson's unheroic role as a destructive agent of Navajo culture. He quotes at length the most dismal remembrances (all more than one generation removed) of the Carson campaign, the

Navajo journey to eastern New Mexico, and the imprisonment at Fort Sumner, from Ruth Roessel's *Navajo Stories of the Long Walk Period*, whose collection of oral testimonies is largely free of accusation.[51]

Another historian-anthropologist whom Brugge-Correll-Watson aided was John P. Wilson, then working for the Museum of New Mexico. As the ground was being prepared for the construction of the Navajo Dam and the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project in northwestern New Mexico, the Museum contracted a salvage archaeology project for the National Park Service in 1962, and Wilson wrote a brief ethno-historical study of the period 1800 to 1846 as a background to the survey. The greatest need seemed to be the Spanish-Mexican period, since other studies covered the American period from 1846 onward. Wilson was assisted not only by the staff at Window Rock, but also by Myra Ellen Jenkins of the New Mexico Records Center and Albert Schroeder of the National Park Service. Wilson concluded that an inevitable state of war, broken by short periods of peace, prevailed between the Navajo and the Hispanic. Navajos were the instigators of the hostilities, never keeping the peace treaties.[52]

Correll and Brugge also gave material assistance to Lynn R. Bailey, whose book titles reveal his approach: *Indian Slave Trade in the Southwest*, then *Bosque Redondo: An American Concentration Camp*, followed by *The Long Walk: A History of the Navajo Wars, 1846–1868*. (In the latter two there is some duplication of material.) Bailey also edited the record of a Navajo military expedition of 1859, *The Navajo Reconaissance*. Finally he published *If You Take My Sheep: The Evolution and Conflicts of Navajo Pastoralism, 1630–1868*. Bailey describes the impact of the introduction of sheep by the Spanish on Navajo social organization and customs and the resulting expansion which led to conflicts with the Spanish. The adoption of a pastoral way of life divided the Navajos into classes: the *ricos* and the *ladrones*. For some unexplained reason he ends his book at 1868, at the same time characterizing the period 1868 to 1920 as the "great void" in Navajo history. None of his books would have been possible without the help of the Claims Commission staff.[53]

Beginning in 1937 until his death in 1967, Frank Reeve, a professor of history at the University of New Mexico and an editor of the *New Mexico Historical Review*, published a series of articles on Navajo history, based on his doctoral dissertation at the

University of Texas. Reeve at the time broke new ground. He was the first professionally trained historian to intensively study the Navajo, and he used all the requisite archival materials and published works. Although his articles did not appear in historical order, they can be arranged so as to become an exhaustive sequential history of the Navajo from earliest times to 1888. Toward the end of his life he labored valiantly to fill the gap between 1795 and 1846 in his narrative, but did not quite realize his aim. Eleanor B. Adams and John L. Kessell edited the manuscript and published it in the *Review* in 1971. Reeve was rather ambivalent toward the Anglo and the Navajo. To paraphrase him: through all the intricacies, confusions, and immoralities of federal Indian policy, there was a strong feeling that the plundering, savage Navajo could be dealt with fairly and would survive because of his strong constitution. It was a kind of "plague on both your houses" attitude. Reeve must be viewed independently of the Correll-Brugge-Watson operation at Window Rock, yet he was part of the Navajo history awakening, if not the founder of the Navajo history fraternity.[54]

Reeve was mentor and guide to Lawrence Kelley who discovered some new letters of Kit Carson in the Library of Congress and the National Archives, which he edited and published in *Navajo Roundup*.[55] Correll in *Through White Men's Eyes* has also used these documents, even citing Kelley's book in several instances. In comparing Correll's rendition with Kelley's, we see how Correll has abstracted and re-formatted his original sources, which is one reason why the historian may want to go to Correll's sources for accuracy. Kelley also provided extensive explanatory footnotes and commentary, unlike Correll. Kelley employs his skills as an historian to edify his reader. It is Kelley's conclusion that the Carleton-Carson campaign was actually planned by Canby, and merely executed by Carson. The old squaw man was a reluctant campaigner. His staff was plagued with incredible disharmony. The Navajos surrendered, not because of Carson's "victory" at Canyon de Chelly, but because Carson had impoverished them by the destruction of crops, a fact he did not realize, and because the leader Delgadito went among the Navajo urging them to come in.[56] Such views are hardly in accord with McNitt, Trafzer, and Bailey, who believe that the Americans were the great aggressors.

From the University of Arizona has come another Navajo

study, Gerald Thompson's *The Army and the Navajo*,[57] under the direction of Professor Harwood Hinton. Thompson's account of the Fort Sumner captivity relies on records in the National Archives and on important manuscript collections. Thompson also has a less severe view of Anglo treatment of the Navajo. The Bosque Redondo was not a story of untold hardship and suffering. The experiment reflected the views of the nineteenth century humanitarian, an anti-savage approach. It was a "successful failure." It did not make the Navajos self-sufficient nor completely solve the problem of depredations. It did, on the other hand, prevent extermination by the Hispanic militia and private companies. And it had the further success of fostering mutual respect and trust between the whites and the Navajo. At the Bosque the Navajos learned smithing and metal working, a prelude to the great art of silversmithing in the 1890s. The Navajos labored hard to make their communal farms a success. I have trouble with some of Thompson's other conclusions. The village style of living promoted a greater sense of tribal unity, he contends. The Navajos learned to irrigate, to use hoes, shovels, plows, and rakes. They used wagons, logs for dwellings, and they came to understand the value of money and its relation to goods.[58] Thompson may overstate his case, but he does point out more positive features of the Anglo-Navajo relationship.

A more negative view of this relationship was written by Jack D. Forbes whose mentor was Donald Cutter at the University of Southern California. Forbes' *Apache, Navajo, and Spaniard*[59] covers the period of the Spanish *entrada* from 1539 to 1700, and it is difficult to test his hypotheses against Correll's documentation because this portion of Correll is based on secondary works. Forbes contends that the Apache-Navajo were peaceful and unpredatory until the Spanish *entrada* brought warfare, population reduction, and cultural decline. This does not explain why the Navajos attacked Oñate's settlements on the Rio Grande almost the moment Oñate established them. He refutes Alfred Barnaby Thomas that Navajos sold slaves to the Spanish, and would kill them if the Spanish would not buy them. Thomas' source on this is faulty, he insists. Forbes attempts to broaden the significance of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680–1696 by calling it the Great Southwestern Revolt, to include the surrounding non-Pueblo tribes such as the Navajo in the uprising. I do not believe he makes the case for the Navajos participating in the uprising, but they did resist the Spanish Reconquest.[60] On one point Forbes may be

compared to Correll. Forbes speculates that the Navajos came into the Southwest as early as the 1400s and perhaps the 900s. Correll presents tree ring data on Navajo sites. The earliest date is 1350 on Chacra Mesa in northwestern New Mexico, but amazingly enough the largest number of dendrochronological sites are for the 1300s to 1500s on Mariano Mesa, near Quemado, in west central New Mexico.[61]

From this description of a number of books on the Navajo, it can be seen that Correll and Brugge cultivated the great efflorescence of Navajo historical scholarship in the 1950s and 1960s. That is as significant as the publication of these documents.

But what of my original question: what can we do with these volumes?

VI

Undoubtedly these volumes can be used for research purposes. Not only can basic questions of causation, motivation, and images be investigated, but a considerable amount of raw data is presented: tree ring dates (although this information is now somewhat out of date),[62] lists of rations distributed, lists of Hispanic claims for depredation losses, reports of Navajo conversions from the parish records, the monthly census returns at Fort Sumner, and finally treaty provisions. The official reports and newspaper articles constitute a great treasure trove. The researcher must use these with a great deal of caution because of editorial lapses, selected subject matter, and re-arranged paragraphs. One may finally want to go back to the original source. The general reader may also find portions of these volumes interesting and stimulating. But I believe that these volumes will be mostly employed for in-depth investigations of specialized topics, and where monographs are being prepared, as leads to archival sources.

NOTES

1. Window Rock: Research Section, Navajo Parks and Recreation Department, 1971. I am much indebted to David Brugge for assistance in preparing this review essay. Russell Hartman was also most helpful.

2. *Ibid.*, 1968. This volume has been re-published by Tsaile: Navajo Community College Press, 1985. Brugge also edited *Long Ago in Navajoland* (Window Rock: Navajo Tribal Museum, 1965), a series of documents covering the period 1805-1845. These tribal publications were in typescript.

3. Brugge to Lyon, April 16, 1988; Correll, "Navajo Land Claim," *The Navajo Times*, September 5, 1962, 9; Telephone conversation with Russell Hartman, Curator, Navajo Tribal Museum, April 11, 1988. For Van Valkenburgh see Robert Young, "Richard Fowler Van Valkenburgh—1904-1957," in *American Antiquity* 23 (April, 1957): 421.

4. I have been unable to locate a copy of *Dine' Baahani'go Binaaltsoos Bik'ehgo Nahidizidi* or Historical Calendar of the Navajo People (1968).

5. *Zarcillos Largos, Courageous Advocate of Peace* (Window Rock: Research Section, Navajo Parks and Recreation, 1970).

6. *Bai-a-lil-le, Medicine Man—or Witch?* (*ibid.*).

7. *Sandoval—Traitor or Patriot?*, (*ibid.*).

8. (Window Rock: Navajo Tribal Museum, 1964); Brugge to Lyon, April 16, 1988. See Van Valkenburgh, *Navajo Sacred Places* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1974), 9-199, which is part of the Indian Land Claims Commission Report.

9. (Window Rock: Navajo Tribal Museum, 1967); Second edition with Supplement, (Window Rock: Research Section, Navajo Parks and Recreation Department, 1969); another edition, *ibid.*, 1973. Two other bibliographies are Peter Iverson, *The Navajos: A Critical Bibliography* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1976); and a much older, outdated one: (Clyde Kluckhohn and Katherine Spencer, *A Bibliography of Navajo Indians* (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1940; reprint New York: AMS Press, 1972).

10. *Through White Men's Eyes: A Contribution to Navajo History* (Window Rock: Navajo Heritage Center, 1976). This early volume was in typescript, and also an Arizona Bicentennial Project.

11. *The Navajo Times*, August 30, 1979, September 18, 1980; *Independent*, Gallup, September 11, 1972; Hartman, April 11, 1988.

12. See the "Prologue" at the beginning of each volume.

13. III, 25-26.

14. III, 165-166.

15. Frank McNitt, "The Long March: 1863-1867," in Albert Schroeder, editor, *The Changing Ways of Southwestern Indians* (Glorieta: The Rio Grande Press, 1973), 145-170; Crawford R. Buell, "The Navajo 'Long Walk': Recollections by Navajos," in *ibid.*, 171-188.

16. V, 177-178.

17. II, 139-140, 142, 303-306; III, 39.

18. V, 262-264.

19. I, 402.

20. II, 46; III, 90-91.

21. I, 403; II, 88, 100, 103, 115; III, 154. For raiding for subsistence, see I, 238, 377, 396; V, 38, 44.

22. Morgan, *Ancient Society; or Researches in the Line of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (1877). For a general presentation of images of the American Indian, see Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).

23. III, 40.
24. I, 205, 206, 265, 271, 309, 313; II, 30, 34, 71, 392; III, 26, 49, 78, 88, 138.
25. II, 28 and *passim*, 177, 178; V, 278.
26. II, 128.
27. V, 127.
28. I, 213.
29. II, 303-306.
30. V, 169, 177, 392-402.
31. II, 142-145, 196, 199, 202-204, 208, 229-231.
32. I, 349-351.
33. III, 303, 304, 312, 343-345, 374.
34. III, 101.
35. See Gary Witherspoon, *Navajo Kinship and Marriage* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 58, 64, 119.
36. V, 354; VI, 235-237.
37. I, 197; II, 29.
38. III, 273.
39. III, 103.
40. I, 196; II, 47; V, 377.
41. Van Valkenburgh, *A Short History of the Navajo People* (Window Rock: Navajo Service, 1938), which was reprinted as part of the Indian Claims Commission Report, in *Navajo Indians* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1974), 201-267. Young, *The Role of the Navajo in the Southwestern Drama* (Gallup: The Gallup Independent, 1968). I have not attempted to analyze either Van Valkenburgh's or Young's survey of the Navajo past. See also Brugge to Lyon, April 16, 1988.
42. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1972).
43. Brugge, *Navajos in the Catholic Church Records* (1968), 64. The references to slavery, or servitude (servants), or peonage, or captives in Correll are legion, and would have to be exhaustively researched to confirm my impression.
44. McNitt, *Navajo Wars*, vii-viii.
45. *Ibid.*, 224-236, 286-297, and *passim*.
46. *Ibid.*, 320-331, and *passim*.
47. *Ibid.*, 12.
48. Trafzer, *The Kit Carson Campaign* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982), xv-xvi. Other shorter works by Trafzer are: *Dine' and Beligaana: The Navajos and the First Anglos* (Tsaile: Navajo Community College Press, 1978); *Navajos and Spaniards, ibid.*; *Navajo Riders and Anglo Expansionists: A Conflict of Interests, ibid.*, and *Navajos and Anglo Indian Traders* (Yuma: Yuma County Historical Society, 1976).
49. *Kit Carson Campaign*, 73, 92-95.
50. *Ibid.*, 237-239; Edwin L. Sabin, *Kit Carson Days, 1809-1868* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1914; revised New York: Press of the Pioneers, 1935); Harvey L. Carter, *"Dear Old Kit:" The Historical Christopher Carson* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968); A later work is Thelma S. Guild and Harvey L.

Carter, *Kit Carson: A Pattern for Heroes* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984).

51. *Kit Carson Campaign*, 154–162, 190–197; Ruth Roessel, *Navajo Stories of the Long Walk Period* (Tsaile: Navajo Community College Press, 1973).

52. John P. Wilson, *Military Campaigns in the Navajo Country, Northwestern New Mexico, 1800–1846* (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press, 1967), 1–3, 24–25.

53. The following facts of publication for Bailey's books are in the same order I have listed them in the text: (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1966); (Pasadena: Socio-Technical Books, 1970); (*Ibid.*, 1970 [c1964]); (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1964); (*Ibid.*, 1980). For an appraisal see Lawrence C. Kelley, Review of Bailey *If You Take My Sheep* in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 6, no. 2 (1982): 118–120.

54. Reeve, "Navajo Foreign Affairs, 1795–1846," in *New Mexico Historical Review* 46 (April, 1971): 101–102, and Reeve, "The Federal Indian Policy in New Mexico, 1858–1880," in *New Mexico Historical Review* 12 (July, 1937): 218–222. The paraphrase is from pp. 218–222.

I herewith cite Reeve's articles in narrative order, not publication order, to illustrate that he very nearly wrote a general history of the Navajo up to the latter part of the nineteenth century. Some of the last articles do not quite fit into the general scheme. All the articles appeared in the *New Mexico Historical Review*. "Early Navajo Geography," 31 (October, 1956): 290–309; "Seventeenth Century Navaho-Spanish Relations," 32 (January, 1957): 36–52; "Navaho-Spanish Wars, 1680–1720," 33 (July, 1958): 205–231; "The Navajo-Spanish Peace: 1720s–1770s," 34 (January, 1959): 9–40; "Navaho-Spanish Diplomacy, 1770–1790," 35 (July, 1960): 200–235; "Navajo Foreign Affairs, 1795–1846," Part I, 46 (April, 1971): 100–132, Part II, 46 (July, 1971): 222–251; "The Government and the Navaho, 1846–1858," 14 (January, 1939): 82–114; "The Federal Indian Policy in New Mexico—The Navaho, 1858–1862," 12 (July, 1937): 223–169; "The Federal Indian Policy in New Mexico—The Bosque Redondo," 13 (January, 1938); 14–49; "The Government and the Navajo, 1878–1883," 16 (July, 1941): 275–312; *ibid.*, "1883–1888," 18 (January, 1943): 17–51; "A Navajo Struggle for Land," 21 (January, 1946): 1–21; "War and Peace: Two Arizona Diaries," 24 (April, 1949), 121–129.

55. (Boulder: Pruett Publishing Company, 1970).

56. See "Introduction."

57. (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1976).

58. *Ibid.*, ix–xi, 158–165.

59. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960).

60. Pp. 24–28, 108–109, 177–285.

61. Correll, I, 21–23; Forbes, xiv–xxiii. Forbes refutes Albert Schroeder on tree dating, but does actually cite him.

62. For a survey of recent scholarship on Navajo migration, see Linda Cordell, *Prehistory of the Southwest* (Orlando: Academic Press—Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1984), 356–360.