

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Three Nations, One Place: A Comparative Ethnohistory of Social Change among the Comanches and Hasinai during Spain's Colonial Era, 1689-1821. By Martha McCollough.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0n07b01b>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 29(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Martínez, Joaquín Rivaya

Publication Date

2005-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

progress to farming and herding. However, an examination of the Salishan languages of Washington, British Columbia, Idaho, and Montana shows that these terms are unnecessary to make such a distinction. Words equivalent to *garden* were applied to plots where individuals managed plant resources and thereby asserted some claim to harvest ownership, in contrast to those areas where such names could not be applied (Nile Robert Thompson and C. Dale Sloat, "The Growth of Salishan 'Gardens,'" pt. 1, "Interior Salish," University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 14, 2004). One would expect to find words distinguishing tended from untended areas among not only the agricultural Yuman tribes but also the tribes with protoagriculture, such as the Hupa, who appear to have made distinctions of ownership based upon whether a resource was altered or not (cf. Arnold R. Pilling, *Yurok: Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 8, *California*, 1978, 147).

If California indeed was a good place to live for three hundred thousand Indians in precontact times, that state of affairs would seem to us to say little about how to make it a good place for forty-five million people to live now. The principal technique for dealing with wild areas proposed by Anderson is controlled burning, which has been practiced in modern times to manage both wild and cultivated lands with varying success. For a look at the many problems *caused* by burning, Anderson might want to consider the annual burning of grass-seed fields in the Willamette Valley of the neighboring state of Oregon. Since the land management techniques used by the Indians of California are essentially the same as those well-documented ones practiced by Indians all over the Far West and other parts of North America (and ones allowed by Anderson to be nearly universal among human societies), the best feature of *Tending the Wild* is the specific information she provides about plants used in alimentary or cultural ways by the indigenous people of California. The argument about whether protecting certain areas of the planet from cultivation is a good idea or not will certainly not be settled by this book.

Nile Thompson

Dushuyay Research, Seattle, Washington

C. Dale Sloat

Portland, Oregon

Three Nations, One Place: A Comparative Ethnohistory of Social Change among the Comanches and Hasinai during Spain's Colonial Era, 1689–1821. By Martha McCollough. New York: Routledge, 2004. 140 pages. \$75.00 cloth.

The two indigenous nations discussed in *Three Nations, One Place* are the nomadic, bison-hunting Comanches of the Plains and the sedentary, horticulturalist Hasinai of eastern Texas. The third nation, Spain, was one of the colonial powers whose presence spurred social change in the region. The "place" is actually "an area extending from the Arkansas River east to the Mississippi River, south to the Gulf of Mexico, and west to the upper Rio

Grande” (9). Note that while the Comanches were constantly on the move across much of that region (and beyond), progressively extending their range further south, the Hasinai rarely moved away from their crops, usually to hunt bison. Before the Comanche-Spanish peace of 1786, Spaniards rarely ventured across the South Plains, and there was no direct communication between the provinces of New Mexico and Texas.

Despite contemporary Spanish territorial claims, the presence of Spain in much of that region between 1689 and 1821 was nominal rather than factual. Hispanics and Indians from present-day Mexico settled in parts of present-day New Mexico and Texas, which became thus incorporated as the northernmost provinces of New Spain. The nature of Spanish occupation varied greatly between and within the two provinces in demographic, economic, social, and political aspects. Even though Spanish policies toward Native Americans derived from the same legal system, and Spanish regional policies generally obeyed common guidelines, interactions between Hispanics and Native Americans at the local level were highly conjunctural (see David J. Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America*, 1992). Martha McCollough’s contention that Hasinai and Comanches dealt with “the same colonial presence” (5) should, therefore, be taken cautiously.

McCollough carries out a cogent critique of earlier trends in Native American studies, rejecting Boasian historicism, as well as ecological, functional, and economic models as valid approaches to explain the complex, multifaceted changes undergone by Native American communities as a result of European intrusions in the continent. Instead, drawing on world-systems, regional analysis, and social history theory, she explores the relationship between the changing political economy of the region and the evolution of Comanche and Hasinai patterns of settlement, economic production, and social reproduction at the global, regional, and local levels.

Her main argument is that both Comanches and Hasinai deliberately underwent social change to benefit from the trade in key commodities—namely horses and firearms—and resist Spanish expansionism. Hasinai communities merged and relocated closer to sources of those commodities, while their political organization became less hierarchical and more secular. Hasinai leaders played a key role as brokers between the competing French and Spanish. Once this competition ceased, however, “having one leader became a liability, as Spain could sanction the entire community through the auspices of this one representative” (8–9), which resulted in the decline of the Hasinai relevance in the trade networks of the region. Comanche political organization, on the other hand, remained decentralized, “except for a brief period of forced centralization,” which “diminished the control Spanish officials could exert over the community” (8). As McCollough herself acknowledges, Comanche leadership remains a topic of scholarly debate. She contends that increasing Comanche involvement in market exchange resulted in more specialized production, increased mobility, and a presumed decrease in bison hunting. The Hasinai, on the other hand, increased both agricultural production and bison hunting, but their opportunities for exchange decreased. By the time Mexico became an independent state in

1821, the Hasinai had been weakened and marginalized from the trade, whereas the Comanches had become hegemonic on the South Plains, despite the detrimental effects of epidemic diseases and widespread warfare.

Three Nations suffers from two problems that could have been easily remedied. It is remarkable that a book with so much emphasis on geography does not include a single map. In addition, the frequent misspellings, particularly of Spanish terms and proper names, denote little attention by the editors. From the perspective of the scholarly reader, the book touches on many issues without fully developing any of them. This is not surprising if one considers that a project of such an ample geographic, chronological, and theoretical scope has been restricted to barely 140 pages.

Three Nations relies overwhelmingly on secondary works. The book would certainly have benefited from closer attention to original sources. For instance, archival records do not seem to support what McCollough calls Comanche “forced centralization.” We must bear in mind, however, that even though the Comanches were present in Spanish New Mexico since at least the 1700s, what little is known about them until the 1770s comes almost exclusively from Euro-American documentary sources (see Thomas Kavanagh, *Comanche Political History: An Ethnohistorical Perspective*, 1996). Conversely, there is a relatively ample literature on the archaeology of the Hasinai (see Timothy K. Perttula, *The Caddo Nation: Archaeological and Ethnohistorical Perspectives*, 1992). Hence, McCollough dedicates comparatively more attention to a discussion of the changes in the settlement patterns of the latter.

The idea behind *Three Nations* is a great one. There is an enormous need for comparative studies in Native American ethnohistory. Readers interested in social change are referred to three classic works: Richard White’s *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos* (1983), Thomas Hall’s *Social Change in the Southwest, 1350–1880* (1989), and Edward H. Spicer’s *Cycles of Conquest* (1962).

Future research should develop some of the concerns raised by McCollough. South Plains scholars tend to take some of those issues for granted without exploring them in depth. What was the nature of inequality between and within Comanche bands and how did it develop? What was the actual relevance of firearms and the firearm trade in the political economy of the South Plains? Most importantly, to what extent was involvement in market exchange responsible for the changes experienced by the diverse indigenous societies of the region? The increasing scholarly emphasis on political economy, markets, and commodities could become an ethnocentric bias that hinders our ability to grasp other non-strictly economic aspects that may have been equally salient in the decision-making processes of indigenous communities and individuals.

Joaquín Rivaya Martínez
University of California, Los Angeles