

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Lt. Charles Gatewood and His Apache Wars Memoir. By Charles B. Gatewood.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2zq1q8bf>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 30(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Smith, Victoria

**Publication Date**

2006

**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/>

Wilkins's argument flows from his article "The Lumbee Tribe and its Quest for Federal Recognition," in *A Good Cherokee, a Good Anthropologist*, Steve Pavlik's 1998 edited volume about Cherokee anthropologist Robert K. Thomas. Wilkins's writing complicates Oakley's assertion that recognition is the "brass ring" of Indian identity—how important should the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA's) process of federal acknowledgment be to Indian identity maintenance, when these tribes have already been legally recognized as sovereigns? What remains is for these nations to assert their sovereignty, which is no small feat in the current political and legal climate, but scholars can help by asking the right questions about recognition and identity.

*Keeping the Circle* provides scholars and general audiences with the narrative and evidence to push recognition and other identity boundaries forward into the next stage of inquiry. Oakley's argument, and his detailed treatment of Indians' social and political history, offers a great deal to future scholarship in Native studies.

*Malinda Maynor Lowery*  
Harvard University

**Lt. Charles Gatewood and His Apache Wars Memoir.** By Charles B. Gatewood. Edited and with additional text by Louis Kraft. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005. 283 pages. \$39.95 cloth.

Arizona territorial history, particularly as it applies to Native Americans, plagues researchers with thorny issues from the past. Not insignificantly, Indian opposition to white American expansion—particularly, but by no means exclusively, Apache resistance—subverted the territory's bid for statehood until 1912, marking Arizona as the last territory in the lower forty-eight states.

Throughout the long struggle between Indians and whites for control of Arizona, Army officers not only substantially influenced the general outcome of the territory's history, but kept records of their experiences as well, or at least recorded their memoirs after the dust had once again settled across the desert. While the Arizona historical canon is not limited to military recollections, some of the most indicative, albeit witty and entertaining, works from the era are found within the military genre. The long struggle began smoldering with the US acquisition of Arizona from Mexico in 1848, spontaneously combusted in the 1860s with Cochise's mistaken role in the captivity of Mickey Free, spread throughout the 1870s among central Arizona's Yavapais in the 1870s, erupted into a firestorm in the early 1880s with brutal Chiricahua raids across southern New Mexico and Arizona, and was not snuffed out until the deportation of Geronimo's Chiricahuas in 1886, followed by the final flickers of resistance from Massai and Apache Kid well into the twentieth century.

The old, imperialist voices of the army's officers—men who claimed to understand Indians but didn't, and others who did understand but self-censured their own empathetic perspectives to conform to American rhetoric—still echo in the not-so-hallowed halls of history. In the dimly lit

chambers of time they endlessly argue the particulars of their brutal and protracted war against their most formidable enemy, the Apaches. Some wonder who was responsible for the botched Bascom Affair of 1861, wherein the captivity of a Mexican-American boy, Mickey Free, catapulted an uneasy peace between Chiricahuas and whites into a decade-long battle of retribution. Others argue culpability in the Camp Grant Massacre of 1871, which resulted in the massacre of dozens of Aravaipa women and children camped under an American flag—Arizona's shameful version of Sand Creek. One group focuses on the issue of the so-called Cibecue mutiny of 1881, said to be the only instance when enlisted Indian scouts "mutinied" from the US Army. Two of the most enduring arguments from the era arose in post-1886 Arizona. One concerns the character of Geronimo, who had risen to prominence among the Chiricahua Apaches following the death of Cochise in 1875. The other questions which army officer should receive credit for forcing Geronimo's final surrender.

Their verdict is always the same: Cochise was an honorable and admirable foe, whereas Geronimo was a cagey, unscrupulous liar who had outwitted the seemingly maligned General Crook on several occasions out of pure cussedness. Even more important among late writers of the era is an unending debate about who should ultimately be awarded credit for Geronimo's defeat. Some who were there accord it to General Miles's invasive strategy in Mexico and the doggedness of his officers Henry Lawton and Marion Maus. Others claim that the honor of defeating Geronimo rightfully belongs to the disgraced "Crook man," the frail but dogged Charles Gatewood.

Gatewood, a lieutenant in the sixth cavalry, arrived in Arizona in 1878, decades too late to be considered among the first of the army to penetrate the territory, but early enough to have witnessed the political ascension of Geronimo and the growing predicament of the beleaguered Chiricahua Apaches, who, unlike their kin the Western Apaches, refused to accept reservation life. Kraft argues that Gatewood, in contrast to many of his contemporaries, consciously sought to understand the Apaches placed under his watch at Fort Apache in the mid-1880s, and to some extent succeeded in winning their trust. While Gatewood's role as scout commander at Fort Apache is witnessed by other accounts, it is his complicated rift with Crook over corruption within Indian administration that emerges from the publication of his memoir. Contrary to the traditional view, which ties Gatewood to the Crook camp of Army/Indian relations, Gatewood clearly expresses his disagreements with Crook. Kraft chronicles the growing rift between the two men, watching as it ultimately embroils the embattled young officer in legal entanglements and then destroys his career. Unarguably a man cursed with an unfair life, bitter historic irony has additionally mislabeled Gatewood as a loyal Crook supporter.

In editing Gatewood's Apache war memoirs, long housed at the Arizona Historical Society, Louis Kraft has made Gatewood's perspective on the wars accessible to more than simply those with the resources to access the collection in Tucson. Kraft has done a fair job with the original, contextualizing only where necessary and with a light hand. Like the journal of Captain

Joseph Sladen (Edwin R. Sweeney, *The 1872 Journal of Captain Joseph Alton Sladen*, 2001), which brings to light an exciting new perspective on General O. O. Howards's celebrated but controversial peace conference with Cochise in 1872, or Robinson's edit of John Gregory Bourke's diaries (Charles M. Robinson III, *The Diaries of John Gregory Bourke, Vols.1 and 2*, 2003 and 2005), which adds substantial depth to the years Bourke spent with General Crook in the field, Kraft's *Gatewood* is as welcome as a rendezvous with a supply train to a soldier on a lengthy detachment in the field. Furthermore, as those who have accessed the extensive Gatewood collection can attest, it offers fodder for a variety of topics of interest to modern scholars of the American West, and Kraft's contribution is by no means the extent of the possibilities.

But, while any editor's contributions to Arizona history are legitimately welcomed on their own merits, one should not expect this book to challenge the imperial view perpetually expressed in published Arizoniana, nor does Kraft expect it to do so. In this book, American expansionists are still the proud, self-justified aggressors, subjugating the Indians of Arizona for the tribes' own good. In their view, Indians, and especially Apaches, are still "red devils," subhuman characters begging for a well-executed dose of Christian discipline, to be reapplied repeatedly until the exhausted creatures are cured of their heathenism and reborn as agriculturalists or cattle ranchers, within the limited confines of their reservations, and all of this is merely a means to an imperialistic end, that end being statehood for wild and woolly Arizona.

One may question the irreverence of the anti-imperialistic view and chalk it up to historic sour grapes. But to those who would do so, this question is posed: If Geronimo were alive today, would he be concerned with the assignation of credit for his surrender in 1886? Or, on the contrary, might he be concerned—as he was then—with the arbitrary forces of imperialism that recognize no master but their own insatiable need for natural resources, and this on a planet where resources are both limited and, in their scarcity, sacred? The study of history is pointless, merely a petty bourgeois indulgence, if it can't teach us how to live honestly in the present.

*Victoria Smith*

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

**The Myth of Syphilis, The Natural History of Treponematosi s in North America.** Edited by Mary Lucas Powell and Della Collins Cook. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005. 528 pages. \$85.00 cloth.

This book is an excellent example of research and scholarship in the field of anthropology. The editors and authors of each chapter clearly took pains to be fair and honest in their research treatment of treponematosi s, an infection found in both warm-blooded animals and humans in North America. This collection of work is ideal for academic, medical, and scientific audiences, and a must-read for researchers and students.