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New Mexico Hispanic Soldiers’ Service in the Union Army

Hispanic New Mexicans have a long history of military service. As early as 1598, Governor Juan de Oñate kept an organized militia drawn from colonists. Throughout the seventeenth century, encomenderos (tribute collectors) recruited militia units to protect Hispanic settlements and Indian pueblos from Plains warriors. Later, presidios (garrisoned forts) at Santa Fe and El Paso del Norte housed presidial soldiers who, accompanied by Indian auxiliaries, served to defend New Mexico. Spanish officials recruited Indian auxiliaries from the various Pueblo tribes as well as Ute warriors among others. In the late eighteenth century, Spain reorganized its military units throughout the Americas to include a regular standing army. Finally, after Mexican independence from Spain, Mexican officials maintained regular army units to defend the newly created nation. Militias assisted regular troops and took their place in their absence when needed. Overall, soldiers under Spain and Mexico protected against Indian raids, made retaliatory expeditions, and escorted mission supply trains, merchants, herders, and the mail. Under Mexico, soldiers protected the borders and arrested foreigners without passports. With the advent of the Santa Fe trade in 1821, Mexican soldiers were assigned to customs houses and, to some extent, offered protection to incoming merchants. After New Mexico became a United States territory, militias provided for its defense. Some of these militias evolved into regiments of New Mexico Volunteers. During the Civil War, over 3,000 men, mostly Hispanics joined the New Mexico Volunteers, with their own officers. After the Civil War, Hispanics served in the regular army, while others remained with their militia units as late as the 1890s.

Texan Intrusion into New Mexico

The controversy with Mexico dates from the establishment of the lone Star Republic. In 1836, the expansionist administrators of the Lone Star Republic defined the southern and western borders as the Rio Grande, without consideration of the historical settlements and government already existing in Coahuila and New Mexico.1 There was a continual conflict with Mexico, which still considered Texas to be a Mexican department.2

In 1841, Texas Republic President Mirabeau B. Lamar organized the so-called Texan Santa Fe Expedition to seek access to the Santa Fe trade and persuade New Mexicans to become a part of the Texas government. The members of this expedition became lost on the Staked Plains, suffered hunger and thirst, split into two parties, and both groups were finally captured by the Mexican army from New Mexico. The New Mexicans captured the Texans and took them to Santa Fe for incarceration before transporting them to a Mexico City prison.3

---

1 Handbook of Texas Online s.v. “Boundaries,”
2 Handbook of Texas Online, s. v. “Republic of Texas,”
3 Handbook of Texas Online, s.v. “Texas Santa Fe Expedition,”
Meanwhile, conflict with Mexico escalated. In the following years, Mexican armies raided Lipantitlán and San Antonio, capturing the latter twice. In retaliation, Texans captured Laredo and Guerrero, but returned to Texas when it was realized that insufficient supplies and ammunition would prevent further actions. Indeed, that expedition had resulted from an outcry for the invasion of Mexico. As a poorly planned political gesture to satisfy Texans, it had no chance of succeeding. Still, as some of the Texans were returning from their raid on Laredo and Guerrero, they foolhardily attacked the town of Mier. Expecting to be supplied by the village, they were surprised by an overwhelming Mexican army. Although they held out against great odds, they were forced to surrender. Escapes and recaptures caused the Mexican Army to desire a telling punishment. In order to determine which of them would be executed and which ones would be imprisoned, the Texans were each required to draw a bean from a container. Those who drew a black bean—one in ten men—would be executed. The rest were incarcerated until their release in 1844.

In August 1842, a small expedition to New Mexico led by Charles A. Warfield began recruiting men to avenge the capture of the Texan Santa Fe expedition. Warfield and his men met up with the expedition led by Jacob Snively on their return to Texas and accompanied it for a time. Snively sought permission in 1843 from the Texas congress for a retaliatory expedition and received it, with the goal of “intercepting” Mexican traders on the Santa Fe Trail and seizing their goods. In March, Snively and his men attacked a trading party from New Mexico, killing 5 soldiers and taking 18 prisoners, but accomplished little else. This activity was in line with Texas’ exaggerated border claims, but ill-conceived in terms of enticing Santa Fe trade to Texas. The expedition captured Mexican soldiers but let them go. Shortly thereafter, Snively was in turn captured by Capt. Phillip St. George Cooke’s company of U.S. Dragoons, when some of the Texans were north of the Arkansas River in U.S. territory. Cooke seized their weapons and took some of the Texans to St. Louis with him. The rest returned to Texas by August.

Throughout this period, Mexico saw Texas as a rebellious Mexican territory. Texans carried out depredations on Mexican merchants, and were beaten in skirmishes with the Mexican Army in New Mexico. Years later, at the outbreak of the Civil War, most of the recruits of the Confederate Army of New Mexico were Texans, seeking to regain their claimed territory in New Mexico, spread the concepts of states rights and slaveholding, and seek fortune and ports on the Pacific Ocean.
Manifest Destiny

During the westward expansion of the United States, Manifest Destiny proposed that its citizens should spread across the continent, bringing democracy to Indians and Mexicans. To its proponents, Manifest Destiny explained that God had given the United States that responsibility. In 1845, the United States Congress annexed Texas despite the fact that Mexico had not relinquished its sovereignty to the area. Elected in 1844, President James K. Polk sided with the expansionist. Claiming that Mexico had fired the first shot of the war along the dubious Texas border in 1846, Polk urged Congress to declare war.

The United States waged war along several fronts. One prong penetrated Mexico from Texas aimed at Mexico City. Another sailed along the Atlantic coast to Veracruz with Mexico City as its destination. A third prong moved westward with one phalanx headed toward New Mexico and California; the other moving from New Mexico to Chihuahua. In the end, the Mexican War was concluded by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. By dint of war and treaty, the United States stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific, including California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. The clamor for war and Manifest Destiny had resulted in a new map for the United States. Too, age old problems surfaced for the Union.

In the twelve years following the Mexican War, much happened to the newly acquired lands taken from Mexico. Indeed, the Mexican Cession, that is, the newly acquired lands, became a cause for the Civil War. The struggle between North and South for dominance in Congress manifested itself in a number of ways. What to do with the new lands became an issue on both sides. In response to the question, the United States Congress passed a number of laws dealing with states’ rights in the attempt to reconcile Northern and Southern viewpoints.

The question over the balance of free states versus slave states had reached heated debates long before the Mexican War. The Missouri Compromise of 1820, for example, provided for a geographic designation, a line along north latitude 36° 30’, as the border between free and slave states. After 1848, the Mexican Cession raised questions about the balance of slave and free states (15 slave, 16 free). Other solutions aggravated the situation further. For example, the Wilmot Proviso of 1846 prohibited slavery in the new territories. With feelings running high in both the North and the South, the Compromise of 1850, dealt with the question of whether slavery would be sanctioned or prohibited in the Mexican Cession. In that regard, one of the concessions by the South to the North authorized the admission of California as a free state. Another concession by both sides allowed the territory east of California to be divided into the territories of New Mexico (now New Mexico and Arizona) and Utah. That concession provided for settlement by both slaveholders and antislavery settlers. That measure virtually nullified the Missouri Compromise of 1820. On the other hand, the Compromise of 1850 stated that Texas, already in the Union as a slave state, be awarded $10 million in settlement of claims to New Mexico Territory. Although the Compromise of 1850 temporarily quieted the
debate, in the long run, it resulted in the intensification of the hostility between them finally leading to war. 8

**Threat of Secession in New Mexico**

Talk of secession from the Union was widespread as the decade of 1850 drew to a close. 9 In 1860, the election of Abraham Lincoln brought matters to a head. First to secede from the Union in December 1860, South Carolina took an extreme position with a unanimous vote. In 1861, six other states seceded within a matter of weeks: Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana and Texas. Finally, just before war broke out, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and Arkansas seceded between April to May of 1861. The other slave states, Missouri, Kentucky, Delaware, and Maryland, did not secede. 10

In New Mexico, the situation seemed ominous: would the state declare for the South or for the North? The governor, Abraham Rencher, a North Carolinian, remained loyal to the Union. The territorial secretary, Alexander M. Jackson, a personal friend of Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of American, openly allied with the secessionist. The territorial delegate to the U.S. Congress, Miguel A. Otero, temporarily aligned himself with Southern interests. Many officers in the United States Army were Southern sympathizers. One of them, Henry Hopkins Sibley, would resign his command and later lead the Confederate Army of New Mexico. At least eighteen of these officers, including Thomas T. Fauntleroy and William W. Loring, resigned their positions and left for their home states. 11 A lieutenant at Fort Union wrote in his diary, after having received “newspapers from the east, ‘all filled with secession,’” that it was “‘frothing over from the states—nothing but secession talked of at the post.” 12 Another matter that seemed to indicate New Mexico would side with the South was the adoption of a slave code by the Territorial Council in 1859, “for the protection of slave property and to define the status of slaves.” 13 Governor Rencher, Accused of “leading a Confederate revolution and capturing Fort Marcy,” reassured William H. Seward, Secretary of State, in April 1861 of his loyalty and submitted his resignation. He was not reappointed to the governorship. 14

On September 9, 1861, Governor Connelly called for the organization of the militia in New Mexico. He observed that “this Territory is now invaded by armed force from the State of Texas, which has taken possession of two forts within the limits of the Territory, has seized and appropriated to its use other property of the Territorial Government, and has established military rule over the part already invaded...” His first

---

13 Horn, *New Mexico’s Troubled Years*, 86.
14 Horn, *New Mexico’s Troubled Years*, 87-88
legislative message included the sentence “The enemy is Texas and the Texans.” In December 1861, the governor successfully sought the repeal of the Slave Act of 1859.¹⁵

Union and Confederate objectives in the West at the outbreak of the Civil War

At the beginning of the Civil War, New Mexico Territory stretched from the Staked Plains bordering Texas in the east to the Colorado River forming the California boundary in the west. From north to south, New Mexico Territory stretch from what is now southern Colorado in the north, to El Paso in the south. The part of the New Mexico Territory now known as Arizona did not include lands south of the Gila River because it had remained Mexican territory in 1848. In 1853, the land south of the Gila River was acquired by the United States from Mexico under the Gadsden Purchase Treaty. For ten years, the lands acquired under the Gadsden Purchase Treaty, also known as the Mesilla Treaty, included Tucson and Mesilla near present Las Cruces, along with several large land grants. The newly acquired land stretched westward from El Paso to the Colorado River and remained a part of New Mexico Territory until 1863 when Arizona Territory was created. In general, the settled areas of New Mexico were mostly confined to the Rio Grande Valley, with some outlying settlements, such as Taos and Las Vegas, Cubero, Mesilla, scattered ranches and smaller settlements, Indian pueblos, and rancherías, that is, outlying areas inhabited largely by semi-sedentary tribes.¹⁶

Between 1821 and 1848, during the period of the Mexican rule in New Mexico and California, trade had begun between St. Louis and Santa Fe and other points. The route from Missouri to Santa Fe became known as the Old Santa Fe Trail. By 1830, New Mexicans had opened a new trade route to California via the Old Spanish Trail by way of Utah. In New Mexico, the old Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, which ran from Mexico City to Santa Fe during the Spanish Period served as the main commercial and immigration route. After 1821, the trail became a national road of Mexico. The segment of the old Camino Real between Albuquerque (founded in 1706) and Ciudad Chihuahua (founded in 1709) had become a vibrant trade route known as the Chihuahua Trail. New Mexicans traveled south every October to the trade festival held in Ciudad Chihuahua. In late 1830s, after the saturation of the Santa Fe market by Missouri Traders along the Old Santa Fe Trail, the trade expanded to Chihuahua and other parts of Northern Mexico. The route from Missouri to Chihuahua via Santa Fe came to be called the Santa Fe-Chihuahua Trail. Trade along the Santa Fe Trail segment between Missouri and Santa Fe underwent a boom in 1861. Goods of all varieties were transported to supply the military and civilian population, food, munitions, cloth and other manufactured goods. The U.S. mail was transported along the route. Immigrants, merchants, and soldiers used it for their diverse ends.¹⁷  Like the hub of a wagon wheel, Santa Fe connected the Camino Real de Tierra Adentro, the Old Santa Fe-Chihuahua Trail, and the Old Spanish Trail.

During the Civil War, the strategic control of the referenced trails, especially the Old Santa Fe-Chihuahua Trail was a primary objective of the Union and Confederate forces in the West. The trail served as a conduit for the movement of people and things as well as the primary means of communication and supply of civilians and military. By protecting it, Union supporters would deny supplies to Rebel troops, thus making their subsistence more difficult, and ensure the safety of Colorado and California gold fields.

In addition to gaining control of the trail Confederate objectives included the Texans’ taking over New Mexican territory. According to the declaration of boundaries made by the Lone Star Republic in 1836, Texans believed all of New Mexico on the east bank of the Rio Grande belonged to Texas. Aside from their version of manifest destiny Confederate expansionists in Texas reasoned that they could gain California by capturing New Mexico. On the Santa Fe Trail, they could capture supplies and munitions that would allow them to continue on to the rich mining districts of Colorado and California. Once California was taken, the Confederates would have an outlet to the sea, which had been foiled on the Atlantic coast by a Union blockade. Southern control of Pacific Ocean ports and communication by railroad through the Southern states and territories would allow access to Asian commerce.

Rebel hopes ran high for the capture of New Mexico, the gateway to California seemed achievable. After all, factors in favor of a Confederate success there lay in the knowledge that there were many Southern supporters, such as the Texan ranchers and miners in southern New Mexico. Thus, the Confederate army hoped to garner aid and troops as they went. The ultimate Rebel goal, nonetheless, was continental expansion. They had much to gain aside from additional territory for slaveholders and agricultural production, and markets for Southern cotton. The California Gold Rush of the 1850s lured them westward. California gold would go a long way toward financing the Southern war effort.18

Militia and volunteer recruiting in New Mexico Territory

Captain Ceran St. Vrain in Santa Fe in 1846 organized the first unit of territorial militia in New Mexico. Composed of 65 “neighbors” (probably “vecinos,” more correctly translated as citizens) from Santa Fe, the unit saw its first action at Santa Cruz, Embudo, and Taos, in 1847. These events associated with the rebellion against the American invaders, included the assassination of Charles Bent, the first civil governor of New Mexico. Colonel Sterling Price, military governor (1846—48), complimented the operations of this first militia group. In 1964, Adjutant General John Pershing Jolly wrote that the Missouri Volunteers, who came with Kearney’s Army of the West in 1846, introduced the “English colonial concept of militia as it was incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.” Jolly recognized that the Spanish, Mexican, English, and Anglo-American military traditions had been quietly merged in the historical process of the moment. To that end, he wrote “this was recognized in the Kearny Code, which served to formalize the territorial militia. Thus, for the first time in New Mexico, there

was made a distinction between the organized and unorganized militia....Naturally, when the Kearny Code was promulgated it gave consideration to all groups involved and represented ideas both Spanish-Mexican and English Colonial.

In the first fifteen years of New Mexico’s status as a territory, most militia units defended against Indian raiders and tracked them in order to recover captives and livestock.

The utility of militia units in New Mexico Territory reflected the names used for their units. Generally, they were called volunteers, or more specifically the “New Mexico Volunteers,” other times they were called “Mounted Militia,” and used as dragoons, or they served in militia units such as the one organized in 1858 at Mora called “Scouts and Spies.” Captain P.M. Papin, for example, was in charge of New Mexico Volunteers from Las Vegas who responded to Jicarilla Apache raiders in August 1849. Two years later, in October 1851, Governor Calhoun called up the Mounted Militia to make expeditions against the Utes and Apaches. Brigadier General Manuel Herrera of Ojitos Frios, four miles south of Las Vegas, served as the commanding officer. Acting Governor Messevy requested a battalion of militia to serve in Northeastern Ne Mexico in May 1853 or 1854. Governor David Meriwether (1853-56) also wanted a battalion or regiment of mounted militia or volunteers who would work with regular troops, after Mescaleros attacked Galisteo.

The governor appointed Ceran St. Vrain as lieutenant colonel and an Anglo-American as a major. Although six companies were projected, apparently only four were recruited. Colonel Thomas F. Fauntleroy commanded two regular army companies or dragoons and two of artillery. Ordered to Taos, they joined forces with St. Vrain, Kit Carson, and the volunteers. This apparently occurred in July 1855. Another group, the New Mexico Spies and Guides, possibly to be considered as militia, was recruited for one month in November 1858 in Mora.

Equipping militia units was always a problem. As the result of recurrent Indian raids at Galisteo and Glorieta, citizens of Santa Fe volunteered to be of assistance in July 1860, and were provided with horses, mules, and equipment. Colonel E. V. Summer of the U.S. Army offered to arm Captain Preston Beck’s company with flintlock muskets, antiques by then, but Captain Beck did not accept these weapons. The captain had a ranch in the Pecos Valley, south of Anton Chico. The following year Governor Calhoun requested arms from Fort Union for the militia of San Antonio led by Estanislas Montoya.

This brief account does not include the many actions the regular army was involved in nor the interaction of the militia and the regular army. Nevertheless, it is evident that militia forces led by natives or acculturated, naturalized citizens with long experience in the region were regularly called to duty.

Hispanic New Mexicans in the Service of the Union

19 John Pershing Jolly, History: National Guard of New Mexico, 1606-1963 (Santa Fe, New Mexico: The Adjutant General of New Mexico, 1964), 9-11.
With news of the increasing tensions between North and South, recruitment of volunteers actively began in New Mexico. Of the situation, Leo E. Oliva, in 1993, wrote, "each community of sufficient population in the territory was encouraged to raise a company for the volunteer service. The primary reasons New Mexicans joined the Army was for the pay ($13.00 per month) and a bounty of $100 for those who signed up for three years." Some men enlisted as a way to escape the peonage system. This system operated as debt servitude, providing landowners with cheap laborers and locking men and their families into lives of servitude. The military command in New Mexico supported the enlistment of peones against the wishes of landowners. Serving with honor, these recruits proved to be strong and loyal soldiers. Often, Christopher (Kit) Carson and Captain Albert H. Pfeiffer recruited Native Americans (Utes) and New Mexicans to care for animals, serve as scouts, and accomplish other duties.

The extent of training received by recruits is unknown, but it appears that volunteers were trained in a regimen known as the "School of the Soldier" which included instructions in various aspects of being a soldier such as marching, and the handling and use of shoulder arms. Major William Chapman established a camp near Fort Union that bore his name, Camp Chapman, for training new recruits. This was later known as Camp Cameron. He placed Capt. Francisco P. Abreu in charge of training.

Given the barter economy in New Mexico Territory, the method of payment for volunteers appeared to be a negotiated affair, albeit, a bit makeshift. Volunteers were required to furnish their own clothing. However, there were no funds to pay the recruits, so they were furnished clothing, with the charges to be deducted from the value of what would have been their pay. Some soldiers brought their families, and were eventually allowed to buy rations from the Quartermaster with which to feed their families. Other supplies for the recruits, such as tents, arms, and so on were in short supply in July of 1861.

Recruiting continued throughout 1861, although with difficulty. With the resignation of Ceran St. Vrain in September 1861, Colonel Carson became commander of the New Mexico Volunteers. At that time, the volunteer term of service increased form on year or less to three years. Reenlistment was encouraged. Construction of facilities or roads for military purposes, however, continued to interfere with training as recruits were often used as laborers. Nonetheless, the District of New Mexico Commander, E. R. S. Canby approved the employment of "several hundred volunteers" on construction duties throughout the winter of 1861-62. in November 1861, seventy members of Captain Francisco P. Abreu’s Company C, 1st New Mexico Mounted Volunteers were employed on road construction east of Raton Pass to Fort Wise. Large projects, such as retrofitting Fort Union for defensive purposes, required volunteer labor. Fort Union had not been designed originally with defense in mind and was built on an open plan, without any palisade or defensive walls. The quarters and other facilities, built with green, unpeeled logs, were rapidly deteriorating. A defensive fort (known as the second fort or star fort)

21 Oliva, Fort Union, 246-247.
23 Oliva, Fort Union, 250.
24 Oliva, Fort Union, 247.
was designed and Colonel Carson’s volunteers were put to work on the fieldwork, probably digging and moving dirt. Bluffs overlooked the site, about a mile east of the first fort, well within the range of both Union and Confederate artillery. Thus, although the fieldwork might provide some protection, it was still vulnerable. A blockhouse for munitions, storage facilities, and quarters were provided for officers and enlisted men. Poorly drained, the second fort was often quite damp. The works were essentially complete by August 20, 1861. Still, work on the fort interfered with training the volunteers. 26

During the initial recruitment and training of native New Mexicans as soldiers, Anglo-American prejudice surfaced as regular Army officers discovered their inability to communicate with Hispanic New Mexican soldiers, differences in world-view, and cultural and religious values. Use of interpreters solved some problems in communication. Other areas, however, were not easily solved. A poor translation of the army manual, presumably Hardee’s *Rifle and Light Infantry Tactics*, 27 for example, was not understood by officers attempting to use it. Indeed, Hispanic officers had to translate orders into Spanish themselves as they received them in English, rather than rely on the translation. 28 Captain José Francisco Chaves complained about inadequate quarters and discrimination, whereupon Colonel Chapman disparaged volunteer officers and troops and denied the existence of discrimination. Strife existed between regular and volunteer troops and officers and enlisted men, particularly in the first years of the war. Along with discrimination, lack of pay and clothing caused New Mexico Volunteers to desert at Socorro in January 1862, and the same almost occurred at Fort Union. 29

The definitive history of the New Mexico Volunteers is yet to be written. Still, some relevant facts are noted below. Colonel Ceran St.Vrain served as the commander of the 1st Regiment New Mexico Volunteers. Capt. José Maria Valdez, recruited, organized, and commanded the first company—Company A, Mora, 1st Regiment New Mexico Volunteers. Its first assignment was to guard the Santa Fe Trail as far as Fort Wise, Colorado. The second company, B, Las Vegas, served under Capt. Arthur P. Morrison. By August 1861, detachments of New Mexico Volunteers roamed along the Santa Fe Trail to the Canadian and Pecos Rivers. They had also been requested at Hatch’s Ranch. Recruiting of New Mexicans as volunteers for the Union forces continued, and, as the numbers of volunteers increased, regular troops were sent from Fort Union to other posts. 30

With the invasion of New Mexico by Confederate forces from Texas in 1861, the Civil War cast its long shadow westward. The most dramatic events of the Civil War in New Mexico took place in 1862. Three battles defined the fate of the confederate States

26 Oliva, *Fort Union*, 258.
29 Oliva, *Fort Union*, 268-269.
30 Oliva, *Fort Union*, 257.
of America in the West. These battles are Valverde, Glorieta (Cañoncito and Glorieta), and Peralta. The Confederate Army of New Mexico, also known as Sibley’s Brigade, had as its prime goal in New Mexico, the capture of Fort Union, the principal arms and supply depot in the West. Even the inadequate number of weapons, ammunition, foodstuffs, harness, tools, wagons, and livestock there would make the road to Denver City and California and subsequent hostilities much easier.31

Civil War hostilities in New Mexico began with the arrival of troops from Texas in southern New Mexico. Lieutenant Colonel John R. Baylor, had come to New Mexico by way of El Paso in July 1861 with troops recruited in Texas. Facing defeat at the hands of Baylor’s forces on July 27, Major Isaac Lynde abandoned Fort Fillmore, 8 miles south of Las Cruces, setting it on fire to deny its use to the invading army. Overtaken by the Confederate force numbering 300 men under Baylor, Lynde, with some 500 federal troops, surrendered.32 Once Baylor had captured Mesilla, he proclaimed the Confederate Territory of Arizona on August 1, 1861, with its capital at Mesilla.

In December 1862, Brigadier General Henry Hopkins Sibley arrived at Fort Bliss, Texas. The “Sibley Brigade,” another name for the Confederate Army of New Mexico, left Mesilla on February 7, 1862, and by February 16 prepared to renew hostilities. Another five days would pass while the Texans, avoiding a direct attack on Fort Craig, crossed the Rio Grande and traveled to a ford north of Fort Craig, at Valverde. The Battle of Valverde took place on February 21, 1862. Forces of some 2600 Confederates versus 3800 Union troops sustained losses, respectively, of 230 (10%) versus 475 (17%). Although Canby blamed the New Mexico Volunteers for the loss, one historian aptly attributes the severe Union losses to General Canby’s assuming command from Major Peters.33 The loss of McRae’s battery may have been the telling factor which caused the Union troops to withdraw leaving the New Mexico Volunteers in a crossfire. The Confederate demand for the surrender of Fort Craig was denied, and Sibley’s Brigade continued heading north. Opinions about the status of both the Union and Confederates at this point seem ambiguous. Oddly, Sibley, perhaps Canby’s brother-in-law, left Fort Craig behind him because it was too strong and well-defended to attack directly. This meant he was interrupting his supply line. At the same time, Canby and the Union forces had allowed the Confederates to isolate them and cut them off from their source of supply, Fort Union.

New Mexico Volunteers and Militia involved at Valverde along with the regular Cavalry, Infantry and one company of Colorado Cavalry (“Pike’s Peakers”) included:34

31 Oliva, Fort Union, 257.
34 Colonel Canby requested troops from the governor of Colorado in January 1862. After a heroic march through the snow to Fort Union, some were deployed to Fort Craig to assist in its defense and others were present at the Battle of Glorieta. Emmett, Fort Union and the Winning, 256, 262, 264.
1st New Mexico Volunteers led by Colonel Christopher (Kit) Carson
2nd New Mexico Volunteers led by Colonel Miguel Pino
3rd New Mexico Volunteers led by Colonel Jose Gallegos
4th New Mexico Volunteers led by Colonel Gabriel Paul
5th New Mexico Volunteers led by Lieutenant Colonel Benjamin Roberts
Graydon’s Spy Company led by Captain James Graydon

The New Mexico Militia:
1st New Mexico Militia led by Colonel Manuel Armijo
2nd New Mexico Militia led by Colonel Nicolas Pino.

Socorro was defended by some 500 unpaid New Mexico Militia. Various accounts indicate that one artillery shot from the Confederate artillery was enough to convince the militia to surrender. The Confederates established a military hospital there before leaving for Albuquerque. With news of the Confederate army’s approach, Federal troops abandoned Albuquerque, burning what supplies they could not transport. The Confederate troops spent a couple of weeks recuperating in Albuquerque, salvaging some Federal supplies, foraging, and collecting supplies from Southern sympathizers. Some Southern sympathizers in Cubero seized the arms, munitions, and foodstuffs that had been prepared for a campaign against the Navajos and stored in Cubero, and delivered them to the Confederates. Then, Major Charles L. Pyron and 500 Confederate troops proceeded to Santa Fe, arriving on March 10, 1862, while Lieutenant Colonel William Scurry took a larger division from Albuquerque to Galisteo and, later Glorieta Pass.

The major conflict of the Civil War in New Mexico, the Battle of Glorieta, referred to by some historians as the Gettysburg of the West, took place on March 26 and 28, 1862. On March 26, in Apache Canyon, Major Pyron’s southern troops, some 300 men, were attacked by Major John M. Chivington with some 400 Federal Troops from Colorado (Infantry and volunteer Cavalry) and regular Army Cavalry. As Martin Hardwick Hall describes the conflict, “The Confederates were taken by complete surprise, and after fighting a lively skirmish, they retreated to Johnson’s Ranch.”

The second act of the Battle of Glorieta occurred two days later. Pyron’s troops were joined by those of Colonel Scurry, arriving from Galisteo, increasing the numbers to about 700-1000 men. Slough and the Union forces were at Pigeon’s Ranch, where Colonel Scurry and his men began the attack. After some six hours of battle, “the Federals were fleeing from the field in a near rout.” Somewhat earlier, Major Chivington

---

and his men, guided by New Mexico Volunteers under Colonel Manuel Antonio Chavez, from Atrisco near Albuquerque, crossed Glorieta Mesa and destroyed the Confederate supply train. Technically, the Confederates had won the battle, but they were left without supplies and munitions at the end of the battle. They had learned by experience that living off the land was next to impossible. The Confederate army units withdrew to Santa Fe, leaving many of the wounded in a hospital there, and continued on to Albuquerque to await reinforcements and supplies.39

Colonel Canby had brought up Federal army units to Albuquerque with the intent of encouraging the departure of the Confederates. An Artillery duel at this city, which had little effect, may have helped to convince the Confederates to continue their retreat. Similarly, on April 15, south of Albuquerque at Peralta, a battle ensued. The terrain, crisscrossed with irrigation ditches and partitioned by adobe walls and fences, was favorable to the Confederate defenders, but the battle field area.40

Meanwhile, far to the west at Picacho Peak, forty miles northwest of Tucson, a small, but dramatic battle, probably the westernmost military engagement of the Civil War, took place. Tucson, already occupied by Confederate forces, appeared to be the last outpost on the Confederate push to California. But one small skirmish near there changed everything for the Confederates. On the same day as the firefight at Peralta, Carleton’s California Column, a volunteer unit, slowly advanced on the Confederates at Picacho Peak. Once initiated, the action was swift, deadly, and decisive. The Confederates killed three men and wounded another three from the Union advance guard moving toward Picacho Peak. Three Confederates were taken prisoner by the Union troops.41 News of Carlton’s California Column forced the Confederates to abandon their hold on Tucson. Subsequently, the Column arrived at the Rio Grande in August 1862, providing a further incentive for the Confederate retreat.

Conflict between North and South and with non-combatants occurred in numerous other places and contexts in New Mexico Territory during the Civil War. Confiscation of foodstuffs, for example, was carried out by both forces.42 Aside from engaging Confederates, although rumors of the return of the Texans were abundant, the New Mexico Volunteers and Militia were involved in many other activities. Indian hostilities increased during the Confederate invasion. By October 1862, Carleton had dispatched Colonel Christopher Carson and four companies of the 1st New Mexico Volunteers to Fort Stanton to attack Mescaleros and Navajos everywhere, killing all the men. Carleton ordered the establishment of Bosque Redondo in October 1862, as a reservation for Navajos and Apaches, with the goal of “civilizing” the Native Americans. Carson was ordered to compel Navajos to go to Bosque Redondo.43

40 Alberts, The Battle of Glorieta, 163.
42 The bibliography lists the most useful volumes for anyone who might wish to investigate the period, events, and people in more detail.
43 Olivia, Fort Union, 295-298
Carleton worked tirelessly in the reorganization of the military in New Mexico. While maintaining a watch for further Confederate incursions, troops were redistributed. Given the inadequate field works at Fort Union, Carlton ordered a new fort to be constructed. Far to the southwest of there, New Mexico Volunteers, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Jose Francisco Chaves, built a new fort west of Albuquerque, Fort Wingate. Carleton also sent two companies of New Mexico Volunteers to Fort Lyon, Colorado. To assure that military strength would be maintained, Carlton encouraged the expansion of militia units. Recruiting began anew for a regiment of New Mexico Volunteers.  

In 1863, rumors of potential confederate operations continued in New Mexico Territory and preparations for such contingencies were made. The overriding concerns and priorities, however, were Indian campaigns. Colonel Carson's campaign against the Navajos would continue into 1864. In the south central region of the territory around Pinos Altos (present-day Silver City area), General Joseph R. Miller, with New Mexico and California volunteers, led a campaign against the Gila Apaches who periodically raided along the southern route to California and the mining districts. Enlistment of volunteers continued. At this time, most troops involved in the campaigns in New Mexico, Colorado, or California.  

Activities for the last two years of the Civil War were much the same: Indian campaigns and preparations for potential Confederate threat. Carson continued the campaign to round up the Navajos and take them to Bosque Redondo, as well as leading Utes and Jicarillas to fight against the Kiowas and Comanches. South of Socorro, Colonel Oscar M. Brown carried out a campaign against the Apaches with New Mexico and California volunteers from Fort Craig to Fort Goodwin. In 1865, Carson and three companies of volunteer cavalry established Camp Nichols in the Oklahoma panhandle, which was abandoned later that year. They were also involved in the construction of the third fort at Fort Union.  

As needed, the Territorial Militia of New Mexico continued to operate after the Civil War. The terms of many soldiers ended in 1866 and 1867 and they were mustered out of the service, particularly the 1st New Mexico Cavalry. Still volunteers were needed on an intermediate basis. The militia, for example, saw action on Indian campaigns from 1868-1873 and 1879-1886. In 1882-1883, the militia was involved in peace-keeping efforts associated with the Lincoln County War. The years 1887-1897 saw less need for the militia and troop numbers were gradually decreased. In 1897, the National Guard was established and the Territorial Militia of New Mexico ceased to exist.  

Internal Conflicts in the Union Service  

The influx of European-Americans into New Mexico Territory brought several different world views into conflict. Problems from basic communication to considerations of economy, religion, and culture in general, affected Hispanic New  

44 Olivia, Fort Union, 297, 304.  
45 Olivia, Fort Union, 296-298, 302, 314.  
46 Olivia, Fort Union, 308, 310, 315, 321.  
47 John Pershing Jolly, History: National Guard of New Mexico, 1606-1963 (Santa Fe, New Mexico: The Adjutant General of New Mexico. 1964), 17-18.
Mexicans at all levels in the emerging Territorial culture. New Mexico Territorial Governor James S. Calhoun wrote in 1851 that "of the sixty thousand inhabitants in this territory, I am satisfied there are not five hundred persons, unconnected with the army, who can read the English language. Hence, the necessity of writing or printing both in English and Spanish." One of the conditions for recruitment of soldiers was that "foreigners or stammerers" were not to be enlisted "unless they can understand and speak rapidly." Monolingual Spanish speakers and other foreign born soldiers had problems communicating with monolingual English speaking soldiers and officers. There were foreigners in the incoming troops, Germans, for example, who had similar problems. The army addressed the problems by enlisting men who spoke the same language in the same units, by providing for bilingual soldiers in units, and by having unit officers who spoke both languages assigned together. When possible, translators were used. In 1993, Leo E. Oliva wrote the following interpretation of the situation:

"The Language barrier was the most obvious division between Anglos and Hispanos, but there were deep-seated prejudices on both sides. New Mexicans saw the Anglos as conquerors who had captured their land and were in the process of destroying their cultures. Many Anglos considered all New Mexicans to be inferior and not good material or soldiers. The situation was further complicated by a superiority complex of professional officers and regular troops in their view of volunteers. Many of the New Mexican volunteers did seem to be inadequate as soldiers because of the language barrier, lack of military experience...They possessed many strengths, however, that were seldom utilized because of Anglo prejudices: understanding of the environment (routes of travel, locations of springs, and utilization of native plants) and the Indians, experiences of endurance in the face of obstacles, and courage in the midst of battle (especially against Indians). Many New Mexicans performed admirably in the service of the U.S., but most Anglo officers did not give them proper credit because of their preconceptions about "Mexicans" and volunteers."  

49 Oliva, Fort Union 246
50 Oliva, Fort Union, 246-247.
Other aspects of the contrasts in world view, such as land tenure, brought native New Mexicans and incoming Anglo-Americans into conflict.

Contrasts in Spanish law and tradition regarding land and water would offer volumes in differences and similarities between the two cultures. Problems arising from differences, however, would take over a century to resolve. Still, the legal system introduced by Anglo-Americans would lead to injustices, long term legal processes, and some successes for Hispanics defending their properties. The legacy of that episode of nineteenth century history resounds today as Hispanic land grant heirs continue to press for a fair review of that history. Recently, in 2004, the GAO report on land grants offered a glimmer of hope for a resolution by Congress.

Religion was another arena of conflict. Most of the incoming Americans were Protestants and regarded Catholicism as superstitious and quaint. Ovando J. Hollister, a member of the Colorado Volunteers, wrote his biased account on August 21, 1862, after seeing the cathedral in Santa Fe:

“I stood spell-bound by their influence (the bells’ sounding), while the awful power of the Catholic Church in the dark ages, the overwhelming influence of the clergy obtained by keeping the masses in ignorance and practicing on their feelings through the confessional, the unswerving devotion of the priestly orders to her advancement and glory, weighed against which the rights of whole nations were as a feather; Cortez, with his iron band, conquering this ancient and extensive empire, Holy Fathers binding his yoke on the people’s necks, and the bands of Mother Church on their souls, mingled with visions of my native hills, where man is man and thought is free as the wind; all that is grand in history or beautiful in song was conjured from the past, and thrilled through and through me, raising the hair from my head and the water from my heart.”

Unabashed by his logic, Hollister attended the mass and then went to a horserace. Later, referring to Tecolote, he writes haughtily that

“the forms of religion, if not its substance, appear to be generally respected and observed. Doubtless the people are as well priest-ridden as the most inveterate lover of that kind of craft could wish. For myself, I never realized the utter blankness and poverty of the Mexican mind, till I climbed through a hole in the wall about twelve feet from the ground, the door was fastened, and descending, found myself inside of a church for the first time. The impressions a country smith makes on his shop door with a redhot horseshoe, rings, brands, etc. to


signify the nature of his occupation to the public, are incomparably superior to the
prints, paints and daubs, intended to adorn the church walls. What language can
adequately express the simplicity, not to say stupidity of a people who treasure
such trash in their sanctuaries!”

These two passages demonstrate not only the presumed Protestant intolerance of that
particular soldier, but also his self-righteous, ethnocentric opinion about people for which
he had no familiarity. As an example of a compatible but official stance, in 1867, the
commanding officer of Fort Union, Major Elijah G. Marshall, hoped to promote
Protestantism at Fort Union to combat the Catholic religion, but Protestant chaplains
were not always available at the fort. In contrast, at least one regiment of the New
Mexico Volunteers had its own Catholic chaplain, Father Damaso Talarid. Likewise,
Anglo-American Catholic soldiers had more access to their own churches and priests in
New Mexico. Such opinions, while ethnocentrically based had little or no effect on
Hispanic culture in New Mexico. Still, such prejudices affected the civil rights of
individuals in education, housing, banking, the workplace, law and medicine throughout
the Greater Southwest, not only in New Mexico for at least the next century and a half.

Little attention was given to the New Mexican volunteers as is demonstrated in
such basic matters as military supply. Colonel Edward R.S. Canby, wrote in a report to
the adjutant general of the United States on December 8, 1861 that

“Third. The regular troops have the most improved arms—the infantry the
Springfield rifled musket, .58 caliber, and the cavalry the Harper’s Ferry rifle,
Colt’s pistol (Navy), Sharp’s and Maynard’s carbines and a few of Colt’s
revolving rifles for experiment. The exact number of the arms in the hands of the
troops cannot be stated until the ordinance returns are received, but it is slightly in
excess of the number of the troops. The volunteers have arms of older models—
the rifled musket, .69 caliber; Harper’s Ferry rifle, calibers .54 and .58; the
cavalry musketoon, the carbine pistol, and a few companies the smooth-bore
musket. .69 caliber. These arms are all in serviceable condition, but the troops
are imperfectly equipped, as there is a great deficiency of accouterments. The
clothing of the regular troops is good, and there is a sufficient quantity for all their
probable wants until the right period of receiving supplies. Clothing for two of
the volunteer regiments has been received and distributed. It is reported to be
inferior in quality. For the two other regiments it is supposed to be in the trains
that are now near Fort Union.”
Accouterments were not among enticements for recruitment. As mentioned earlier the militia in the 1850s refused the offer of obsolete flintlock muskets which were much more complicated to use and more difficult to keep in working order. Although recruiters made it clear that no clothing would be issued, this was not always true. According to Hardee’s manual, the various states would issue clothing and uniforms to the volunteer militia as follows: a jacket, a pair of trousers, overcoat, fatigue cap, two flannel shirts, two flannel drawers, two pair of woolen socks, a pair of shoes, a blanket, knapsack, haversack, and canteen. 57

Civil War Leaders in New Mexico

Working in unison with their respective governments, Civil War commanders on both sides controlled the local situations in their theater of war. Within this context, the principal leaders in the development of the events emerge in the succeeding paragraphs.

Regular U.S. Army Officers

The U.S. Army regulars throughout the country were organized into departments or military districts whose leadership and territories changed over time. Colonel Edward Richard Sprigg Canby, a graduate of West Point and veteran of the Mexican War, was the commander of the Department of New Mexico at the outbreak of the Civil War. Colonel Canby was at Fort Craig when the Union forces lost the Battle of Valverde. According to some, his late intervention in the leadership of the battle was the cause for the loss. Others suggest that failing to continue the battle to its end was a tactical move designed to break off the Confederate army’s supply line. Canby notified troops in Albuquerque and Santa Fe of the danger and had them withdraw and destroy what supplies they could not transport. 58 Canby’s losses led to Confederate victories in which both Albuquerque and Santa Fe were captured.

Soon after the fall of Santa Fe, the Battle of Glorieta took place dooming Confederate designs on Fort Union, and ultimately, their dream of continental expansion. Colonel John P. Slough and Major John M. Chivington of the 1st Regiment Colorado Volunteers were instrumental in this action. Slough had a slightly earlier enlistment date than the commander of Fort Union, Colonel Gabriel Paul, and thus took command of all the Union forces. Fearing punishment for his actions, Slough resigned shortly after the battle and returned to Colorado. Colonel Chivington, with 269 New Mexico volunteers led by New Mexican Colonel Manuel Antonio Chavez, destroyed the Confederate supply train. Having routed the Confederate forces there, the Battle of Glorieta turned into a significant Union victory. 59

57 Emmett, Fort Union and the Winning, 237. W.J. Hardee, Rifle and Light Infantry Tactics for the Instruction, Exercises and Maneuvers of Riflemen and Light Infantry (New York: J.O. Kane, Publisher, 1862), 154.
Command of the Department of New Mexico was delegated to General James H. Carleton in September of 1862. General Carleton arrived in New Mexico in August of that year with the California Column, a group of volunteer recruits intended to bolster the defense of New Mexico against the Confederates. Although rumors of Confederate recruiting and their intentions to reenter New Mexico came and went, no southern troops ever again appeared in the Territory. 60

Hispanic Militia and Volunteer Leaders

The majority of the militia and volunteers, both officers and men, were native New Mexican Hispanics. However, two of their leaders, Ceran St. Vrain and Christopher (Kit) Carson were from Missouri and Kentucky. St. Vrain, originally from the St. Louis area, was a trapper, trader, and partner with George and Charles Bent in the trading enterprise on the Arkansas River known as Fort William or Bent’s Fort (1830s). Beginning in 1825, he lived in Taos and for many years, managed the partners’ stores ther and in Santa Fe. St. Vrain served as American consul in Santa Fe during that same period. He helped to suppress a rebellion in 1847. In the 1850s, he recruited for and led a militia organization, but resigned in September of 1861 61 relinquishing command to Colonel Carson. Carson, a trapper and Indian agent, was married to a Hispanic woman and spoke Spanish. He led his regiment at the Battle of Valverde and later participated in campaigns against the Mescaleros and Navajos. 62 Members of some of the leading New Mexico families, such as Manuel Antonio Chaez, Jose Francisco Chavez, and Nicolas and Miguel Pino, were former soldiers and officers in the Republic of Mexico in New Mexico. After the U.S. occupation, they continued in military service under the American government. They served in the militias attached to the United States army during the mid-1800s and as volunteers during the Civil War.

In the Mexican American War, Manuel Antonio Chavez, a militia leader known as “el Leoncito” (the little lion), was ordered to turn back at Apache Canyon along with Miguel Pino and others. Mexican Governor Manuel Armijo had apparently been convinced by American traders in Santa Fe that the American invaders were too strong to resist.

When Territorial Governor David Meriwether called for the raising of the militia in 1855, Chavez and Pino applied for commissions as captains. Both of them became officers. By 1860, Chavez was a lieutenant colonel of the regiment of mounted volunteers that was formed to deal with Navajo raiding. The same year, Colonel Miguel Pino was stationed in Santa Fe during which time Jose Francisco Chavez was raising a militia company at Peralta.

60 Darlis A. Miller, *The California column in New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, in collaboration with the Historical Society of New Mexico, 1982), 4, 13, 16.
Manuel Antonio Chavez, Miguel Pino, Jose Francisco Chavez and Kit Carson were at Fort Craig and received praise from Colonel Canby for their actions during the Battle of Valverde. Colonel Nicolas Pino led the 2nd New Mexico Militia at Valverde. At Socorro, he and his men surrendered in the face of overwhelming odds to a Confederate army who had threatened the community with an artillery attack. Eventually the army began its march northward.

At the Battle of Glorieta, Lt. Col. Manuel Antonio Chavez guided Major John M. Chivington across Glorieta Mesa and led a detachment of 269 men in the successful attack that destroyed the Confederate supply train on the second day of the battle. The attack routed Confederate forces. After Sibley's withdrawal from Santa Fe, Manuel Chavez and Miguel Pino, were ordered by Col. Canby to reconnoiter the Albuquerque area. That action hastened the Confederate retreat south to El Paso. 63

Joe Francisco Chavez was born in 1833. He attended schools in St. Louis, Missouri and eventually studied medicine at the New York College of Physicians and Surgeons. Like Manuel Chavez and Miguel Pino, he served in the militia in 1858 on a Navajo campaign. In 1861, he was commissioned as a major of the 1st New Mexico Infantry and was later promoted to lieutenant colonel. He was involved in the establishment of Fort Wingate (1862), which he commanded for a period. After the war, Chavez studied law and was admitted to the bar. He later served as a representative to the territorial House of Representatives, and served as a two-term elected delegate from New Mexico to Congress. By 1889, he was member and president of the New Mexico Territory constitutional convention. 64

For the most part, the service of New Mexican Hispanics during the Civil War is little known, an facts about their lives are difficult to find. However, it is important to recognize the contributions of New Mexicans in service and defense of their country. Three men whose records are known are Colonel Francisco P. Abreu, Rafael Chacon, and Julian Aragon y Perea. 65

Colonel Francisco P. Abreu first commanded Fort Union in an interim position on several occasions. While in charge of Camp Chapman near Fort Union in 1861, Abreu was also responsible for training new soldiers. In November of the same year, he commanded recruits in building a road between Forts Wise and Union. He served as the interim commander of Fort Union at least four times in 1864-65. In 1865, he was in charge of preparing Fort Union for inspection. 66 Somewhat later, he commanded Fort Bascom. At the Battle of Adobe Walls, he was second in command after Kit Carson.

---

65 More detail of their life in the military can be obtained from their official service records, which have not been consulted for the purposes of this study.
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Rafael Chacon, born in 1830, was a cadet with troops in Taos at age 11 and studied at the Normal Military School in Chihuahua at age 14. In 1862, he enlisted for three years at Fort Union as the Captain of Company K, 1st Regiment New Mexico Volunteers Infantry (later Cavalry). He served in the Battle of Valverde and at Peralta and later conducted 400 Confederate prisoners from Peralta to Fort Union in April 1862. Promoted to major in March 1864, Chacon carried out operations against Navajos and Apaches. On two different occasions in 1862 and 1864, he served as interim commander at Fort Wingate. He was commander at Fort Stanton in 1864 but was mustered out sometime later in the year. At one point, he conducted 5000 Navajos to Fort Stanton. In his latter years, he served as Chief Clerk of the New Mexico Territorial Senate and Justice of the Peace and sheriff in Las Animas, Colorado. Also in Colorado, he was a notary public for over twenty years. 67

Julian Aragon y Perea traveled to Missouri in 1848 in a wagon train over the Santa Fe Trail accompanied by two friends. He stayed in Missouri where he went to school for a few months, worked in a tailor shop to learn the trade, and later worked as a freighter. In 1851, on his return to New Mexico, he worked as a tailor in San Miguel and traded with Apaches in 1853. From 1857-1861, he worked as a freighter on the Santa Fe to Kansas City route. Enlisting in the 4th Regiment of Mounted Volunteers in October 1861, he served as captain of Company B. Briefly in 1862, he was involved in commerce, freighting, and sheep raising. By 1863, he had re-enlisted as a first lieutenant in charge of Company D, 1st Regiment, 2nd Brigade, New Mexico Militia. After his military service, he served as a supervisor of schools, assessor, director of schools in Guadalupe County, and later as a notary public. 68

Leaders of the Confederate “Army of New Mexico”

The succeeding narration presents brief accounts about the following Confederate leaders: General Henry Hopkins Sibley, John R. Baylor, James Reily, and William Scurry.

General Henry Hopkins, born in Natchitoches, Louisiana, in 1816, attended the military academy graduating in 1838. Before the Mexican War, he participated in Indian campaigns. During the war, he was present at the siege of Veracruz, and the Battles of Medellin, Cerro Gordo, Contreras, Churubusco, and Molino del Rey. Stationed in Texas and Kansas before the Civil War, he participated in the Mormon Campaign of 1857. Afterwards, he was stationed in New Mexico at Forts Marcy and Union. His participation during most of the Civil War battles in New Mexico seems to have been mostly from the sideline. Because he sided with the south, he resigned his post with the U.S. Army. In May and June of 1861, he briefly commanded Fort Union while waiting for his letter of resignation to be accepted. 69

69 Hail, et al., Confederate Army of New Mexico, 43-44.
John R. Baylor was born in Kentucky in 1822. At age 18, he and a brother were involved in conflicts with Comanches. Baylor married in 1845, formed for several years, and served in at least one elected office. Throughout the 1850s and 60s, he sought to control Indian depredations through legal and other means. The Texas secession committee, charged with defense, raised two cavalry regiments, one of which Baylor commanded. By early July 1861, Baylor was at Fort Bliss, Texas and led the first Texan troops to Mesilla, New Mexico. He proclaimed the Confederate Territory of Arizona later that year. 70

James Reily, born in Ohio in 1811, studied law and later practiced in Texas. Although he was selected U.S. consul to St. Petersburg, Russia, after a short stay there, he resigned. By 1861, he had returned to Texas and raised a company of volunteers. Also in 1861, he had returned to Texas and raised a company of volunteers. Also in 1861, he served as a diplomatic envoy to Mexico.

William “Dirty Shirt” Scurry, born in 1821, was a lawyer from Tennessee and served in the Mexican War. General Sibley appointed him lieutenant of the 4th Regiment in August 1861. 71

The Civil War in the West

The Civil War battles in New Mexico were not the only conflicts occurring west of the Mississippi. Continuing disturbances by various Plains tribes resulted in punitive expeditions by militia and occasionally regular troops in New Mexico. Other disturbances in 1861 occurred in Minnesota on the Dakota Sioux reservation. Troops sent to bolster the Federal Army in the east left many areas unprotected against Indian raiders. The tribes were agitated by the continual expansion onto their lands by immigrant farmers, who had their eyes on reservation lands. Corruption and delays in issuing food and other necessities to the Sioux provoked several attacks and punitive campaigns did not provide a solution, but fueled continuing unrest among the Plains Indians that would continue for almost twenty years. 72 Colorado Territory received some fallout from the events in Minnesota because word of the campaigns spread rapidly among tribes living on the Plains.

In spite of the Civil War in the east, expansionist activities continued west of the Mississippi. Refugees from the war, emigrants with their belongings, traders with goods, businessmen, and entrepreneurs continued to move west to California, Oregon, Utah, and Colorado. They killed buffalo, encroached and settled on Indian lands, and interfered with the movement of the tribes. The government sought to protect the routes and transportation of goods and mail along routes through Indian country. In November 1864, in a campaign connected with the statehood movement, Colonel John M. Chivington and his troops carried out the infamous Sand Creek Massacre killing unarmed women and children for which he was first praised and later condemned. 73 This was neither the first nor last of the events during the period in which Indians would be victimized.

70 Hall, et al., The Confederate Army of New Mexico, 295-296.
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Indians from Indian Territory (currently the state of Oklahoma) also served as troops for both the Union and the South. They were involved in activities in Kansas, Missouri, and Arkansas, and participated at the Battle of Pea Ridge, Arkansas, on March 7, 1862. The Confederates particularly encouraged the Indian participation in Missouri hoping to protect their western flank. After 1863, federal troops were withdrawn leaving Indian Territory vulnerable to Confederate control. During this period, Indian troops from both sides were involved in skirmishes and guerrilla actions throughout the area.  

The blockage of the Texas coast and ongoing attempts to prohibit the exchange of cotton for arms and supplies from Europe is an aspect of the Civil War that is well-known. The Union Navy intercepted blockade runners, attacked coastal fortifications, such as that at Brownsville, and occupied this settlement for a time in 1863-64. Ongoing concerns, such as the Confederate supply route along the Red River, which currently forms the northeast border of Texas and drains into Louisiana, caused the Union forces to be shifted from the coast up river in 1864. The Federal Louisiana-Arkansas Campaign (Red River) that followed was unsuccessful.

Conclusion

Between 1837 and 1846, New Mexicans had been virtually independent from Mexican governmental control and had become accustomed to self-government. They had achieved a way of living in a hostile environment and were used to reciprocal raiding, taking captives, and pursuing Indian raiders when not trading or allying with them. They had dealt harshly with Texan intruders in the 1840s and, twenty years later under the United States government were prepared to defend themselves against Confederate invaders. With the end of the Civil War, most New Mexicans returned to their former pursuits although a few continued as regular soldiers and militia members. The army continued active in the region for another twenty years.

With the boost afforded by the military supply process, the economy grew. Agriculture changed from subsistence farming to a commercial venture. The few cattle and many sheep Hispanics and others raised became great herds and flocks. A Cash economy was substituted for the barter system that previously existed. The mail circulated with improved frequency, and communications became more accessible especially after the advent of the telegraph in the 1870s. The railroad in 1880 made travel and shipping to and from other parts of the country much faster and put an end to the commerce on the Santa Fe Trail.

Historically, the role of Hispanic militia and volunteers becomes increasingly evident in the evolution of Fort Union. The relationship was two-ways. Both profited from each other’s needs and offerings. In the end, the relationship between the two was linked by the lasting heritage they gave to the area. Today, their descendants continue to live in the area, and Fort Union, as an important unit of the National Service, preserves their history as a part of our national story.

76 Josephy, Jr., *The Civil War*, 323.
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Center for Land Grant Studies website. This electronic resource may be accessed via the Internet at http://www.southwestbooks.org. Some electronic texts, such as Malcolm Ebright's: "Land Grants in a Nutshell," and others are available, plus a good bibliography of books available for purchase, related events, genealogical materials, and a list of unpublished manuscripts.

Civil War Preservation Trust website: www.civilwar.org. This is a non-profit organization that seeks to raise money to assist in purchasing Civil War battle sites for the purpose of preservation. It has information about development and battle sites and links to other sites, such as the National Park Service's Civil War Soldiers and Sailors System.

Confederate Victories in the Southwest: Prelude to Defeat (from the Official Records). Albuquerque: Horn & Wallace, Publishers, 1961. Documents from federal and confederate leaders from official U.S. Government sources can be used to get an idea of the official view of people and events in the Civil War in New Mexico. Note: War of Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies. Prepared under the direction of the Secretary of War by Lieut[enant] Col[onel] Robert N. Scott, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880-1901, which may very well be the source of the documents in the Horn & Wallace publication, is available principally in research libraries, and is composed of four series with numerous volumes, often multipartite: Series I has 53 volumes; II, 8 volumes; III, 5 volumes; IV, 3 volumes.

Cutter, Donald C. "The Legacy of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo," New Mexico Historical Review 53 (1978), pp. 305-15. Cutter identified this treaty as the "most important single document in Southwestern history." The treaty confirmed the United States' claims to Texas and provided for the United States' possession of New Mexico and California. Occupation was not without problems, such as cultural conflict, the uncertain boundary of the Gila River, and the changing course of the Rio Grande, problems with land titles, water rights, community property, women's rights, and citizenship. Further, he declares the United States government has not complied with the treaty provisions and recommends the establishment of a "Hispanic Land Claims Commission" on the pattern of the Pueblo Land Claims Commission.

Davis, William C. The Civil War Reenactor's Encyclopedia. Guilford, Connecticut: The Lyons Press, 2002. Davis indicates that one way of understanding the Civil War is to reenact it, wear the clothes, carry the equipment, research the battles, and recreate them. An interesting figure he gives is that for most soldiers, one day in twenty was spent actually fighting. After an introductory section are sections on the uniforms, weapons, and equipment of the soldier, and then two sections which respectively deal with these matters as expressed in the Federal and Confederate forces, The final section of the book is a treatment of the battles. The war in New Mexico is not mentioned. Many color photographs and color illustrations of individuals make this work especially useful. Anthony Shaw's The Civil War Catalog is a similar work to this.
Ebright, Malcom. *Landgrants and Lawsuits in Northern New Mexico.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, c1994. 1st ed. [Also accessible as an electronic book through NetLibrary, via Libros at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.] Ebright points out the inequity of the United States’ adjudication of land grants in not recognizing the different laws and attitudes towards land and water prevalent among the Hispanic inhabitants of New Mexico: the existence of common lands for use by all, sufficient water for use by all, sharing in times of scarcity. The collected essays mainly deal with Rio Arriba land grants.


Elder, Jane Lenz and David J. Weber. *Trading in Santa Fe: John M. Kingsbury’s Correspondence with James Josiah Webb, 1853-1861.* Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University Press, DeGolyer Library, 1996. The letters collected and extensively annotated in this collection provide a unique window into the daily life of the Santa Fe trade. Some footnotes identify traders, such as the Oteros and Felipe Delgado, and annotation and introductory material discuss the nature of the trade, how it was financed, and so forth. There is more information on specific individuals. In brief, though, the coming of the army boosted the area’s economy. The Santa Fe market, becoming saturated with goods, gave way to long distance international trade in the Mexican towns of Chihuahua, Zacatecas, and Durango. The Webb and Kingsbury correspondence has references to Hispanic traders, freighters, and others involved in the Chihuahua trade and some references to Fort Union and military personnel.

Emerson, William K. *Encyclopedia of United States Army Insignia and Uniforms.* Norman, Oklahoma and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996. This is a comprehensive study of the variations in Army uniforms according to the regulations. Different branches of the service, nineteenth century coats and headgear, a history of uniforms, and insignia are included. [Douglas C. McChristians’s *The U.S. Army in the West: Uniforms, Weapons, and Equipment.* Norman, Oklahoma and London: University of Oklahoma Press. 1995 focuses more on the evolution and details of clothing, weapons, and equipment in the 19th century.]

Emmett, Chris. *Fort Union and the Winning of the Southwest.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965. James W. Arrott, a Pittsburgh industrialist, collected a wide-ranging and extensive collection of documents, photographs, maps and other material related to Fort Union. Emmett was the “first and only researcher to have unrestricted access to Mr. Arrott’s collection”---- W.S. Wallace, Librarian, Rodgers Library, New Mexico Highlands University, 1964. Emmett deals with personalities and events over the 40-year course of the fort’s history, in which the emphasis is primarily on events at the
fort and in the immediate area. See index entries for New Mexicans and New Mexico for Hispanic resources.


Finding aid for Arrot’s Fort Union collection [electronic resource] [Las Vegas, N.M.: Thomas C. Donnelly Library, New Mexico Highlands University, 2002]. Excel database version of the Arrott collection catalog. Compact disc. This aid can be searched electronically, which makes a large number of resources much more accessible.


Frazer, Robert W. Forts and Supplies: The Role of the Army in the Economy of the Southwest, 1846-1861 (Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1983). Frazer’s account deals with the period after the Mexican-American war and details how Fort Union and the military in the Southwest affected the economy of the region.

Frazier, Donald S. Blood and Treasure: Confederate Empire in the Southwest College Station, Texas: Texas A & M University, 1995. Frazier studies the genesis and development of the Confederate campaign in New Mexico territory; establishment of the Confederate territory of Arizona (the southern half of New Mexico Territory, below 34 degrees Latitude); battles and skirmishes of the Civil War in New Mexico; and the Rebel retreat. The author analyses of the Civil War in New Mexico; and the Rebel retreat. The author analyses the personalities and battles and concludes that “Sibley’s failed adventure might have provided one of the few prospects for Southern independence. The creation of a Confederate empire would have secured western wealth and European recognition. The hopes for the campaign had indeed been high—much greater than history has remembered—but the dream came to a tragic end.” Although there are various accounts of the principal battles from the Union point of view, this study gives details on many of the lesser skirmishes and engagements.
Gardner, Mark L. *Wagons for the Santa Fe Trade: Wheeled Vehicles and Their Makers, 1822-1880*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000. Gardner focuses on the wagons *per se*, who made them, how they were loaded and pulled by oxen and mules, and what happened to them at the end of the trip.

Gelbert, Doug. *Civil War Sites, Memorials, Museums and Library Collections: A State-by-State Guidebook to Places Open to the Public*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 1997. Gelbert includes Old Town, Albuquerque; the Santa Fe National Cemetery where soldiers killed at Valverde and Pigeon’s ranch are buried; the Valverde Battle site, south of Socorro; and the Kit Carson home and museum in Taos, New Mexico. He also indicates there were 75 “scenes of action.”

Gerow, Peggy A. *A Guardian of the Trail: Archeological and Historical Investigations at Fort Craig*. Cultural Resources Series, No. 15. Ed. June-el Piper. Santa Fe: New Mexico Bureau of Land Management, 2004. Results of the five-year archeological field school that was conducted at Fort Craig, south of Socorro, New Mexico. Particularly of interest is the section on the archeology of the hospital.


“Soldiers at Play: A History of Social Life at Fort Union, New Mexico, 1851-1891.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1969. Giese was historian at Fort Union from 1961-65. The fort essentially was a microcosm of 19th century life. Giese begins with the intellectual resources and activities at the fort, by way of religion, education, and the library, goes on to the sorts of organizations that existed, the Masons, theater groups, musical organizations and clubs, and then to housing: where the soldiers and officers lived, what they ate, their families and servants and how they were supplied (by the sutler, among others). Then he deals with the sorts of activities they were involved in, from social get-togethers to celebrations of national holidays, to games and sports, gambling, boxing, hunting and fishing, and baseball. Extracurricular excursions, dancing, drinking, or not, and consorting with the “soiled doves” of Loma Parda, lead inexorably to his discussion of punishment and incarceration, for theft, injury to and deaths of others. Illnesses such as threatened cholera, suicides and natural deaths lead to the final chapter, where he writes of the closing of Fort Union and the departure of all the soldiers. As a history of social life, the connections indicated with New Mexicans tend to be general in nature. Additionally, there is no index, so that Hispanic resources must be sought out in this work. There were Mexican and New Mexican soldiers at the fort. The fort employed civilian employees and contractors (blacksmiths, teamsters, beef and flour providers). Local residents provided goods and services of other sorts, such as fuelwood, charcoal and casual sales of produce and livestock, chickens and eggs. Mexican servants worked for officers. Some of the connections are religion: although Catholic services were rarely held at the fort, Catholics could attend mass while on leave. Opportunities for recreation were sought out in local communities. Loma Parda and Las Vegas provided
opportunities for dancing, drinking, gambling and consorting with prostitutes. The hospital provided services to civilians as well as military.


Griswold del Castillo, Richard. *The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A Legacy of Conflict*. Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1990. Griswold describes the “promises” of the Treaty of Guadalupe as “largely unfulfilled.” His study emphasizes the special relationship provided by the treaty, which promoted more symbolic recognition of Hispanic and Native American residents of the Southwest affected by the Mexican-United States War, United States’ possession, and the aftermath. Chapter 5 describes citizenship status and how few land titles were recognized by the United States government.

Hall, G. Emlen. *Four Leagues of Pecos: A Legal History of the Pecos Grant, 1800-1933*. New Mexico Land Grants Series. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1984. The Pecos Pueblo area is like the Rio Grande Valley, possessed of a scarce resource, water. Hall’s work may be instructive in investigating the importance of water, both in terms of the land tenure practices brought by the Spaniards, as they evolved, and the ultimate resolution of ownership in the territorial period. The early lack of understanding of such practices by territorial officials and manipulations by land speculators are masterfully examined.

Hall, Martin Hardwick, with the assistance of Sam Long. *The Confederate Army of New Mexico*. Austin, Texas: Presidial Press, 1978. Hall’s work consists of a succinct introduction describing the events of the Confederate Army’s New Mexico Campaign. The bulk of the work is devoted to histories, biographies, and narrative of the Texas military units involved in the Campaign: the 4th, 5th, and 7th Regiments of the Texas Mounted Volunteers, the Valverde Battery and Baylor’s command. Including units posted to Confederate Arizona Territory. Each regiment is broken down into companies, with biographies of their commanders, a brief history of each company’s activities, and outcome of each individual’s service (death, wounds, illness, discharge capture, parole, honors). A glossary of medical terms used at the time is included at the end of the work. The extensive index is limited to personal names.

Hall, Martin Hardwick *Sibley’s New Mexico Campaign*. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press. 1960, 2000. A book-length study of the Confederate campaign in New Mexico, with emphasis on the advantages to Texas and the South.

Hammond, George P. *The Adventures of Alexander Barclay, Mountain Man: A Narrative of His Career, 1810-1855: His Memorandum Diary, 1845-1850*. Denver: Fred A Rosenstock, Old West Publishing Co., 1976. Col. Edwin V. Sumner, according to Barclay’s words in Hammond’s account, knowingly established Fort Union (at Los Pozos) on private lands seven miles south of Barclay’s fort at La Junta, part of the Scolly Grant, which were owned by Barclay. This account contains a biography of Barclay, his
diary, and information on Barclay’s contesting government occupation of his land and further outcome.

Hand, George O. Ed. Neil B. Carmony. *The Civil War in Apacheland: Sergeant George Hand’s Diary: California, Arizona, West Texas, New Mexico, 1861-1864*. Silver City, New Mexico: High-Lonesome Books, 1996. Hand was a member of Company G, 1st Infantry Regiment, California Volunteers, the organization known as the “California Column.” This first-person account details the tedium and drudgery of the soldier’s life, through its expedition to New Mexico and posting in southern New Mexico. The column had arrived too late to assist in expelling the Confederate army from New Mexico, but there were Indian campaigns and the fear the rebels might return. Hand displays typical Anglo-American ethnocentrism, but does mention the New Mexico volunteers, fandangos, agriculture (Mesilla area), and religious celebrations in New Mexico. A map and illustrations (some Contemporary, from publications of the period) add to the value of this work, such as the diagram showing the mountain howitzer loaded on three mules, and the varieties of punishment inflicted on the soldiers (taken from Harold Peterson’s work cited in this bibliography).

*Handbook of Texas Online* Website, consulted at http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook. The Handbook is co-sponsored by the Texas State Historical Association and the General Libraries of the University of Texas at Austin, and provides searchable access to people, places, and entities relative to the history of Texas.

Hardee, W.J. *Rifle and Light Infantry Tactics for the Instruction, Exercises and Maneuvers of Riflemen and Light Infantry* (New York: J.O. Kane, Publisher, 1862). Adopted in 1855, this work would have been the official manual for the training of soldiers at the time of the civil war, although the militia may have had access to General Winfield Scott’s manual written in the 1830s, but long obsolete.

Harrison, Laura Soulliere, and James E. Ivey, *Of A Temporary Character: A Historic Structure Report of First Fort, Second Fort, and the Arsenal and Historical Base Map, Fort Union National Monument, Fort Union, New Mexico*, Southwest Cultural Resources Center, Professional Papers, No. 43. Santa Fe: Division of History, Southwest Cultural Resources Center, Southwest Region, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, 1993. Chapter 1 gives a general history of Fort Union, and the following chapter provides insight on the changing nature of shelter for soldiers—tents and their use, and army planning for more permanent structures. The other three chapters in the first part of the report deal with the construction of the First and Second Forts and the Arsenal. The second part deals with the Fort Union Historical Base Map, particularly useful for the additional information about sutlers and traders at Fort Union, their names and tenures.

Hollister, Ovando J. *Colorado Volunteers in New Mexico, 1862*. Ed. Richard Harwell. Chicago: the Lakeside Press, R.R. Donnelley & Sons Company, 1962. This is a first-person account made by one of the Pike’s Peakers, who participate in the Civil War in New Mexico. His narrative helps one to understand the Anglo-American ethnocentric view of life in New Mexico. Appendices include lists of Coloradan Union soldiers.
Horn, Calvin, New Mexico's Troubled Years: The Story of the Early Territorial Governors (Albuquerque: Horn and Wallace, Publishers, 1963). This work begins with Governor James S. Calhoun (1851-1852) and ends with Lew Wallace (1878-1881). During the period governors dealt with matters related to the U.S. Army, the Indians, the coming of the railroad and the telegraph, land grants, and the Hispanic population in general.

Horwitz, Tony. Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the unfinished Civil War. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, Inc., 1998. This journalist's account of a year spent as a Civil War reenactor (historical interpreter or living historian) and investigator of the phenomenon should be read in conjunction with historical texts and documents, as another way of understanding the events of the Civil War in general and the phenomenon of its commemoration in particular. Although it does not have a bibliography, many books are mentioned in the text, and there is a useful index.

Jackson, W. Turrentine. Wagon Roads West: A study of Federal Road Surveys and Construction in the Trans-Mississippi West, 1846-1859. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952. Chapter 9 describes the status of the New Mexican road system. After being left to recover from illness y Kearny's Army of the West at Santa Fe, topographical engineers James W. Abert and William G. Peck reconnoitered the upper Rio Grande, made surveys, and compiled statistics. Routes were investigated and, later, congressional allocations were sought for repair of the roads from Taos to Santa Fe and Santa Fe to Dona Ana, as well as Fort Union to Santa Fe and Tecolote to Albuquerque. With the onset of the Civil War, no construction seems to have been undertaken. [There are citations relating to road repair in the Arrot Collection Catalog.] Chapter 15 deals with Beale's 35th parallel wagon road from Fort Smith, Arkansas, to the Colorado River, 1857-1859. Such a road would benefit the military, immigrants, and ultimately, the railroad. Beale examined the area around Hatch's Ranch, Chaparito and Anton Chico in December 1858 and February 1859. This survey and road-building expedition included the famous experiment with camels as pack animals.

Jolly, John Pershing. History: National Guard of New Mexico, 1606-1963. Santa Fe, New Mexico: The Adjutant General of New Mexico, 1964. The author principally traces the activity of the New Mexico Militia 1861-1891, briefly, to its transformation into the National Guard and subsequent action in international wars, more extensively.

Jones, Oakah L. Los Paisanos: Spanish Settlers on the Northern Frontier of New Spain. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979. Chapters 5-6 provide an introduction to patterns of settlement in New Mexico by way of censuses and inspections and to the life styles of the paisanos of New Mexico, including the following topics: education, medicine, economic life, subsistence agriculture and livestock raising, trade, transportation, land grants and tenure, labor, religion, occupations.

engaging history of the Trans-Mississippi Civil War. Topics included are: Sibley’s New Mexican Campaign; the Sioux Uprisings in Minnesota; battles in Missouri, Arkansas, the Indian Country and Louisiana (Red River and Mississippi); repeated attempts to blockade Texas and prevent cotton trade with Britain; protection of immigrant trails to Oregon and California, with subsequent Indian troubles; Carleton and the California Column’s Indian campaigns in New Mexico; and the border state troubles in Arkansas and Missouri, with Indian troops fighting on both sides of the conflict. This is one of a handful of works that deal with the Civil War in the West (that is, west of the Mississippi).

Kendall, George Wilkins. *Narrative of the Texas Santa Fe Expedition, Comprising a Description of A Tour through Texas and across the Great Southwestern Prairies, The Comanche and Caygua Hunting-Grounds, with an Account of the Sufferings from Want of Food, Losses from Hostile Indians, and Final Capture of the Texans and Their March, as Prisoners, to the City of Mexico.* Reprint, 1844. 2 vols. Austin: The Steck Company, 1935. Wilkins’ account does much to remind the reader of the Civil-War-ear fear of Texans, of New Mexican nonchalant trade with Comanches for herds of stolen livestock, and of the enmity of Northern New Mexicans for the Texans who came hunting their livestock. This first-hand account deals with the private expedition (1841) of Mirabeau B. Lamar to secure Texas’ claim of the Rio Grande as its western boundary, which included Santa Fe, and most of the other more populous settlements of New Mexico. Encounters with Mexican Governor Armijo are painted in an unflattering light. New Mexicans, other than the military, are regarded as hospitable (the women), or deceitful and treacherous (the men).


Kenner, Charles L. *The Comanchero Frontier: A History of New Mexican-Plains Indian Relations.* Rept., 1994. Norman, Oklahoma. Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1969. Kenner reports on the ambiguous situation of the Comanchero, Hispanic traders to the Comanches, in relation to US officialdom embodied in the command of Fort Union. Before the Civil War, Comancheros were used as go-betweens to communicate with the Comanches, offering peace, requesting leaders to come to Fort Union or confer with officers of the fort about peace. At other times, military officials sought to distance the traders from the Comanches. Comancheros also served as spies and scouts, or informed the fort of Comanche movements on their own, particularly during the Civil War years. Military officials sought to curtail the Comanchero trade by edict and patrol, but on at least one occasion, the Comancheros anticipated pursuit and avoided confrontation. The traders probably did exchange goods, guns, powder, and ball for cattle stolen by the Comanches in Texas. On several occasions, Texas cattle raisers came into New Mexico as far as Loma Parda, seeking to inspect herds and recover their animals, sometimes successfully, with violence.
Lamar, Howard Roberts. The Far Southwest, 1846-1912: A Territorial History. Reprint, 1966. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1970. Lamar divides his text into four sections: New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Arizona, and includes information on exploration, military and political topics, the economy, the quest for statehood and social concerns throughout the period. Key figures are profiled. A bibliographic essay evaluates different resources that may be of value.

Leary, David Thomas. “The attitudes of Certain United States Citizens Toward Mexico, 1821-1846.” Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 1970. Leary examines the attitudes of 15 different observers (including the diplomat Poinsett, Josiah Gregg, the writer and trader, Richard Henry Dana, Jr., sailor and writer, John Lloyd Stephens, adventure and writer, as well as two Mexican writers) in Mexico, regarding the concept of popular rule, economic progress, education and the arts, religion, ethics, and race. Leary’s conclusion was that these writers harbored an abiding ethnocentricity. They judged by their own standards, overlooked Mexican scholars and artists, were prejudiced against the religion, puritanical in regard to ethics and intolerant, and downright racist when it came to the diverse peoples who made up Mexico. That White Anglo-Saxon Protestants could reform Mexico was a prevailing mindset at the onset of the Mexican-United States War and had not disappeared at the time of the founding of Fort Union.

Levine, Frances, Ph.D., and William West bury, with contributions by Lisa Nordstrum. A History of Archeologica Investigations at Fort Union National Monument. Southwest Cultural Resources Center Professional Papers, No. 44. Santa Fe: National Park Service, 1992. Prepared almost 30 years after archeological work was done, the authors have sought to treat the work within the context of the time when it was carried out. Two main areas are covered: stabilization of the ruins and excavations at First and Third Forts and the arsenal. Summaries of work performed at each structure are included, as well as information on published studies and recommendations. Among the latter are preparation of an updated base map, onsite oral history with Rex Wilson and George Cattanach, former Fort Union archeologists, and continued sampling of intact deposits with the object of establishing stratigraphy and provenience, which may be used to help identify previously-excavated artifacts, for which provenience may be uncertain.

Meketa, Jacqueline Dorgan, ed., Legacy of Honor: The Life of Rafael Chacon, a Nineteenth-Century New Mexican. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1986. Rafael Chacon (1833-1925) was born when New Mexico was a part of the Mexican Republic, studied as a military cadet in Mexico, saw the coming of the Americans, and was captain of a company of New Mexico volunteers during the Civil War. He lived to see New Mexico become a state. His memoirs include accounts of ciboleros, the Civil War in New Mexico, and Forts Union and Wingate, among many others.

Meketa, Charles and Jacqueline. One Blanket and Ten Days' Rations: 1st Infantry New Mexico Volunteers in Arizona, 1864-1866. Globe, Ariz.: Southwest Parks and Monuments Association, 1980. The 1st New Mexico Infantry Volunteers, Companies A and I, were involved in the attempt to protect military and civilian personnel against Cochise's Chiricahua Apaches from 1864-1866. Initially, volunteers had been recruited
in 1861 to meet the Confederate threat at the beginning of Civil War hostilities in New Mexico. Failure at the battle of Valverde and success at the battle of Glorieta Pass were followed by their being mustered out. Increasing Indian attacks convinced the authorities that more troops than Kit Carson’s single cavalry regiment were necessary. Gov. Henry Connelly called for volunteers, to be directed by General Carleton from Santa Fe. The majority of the volunteers were native New Mexicans, accustomed to the terrain and with long experience of dealing with Indians. After recruitment in Santa Fe, Company A, led by Capt Nicolas Quintana, went to Fort Union for a period of training and other duties (December 4, 1864-May 7, 1865). Company I was recruited in the Taos area, mostly native New Mexican Hispanics, and was led by Smith H. Simpson, former clerk and secretary of the Indian Agent, Kit Carson. Company I was at Fort Union for training in March and April of 1864, before leaving for Arizona. Lists of the soldiers and statistics are included for each company. This work contains some details about the conversion of flintlock guns to percussion.

Military Division of the Missouri. *Outline Descriptions of the Posts in the Military Division of the Missouri*. Chicago: adjutant General’s Office, 1876. Contains descriptions and plots of nine camps and posts in New Mexico in 1876, including Fort Union.

Miller, Darlis A. *The California Column in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, in collaboration with the Historical Society of New Mexico, 1982. Some 340 of the 2,350 men who made up the California Column—California Volunteers who came to New Mexico under the command of Colonel James H. Carleton to help prevent the Confederacy from conquering New Mexico and Arizona on their way to California in late 1861 and early 1862—remained in New Mexico and contributed to its postwar growth and development. Almost 2,000 of these men were mustered out of the service in New Mexico, the largest number of Anglo-Americans who had come at one time to New Mexico, even though less than a fifth ultimately remained in the state.

-------. “Hispanos and the Civil War in New Mexico: A Reconsideration,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 54 (April 1979), 104-123. A well-balanced study of the participation of New Mexico Hispanics as civilians and military during the Civil War.

-------. *Soldiers and Settlers: Military Supply in the Southwest, 1861-1885*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989. Miller states as her object: “how military spending and supply affected this region both during and after the Civil War.” Not to belabor the point, the army brought income and change to New Mexico. As depot for supplies, munitions, and the like, it was a vast operation, requiring contractors of food, fuel, forage, freighters and construction laborers. Three forts were built which required everything in the way of food, building materials, fuel, and forage for animals. Farmers had to plant more grain and other foodstuffs. Millers had to mill the grain and all the supplies had to be transported, whether from by train from the east to the nearest railhead (Kit Carson or Las Animas, Colorado, in 1876) or on mule back from Ceran St. Vrain’s mill at Taos. As a result of the army’s propensity to deal with larger contractors, many of whom were Anglo-American or German merchants (Jewish or not), many of the smaller
Hispanic farmers and merchants were unable to directly provide their goods, but they might sell them to merchants with contracts. There are many references to Fort Union and to a great number of Hispanic merchants, freighters, and others in her work, by name and in general.

Montoya, Maria E. *Translating Property: The Maxwell Land Grant and the Conflict over land in the American West, 1840-1900*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, c 2002. Soldiers were stationed at Rayado, where Lucien B. Maxwell and Kit Carson founded a settlement to protect the mountain branch of the Santa Fe Trail and local settlers. Arms from Fort Union had a role in quelling civil disturbances related to the Maxwell Land Grant in later years.

National Park Service website: [www.nps.gov](http://www.nps.gov). This website provides access specifically to parks that have a Civil War connection, such as the Gettysburg National Military Park, as well as to research articles, such as “The Civil War Advisory Commission Report,” “Participation of African Americans in the Civil War,” and so forth; to Archeology, Battle summaries, symposia, Cultural Resource Management (a journal on the topic, available at CRM Online, via this website); the Civil War Soldiers and Sailors System (an easily searchable online resource for identifying people and the military organizations in which they served).

New Mexioc Civil War Commemorative Congress website. Accessed on February 3, 2005 at [http//www.currensnet.com/congress1.htm](http://www.currensnet.com/congress1.htm). This site provides access to information for historical interpreters, living historians, or reenactors of the Civil War in New Mexico: how to become a member of an organization, such as the 1st New Mexico (Union), the Civil War Ladies League, and Texas military units (Confederate). Information on uniforms, histories of units, and so forth is contained within the sites. Members of the organizations receive the electronic newsletter. There is a historical database in construction (consult and compare with more formal historical texts), references, and links to The Confederate Network and the Rancho de las Golondrinas Museum, where Civil War battles of New Mexico are reenacted.

Oliva, Leo E. *Fort Union and the Frontier Army in the Southwest*, Professional Papers no. 41 Santa Fe, N.M.: Southwest Cultural Resources Center, Southwest Regional Office, National Park Service, 1993. Extensive, detailed history of Fort Union. Although references to Hispanics are frequent throughout the work, only a few index entries exist. Nonetheless, Oliva gives high praise to Hispanic soldiers.

Oliva, Leo E. *Soldiers on the Santa Fe Trail*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967. The purpose of this work is: to present “an integrated military history of the Santa Fe Trail from the first escort in 1829 to the arrival of the railroad at Santa Fe in 1880,” “reveal the importance of the Trail as a military road and the value of the soldiers in the development of the American West” (viii-ix). Three purposes for establishment of Ft. Union: 1) “serve as a military depot for forts located in N. M.,” 2) “chastise the hostile Indians and help protect the settlements in NE New Mexico,” 3) “aid in protecting travelers on the Santa Fe Trail” (104). Oliva summarizes the location and founding of
Fort Union, and gives a good overview of the building and transformation of the fort, its role in the region, and the gradual relaxing of the conditions that made it necessary.

Ortiz, Roxanne Dunbar. *Roots of Resistance: Land Tenure in New Mexico, 1680-1980*. Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Research Center, University of California, Los Angeles, and American Indian Studies Center, University of California, Los Angeles, 1980. Dunbar has written a socioeconomic interpretation of land tenure in Northern New Mexico. The author challenges earlier views of static, passive New Mexican villagers and Indians and instead posits a dynamic populace involved in community activities related to farming and irrigating the land. She emphasizes the mutual interaction and exchange among the Hispanic and Indian populations, and, further, that the culture will never be understood without attending to the bond between the people and the land.

Owsley, Douglas W. *Bioarchaeology on a Battlefield: The Abortive Confederate Campaign in New Mexico* Archaeology Notes, No. 142 (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico, Office of Archaeological Studies, 1994). This is a forensic study of human remains and associated artifacts in a mass grave on the site of the Battle of Glorieta Pass in March 1862. Several individuals were identified and some potential identification of others was made. The study presents a summary of the Confederate New Mexican campaign and battle of Glorieta, as well as of the condition of the skeletons, artifacts, and the information used in identification of the individuals after 132 years.

Peterson, Harold L. *Round Shot and Rammer*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1969. Peterson studies artillery from the earliest days of the American republic through the Civil War. Artillery used at Fort Union, and that used by detachments in the Indian Wars is treated here. The original illustration of the mountain howitzer packed on three mules appears here.
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