

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sex, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846, by Ramón A. Gutiérrez

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/84c0s5sn>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Compiled by the Native American Studies Center, University of New Mexico

Publication Date

1993-06-01

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/>

Peer reviewed

COMMENTARIES

*When Jesus Came,
the Corn Mothers Went Away:
Marriage, Sex, and Power in New Mexico,
1500-1846, by Ramón A. Gutiérrez*

Compiled by the NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES CENTER,
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

INTRODUCTION

The Pueblo Indians of New Mexico have been the subjects of a specific kind of mythologizing since the Spanish colonists arrived in the sixteenth century, but particularly so since the 1920s. There have been two distinct and often parallel aspects of this image-making. One is promulgated by social scientists in the fields of anthropology, ethnography, and history. The other is touted by entrepreneurs of tourism and popular culture. Among social scientists, New Mexico early became a "living laboratory." Among entrepreneurs and state boosters, New Mexico became a "living backdrop." In both instances, however, the interpretations were and are dominated by outsiders (non-Pueblo) who seek, for their own affirmation, a primitive and exotic humanscape.

In their imaginings about the exotic and the primitive, these outside observers draw on their own preconceptions and experi-

ences to selectively appropriate elements of the mystical and mythical "Indian." The consequent image is a subjective interpretation, the purpose of which is to corroborate the outsider's viewpoint, and not least to gain money and prestige.

Recently, native lawyers and lobbyists have attempted to gain federal legislation to further strengthen and protect indigenous cultural integrity and property. Most of the resulting laws address the protection of objects, artifacts, and burial sites, and the repatriation of bones macabrely stashed by the ton in museums and anthropology labs around the country. Attempts to protect indigenous cultural definition and identity have been made as well. Currently, the United Nations is in the process of developing principles on the rights of indigenous peoples, which will include cultural rights. The impact of such federal legislation as the Native Graves and Repatriation Act, the American Indian Freedom of Religion Act, the Act to promote Development of Indian Arts and Crafts, and the Native American Languages Acts have been significant. Combined they serve to lay the foundation for the development of a patent on culture and historical interpretation.

Cultural pluralism per se is a concept that does not have direct relevance for Native American peoples. Cultural pluralism is a United States nationalistic agenda which is viewed rather suspiciously—if not cynically—by native peoples in the light of past efforts by the federal government to forcibly assimilate them by obliterating their languages, religions, and cultures, and by state governments to restrict native exercise of self-government. Native Americans reject being categorized as "cultural minorities." They are descendants of the aboriginal peoples and believe the United States must revise its history to accommodate them and their experience rather than melding them into a unitary whole, honored only for their quaint "contributions" to the "cultural diversity" that would define American society.

The central question to be confronted by native peoples is whether they will defer to the images that have been ascribed to them. How will they combat past and continuing distortions of their histories and cultures?

These questions are now before the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico as they respond to historian Ramón Gutiérrez's multiple-prize-winning book *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sex, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846* (Stanford University Press, 1991). This latest, critically acclaimed book purports to give "vision to the blind and voice to the mute and

silent," that is, to speak for the Pueblo Indians under Spanish colonial rule in the seventeenth century. The author claims, in this case, to be an "insider," by virtue of being a native New Mexican.

The following commentaries on the book address the most recent mythologizing about the Pueblo Indians by outsiders seeking to fulfill their own career agendas. The first set of comments, by Alison Freese, Simon Ortiz, Joe Sando, Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, and Susan A. Miller, was written during the summer of 1993. It was the result of a dialogue that had been initiated between Pueblo scholars and Ramón Gutiérrez during the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians in April 1993, for which the second set of commentaries was compiled. Oral and written statements were submitted by Ted Jojola, Rina Swentzell, Penny Bird, Glenabah Martinez, Jimmy Shendo, Diana Ortiz, and Evelina Zuni Lucero for the symposium on *When Jesus Came* at the OAH annual meeting. While the OAH commentaries represent the beginning of this dialogue, we are certain that the discussion will continue beyond this forum and extend into many other venues.

Ted Jojola (Isleta Pueblo)
Director, Native American Studies
University of New Mexico

Alison Freese, Information Specialist, Native American Studies Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

(Note: While the debate rages between the "new" and "old" Western historians as to whose "myth of the West" will prevail, there are still questions about the role Native Americans play in this history and who should tell their stories. The following essay addresses these latter questions and their impact on the methodological implications of some works now categorized as "New Western History.")

As a result of entering into the discussion concerning Ramón Gutiérrez's *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*, I have learned a great deal about the New Western History methodology as exemplified by Gutiérrez's book. The shower of prizes indicates that the book is to be taken seriously and perhaps even considered a role model for scholarship by future historians.

Since it does represent such a watershed, this would be a good opportunity to point out some of the more important methodological "advances" that this book employs. A very basic advance, for example, is that in order to establish tenets for a piece

of scholarship, this type of New Western History allows one to draw on sources that may not necessarily support those tenets. Gutiérrez is aware that Pueblo scholars are critical of his "Weberian ideal type" model of precontact Pueblo culture, presented in chapter 1. Yet Gutiérrez maintains his claim based on two sources: (1) Alfonso Ortiz's statement in *New Perspectives on the Pueblos* that a Pueblo worldview can be extrapolated from general unifying principles found in Pueblo society; and (2) Joseph Jorgensen's quantitative analysis of 172 western Indian tribes in *Western Indians* (1980). If Gutiérrez were to ask Ortiz whether his model represented a precontact Pueblo worldview (as I did earlier this year), the answer would be a definitive no. In fact, Ortiz contends that while he spoke of a single Pueblo worldview, it was always with the knowledge of the vast variations that exist among the Pueblos, which cannot be denied or ignored. Ortiz's statement, published in 1972, describes late twentieth-century Pueblo culture and was not an attempt to reconstruct a unitary Pueblo worldview in the 1500s, as Gutiérrez maintains.

Gutiérrez's use of Jorgensen's work to support his unitary Pueblo worldview thesis also follows the new methodological rule that key sources do not necessarily need to corroborate one's argument. Gutiérrez uses Jorgensen's *Western Indians* to assert that there were more similarities than differences between the Pueblo, the Yuma, and the Pima-Papago people on the eve of conquest. If one turns to *Western Indians*, however, Jorgensen does not draw this conclusion at all. In fact, when discussing in chapter 4 the seven culture areas in his study, Jorgensen states that, while the bulk of cultural units were easily classified within these cultural areas, some took intermediary positions, but "only in the Pueblo Southwest, where Pueblos were sufficiently distinct to be separated from all other Southwest cultures, were there no borderline placements of cultural units" (p. 92). In addition, Jorgensen notes,

With the inclusion of the River Yumans and the Pueblos in the Southwest, all of the farming cultures in the contiguous geographic areas that comprise the Southwest could be analyzed together. The distinctiveness from one another of the River Yumans, Pueblos, and Pimans, all of whom were longtime resident farmers of the Southwest, and the distinctiveness of these three from the much less differentiated gatherers, hunters, and part time farmers of the area, provide us with intriguing questions that beg for answers (p. 93).

Nevertheless, Gutiérrez goes on to quote Jorgensen on page xxxi of *When Jesus Came*: "Despite environmental variation, geographical dispersion, and linguistic differences, writes Jorgensen, the Pueblos 'form one large group.'" The article this quote is excerpted from—"Comparative Traditional Economics and Ecological Adaptations" in volume 10, *The Southwest of The Handbook of North American Indians*—covers the range of these topics across the entire Southwest. The statement, which is made in this broad, comparative context, reads in full, "In these distributions [pertaining to economic organization] the differences among the Western Pueblos (Hopi, Zuni, Acoma), most of the Eastern Pueblos (San Juan, Nambe, Santa Clara, San Ildefonso), and the Eastern Keresans (plus the Tanoan Pueblos of Jemez, Isleta, and Taos) are apparent, yet they still form one large group" (*Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 10, p. 696). Thus, selective use of partial quotes also becomes acceptable in this "new" history.

Gutiérrez also justifies his use of Jorgensen's work for his reconstruction of sixteenth-century Pueblo culture because Jorgensen maintains that his study "seeks to analyze aboriginal environments and cultures from Yakutat Bay in Alaska to the northern part of Baja, California, and from the Rockies to the Pacific Coast, as they were before contact with, and penetration by, Europeans" (p. 1). The sources used to describe so-called precontact Pueblo society, however, are all the standard Pueblo ethnographies, which means that Jorgensen's study is based entirely on information gathered and published from the 1890s to the 1970s (see bibliographic references arranged by tribe, pp. 645–48). None of these ethnographers claimed to be describing precontact Pueblo society, and much of the data was collected under dubious circumstances, with questionable results.

It is also apparently methodologically acceptable in Gutiérrez's New Western History to use models drawn from nineteenth-century Plains cultures for sixteenth-century Pueblo cultures, perhaps based on the unwritten premise that all Indian cultures are alike and remain static over time. Gutiérrez uses this technique when citing Jane Collier's work *Marriage and Inequality in Classless Societies* (1988), to construct his view of Pueblo culture in 1500, particularly in relation to gift-giving and sexuality. Jane Collier creates three ideal-typic models for analyzing inequality in classless societies—brideservice, equal bridewealth, and unequal bridewealth—using the Comanche, Cheyenne, and Kiowa, respectively, for her examples. Gutiérrez informs us in note 7 of

chapter 1 that his understanding of the politics of gift-giving comes largely from Collier, *Marriage and Inequality*, pp. 79–92, and several other general works on gift exchange (p. 348). His subsequent notes, however, refer exclusively to Collier's chapter based on Cheyenne ethnography describing equal bridewealth. Gutiérrez borrows Collier's language, which portrays individuals in the model groups as graspingly materialistic and power hungry, and then interjects a smattering of unreferenced Pueblo information within the same paragraph to give the illusion of a careful analysis of Pueblo gift-giving and sexuality. Pages 10 through 13, for example, contain descriptions of the Pueblo children's and juniors' indebtedness to their seniors and the seniors' "demands" that result in unending "bonds of obligation" based on the acquisition of "needed" material goods and "appropriation" of labor. This analysis is then reinforced by testimony given by Spaniards who, one can assume, did not speak the native languages and were either passing through on missions of conquest or were in the process of destroying the native culture in the name of a foreign god. As Rina Swentzell, Simon Ortiz, Evelina Lucero, and others point out in their statements, this is an aggressive interpretation of Pueblo culture that is offensive to Pueblo people. The principles surrounding gift-giving and sexuality are core concepts in Pueblo culture that have not changed substantially over time—nor have they ever been perceived in the materialistic terms used by Gutiérrez.

But this is when another new methodological rule can be invoked conveniently to counteract criticism voiced by members of the Native American group in question. According to Gutiérrez, the Pueblos may very well be deceiving themselves about their own culture and its fundamental principles, which are based on harmony and balance. It seems also that Southwestern anthropologists have followed blindly along in this deception: "Generations of anthropologists have long interpreted the Pueblo ideology of harmony and equilibrium as statements of fact rather than as a denial of man's greatest fear . . . factionalism was the normal state of affairs, and ceremonial harmony was the ideal men tried to create" (p. 24). Indeed, since Gutiérrez's interpretation and those of the Pueblos are diametrically opposed, one must accept his premise that Pueblo people are in deep denial about their own cultural precepts in order to accept his interpretation of Pueblo culture. Is this the direction Gutiérrez's New Western History is taking us?

If one does accept Gutiérrez's interpretation of Pueblo culture, then his description in chapter 2 of Esteban and the Spanish conquistadors as "kachinas" (referring to spiritual beings in the Pueblo pantheon) is also acceptable, because Pueblos vehemently deny that their ancestors would have seen the conquerors as kachinas. It also contradicts general knowledge of the status outsiders had and have vis-à-vis Pueblo society then and now. Strangers were considered dangerous individuals who could potentially harm the community; war chiefs questioned any outsiders thoroughly before allowing them to enter a village. Esteban was questioned outside the pueblo and then promptly killed. Would the Zuni have treated a sacred kachina in such a disrespectful manner?

It is also acceptable in Gutiérrez's model of New Western History to transpose information from one place to another, even if it contradicts information gathered at the location actually in question. On page 43 of his book, a conversation that took place between Hernando de Alarcón and a Yuman leader in 1540 along the Colorado River is interjected into the text as if it took place during Coronado's approach to Zuni. The result is the illusion that the Zuni were dumbstruck by these approaching "gods," when, in fact, Coronado and his lieutenants reported at the time that the Pueblos were aware that aggressive foreigners were at their boundaries. The Zuni had sent messages far to the south that the intruders should be killed. They had also been tracking Coronado and his men and fully expected violent retaliation for the death of Esteban (see Hammond and Rey, *Narratives of the Coronado Expedition, 1540–1542*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1940; and Jesse Green, ed., *Zuni: Selected Writings of Frank Hamilton Cushing*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979). Apparently these details are of no consequence. The transposition of this conversation from Yuman to Zuni territory is considered acceptable, since the foregone conclusion—drawn from Jorgensen—is that Yuma, Pima, Papago, and Pueblo formed one large cultural group in 1500. Therefore, a conversation that took place several hundred miles away could just as well have occurred at Zuni. Gutiérrez explained in his talk at the Organization of American Historians that he used Alarcón's text in order to bring the berdache tradition into the discussion, which is first described by Alarcón among the Yuman peoples. The final result, however, is the gross misrepresentation of Zuni reactions to the arrival of the Spaniards, paving the way for a misleading por-

trayal of the Pueblos as frightened and cowering before the "mighty conquistadors."

Gutiérrez's *New Western History* also allows contradictory and incomplete information in footnotes and, again, encourages the borrowing of information from tribes that are culturally, geographically, and temporally remote. A description of Pueblo preparation for battle on pages 26 and 27, which states that the warriors bathed their war fetishes in human blood and fed them pieces of human hearts that had been torn from the breasts of enemies in previous victories sounds like a questionable interpretation of Meso-American peoples. Since no Pueblo reference is cited for this information, however, the serious reader will never be able to get to the root of these "bloodthirsty" Pueblo practices. Gutiérrez's footnote for this passage (p. 351, note 64) claims that "Pueblo war societies have been extinct since the seventeenth century" and informs the reader that he learned about what Pueblo warfare might have been like by studying Navajo, Mojave, Plains, and Northeastern Woodland war practices, among others. Yet the Ellis article he cites about Pueblo warfare clearly discusses war societies still in existence in the late 1800s and even into the twentieth century. And Cushing's induction into the Zuni Bow Priesthood in the late 1800s is not referenced at all. A similar technique is used on page 30 for Gutiérrez's description of Pueblo bloodletting, which is based entirely on interpretations of Mayan rites (p. 353, note 75). The sweeping statement that "from the Pueblos south to the Maya, bloodletting was tied to rulership and the mythology of cosmic order (p. 30)" seems sufficient explanation to allow Mayan practices to be superimposed on the Pueblos without further clarification or discussion. This is another very convenient methodological innovation.

Apparently, it is also acceptable in Gutiérrez's *New Western History* to make key generalizations based on one tenuous example. One instance of this is Gutiérrez's claim on page 80 that, by the 1660s, the Franciscans had "forged a cadre of youths who stood ready to denounce the sins of their parents." The one and only example he offers to prove the existence of this cadre of youth (which again sounds more like the attempts to convert caciques' sons elsewhere—attempts which often failed) is someone named Blas, whom Gutiérrez identifies as an Isleta boy:

Blas, a young Isleta boy, behaved just as the Franciscans wanted. On a January night in 1661, Blas entered Isleta's

main kiva where he found the elders “invoking the devil” in indigenous ceremonial garb. “You better be careful,” Blas told them, “that is what the padres abhor and have forbidden.” The men admonished Blas not to tell the friars, but the boy broke his vow as soon as he left the kiva. (p. 80)

The documents, however, actually identify Blas as a “mulatto” servant boy living in the household of a Spanish woman named María López Millan, who lived one league away from Isleta (see AGN, Inquisition, vol. 593, f. 17r–17v). Since Gutiérrez concludes in chapter 4 that *mulatto* in seventeenth-century New Mexico “simply meant an individual of mixed Spanish-Indian ancestry” (p. 196), it becomes acceptable in Gutiérrez’s line of reasoning to identify little Blas as an Isleta boy without any further clarification. Although there is room to argue even with this interpretation of *mulatto*, let us assume that Blas was of mixed Spanish-Indian ancestry, in accord with Gutiérrez’s definition. In order for Gutiérrez’s argument to pertain, Blas would have to have been an Isleta boy who was intimately connected with the life of the pueblo and influenced by his elders. Only then could he become part of a cadre of youths who denounced their parents and followed the friars. Unfortunately, there is simply not enough information about Blas to know his place in Isleta society. The fact that he was a mixed-blood servant for a Spanish family that lived over two miles away from the pueblo, however, casts serious doubts on Gutiérrez’s argument. Undaunted by these complications, Gutiérrez uses Blas as an example of the supposed cadre of youths who followed the Franciscans. He then makes a giant leap of faith to claim that the friars succeeded in becoming influential inside chiefs during the so-called Franciscan century. *It is of no consequence that Spanish documentation of the period repeatedly describes resentment toward the friars, clandestine resistance, attempted rebellions, and the successful revolts of 1680 and 1696, during which the missionaries and their churches were the primary targets.*

Finally, footnoting errors are forgiven in Gutiérrez’s version of New Western History. One of the many passages offensive to Pueblo women in *When Jesus Came* is found on page 20. It describes a supposed ritual for a deer when it is brought into the pueblo: “First the women sexually taunted the dead deer with lewd speech, they ‘had’ intercourse with it, fed it, and finally welcomed it into their home.” The footnote for this information (p. 350, note 41) cites Leslie White’s 1943 *New Material from Acoma*, page 336.

There is no mention anywhere of this practice on page 336. One may note that an earlier rule again takes effect in this passage, which is that ethnographic information gathered in the twentieth century can be used to describe precontact Pueblo practices, 450 years after conquest and colonization have taken their toll—but broaching that subject would begin an entirely new discussion. Is there a source for this offensive “information” that was inadvertently omitted? Perhaps the correction will appear in the next edition, or, even better, perhaps the Pueblo material will be reconsidered altogether.

In summary, future researchers who wish to employ the New Western History methodology as practiced by Ramón Gutiérrez in *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away* should keep the following guidelines in mind:

1. Sources cited to support an argument need not corroborate that argument;
2. Information from one Native American group can be used for any other group regardless of cultural, geographical, or temporal distance;
3. Information can be interjected into the text anywhere without the need to explain that the information is taken from a source different from the one implied within the text;
4. One example is all that is needed to prove a key generalization. That example need not be an accurate or full rendition of the original event or individual(s) described;
5. Ethnographic information gathered up to 450 (let’s make it an even 500) years after conquest and colonization can be used to describe precontact aboriginal cultures;
6. Native peoples who object to the historian’s portrayal of their cultures do not understand the true precepts upon which their cultures are founded, so these objections may be disregarded;
7. Footnote errors are acceptable, even if they contain offensive or controversial material. Everyone makes mistakes.

Simon J. Ortiz, Acoma Pueblo writer

In the very best tradition of skillful denial, historian Ramón A. Gutiérrez contrives to tell the truth about the “Spanish conquest of America and its impact on one group of indigenous peoples, the Pueblo Indians.” In *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*:

Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846, Gutiérrez purports to express the “vision of the vanquished,” and by so doing show that “the conquest of America was not a monologue, but a dialogue between cultures.” Conquest as dialogue? This is *his* truth indeed, and this is his lie and a perpetuation of this lie.

Excellently told in the best style of the early Spanish invaders of Pueblo Indian homelands, like Coronado, Oñate, and the Franciscan friars, the treatise by Gutiérrez has been accorded the highest recognition by contemporary Western historians, and one wonders why. There is only one explanation: to justify European dominion over the indigenous Americas since 1492 and to continue to deny the massive genocide of Indian people, the theft of their lands and the further perpetration of theft, and the loss of vast portions of their Indian cultural integrity. Because the lie is told within the context of unquestioned and accepted Western cultural knowledge and with the tacit approval of Western historians, it must be assumed there is nothing noxious about it.

“The power dynamics of the conquest clearly favored the Spanish in the conquest of cultures that began in 1492 and continues to this day,” Gutiérrez says in his introduction, more than agreeing to European domination from past to present. As a scholar who claims, as I have been informed, *genízaro* (peasant Indo-Hispano heritage) ancestry, he does not bring anything other than absurd attention to Pueblo culture, particularly when he refers to sexuality as a key element in the “dialogue.” It is galling and insulting to Pueblo people when he states, “The Pueblo women cooled the passion of the fierce fire-brandishing Spanish katsina through intercourse, and by so doing, tried to transform and domesticate the malevolence of these foreign gods. But the Spaniards as a group would interpret their subjugation of the Pueblos as a supreme assertion of masculine virility, and, as such, would see 1598 as a sexual conquest of women.” Not only did the Spaniards of 1598 see themselves as virile conquistadors, but Gutiérrez seemingly agrees with them as well—and admires them when he relates sexuality to the continuing power dynamics of Western domination today.

Needless to say, Gutiérrez’s arrogance has no boundaries, not with any kind of customary or ordinary respect, anyway. Even as he identifies with an Indian heritage, however slightly, he treats loosely and casually the meaning of sacred terminology such as “katsina,” which he applies, without even the slightest explanation or qualification, directly to the Spanish conquista-

dors. With no compunction, he uses a term having an explicit and exclusive Pueblo Indian religious meaning to identify the Spanish as embodiments of spiritual powers that are integral beings within Pueblo cultural knowledge and cosmology. Gutiérrez's attitude, tone, and verbal style all reveal his personal glibness and disrespect, and this in no way endears him to the Pueblo people, especially the Acoma, about whom he writes in describing the "dialogue" of Spanish invasion and Indian resistance.

As a child at McCartys, one of the villages of Acoma Pueblo, I never heard of the Spanish attack upon Acoma in January 1599 which was ordered by Juan de Oñate, governor general. I never heard about the eight hundred men, women, and children who died defending their land, culture, and community against Oñate's soldiers. I never heard that five hundred Acoma people were tried by Oñate himself and found guilty of not submitting peacefully to Spanish rule. I never heard that the guilty were sent into Spanish slavery, that Acoma men had one foot cut off, and that Acoma children were sent to monasteries and to be servants in Spanish households. It was not until I was almost an adult and began to read history that I learned this actually happened, and I was appalled—and I wondered why my Acoma people did not talk about it in our stories.

As Pueblo people, we know now the truth about European colonization and the establishment of dominion over our land and people, although some of us, too often including our scholars and leaders, do not like to bring it up openly, because it threatens their present status and livelihood. *Nevertheless, it is clear now why there were no stories about the pillaging, burning, raping, and slaughter of Acoma Pueblo. It was because of the "dialogue" Gutiérrez cites between the Spanish conquistadors and the Pueblo. This dialogue denies that any killing, stealing, raping, and lying by the Spanish conquistadors ever took place, and a further result of this destructive denial was that it became the way we, Acoma and other Pueblo people, saw history and ourselves.* Because of this dialogue, we soon did not know that eight hundred Acoma people had died defending their homes, families, and way of life. And we began to live the lie conquistadors wanted us to live, and we began to blame ourselves for the loss of our land, culture, and community. This, in essence, is what is most reprehensible about Gutiérrez's work. This is what must be pointed out by all who refuse to live by what is perpetuated by historians who refute the truth.

Joe Sando (Jemez Pueblo), Director, Institute of Pueblo Indian Study and Research Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico

It is truly amazing that Ramón Gutiérrez has created a social history of native peoples, including the Pueblo Indians. He says there were no Pueblo Indian records in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, so he proceeded to furnish the reader with what was not available before.

I give him credit as a scholar, for the book is well researched and he has worked hard. However, I am aware that some of his resources and references are in error. But I will not sanctify the book by correcting the true nature and the names of the figures he purports to discuss. In this way, the characters are not offended.

It is too bad that probably only those who know little or nothing about Pueblo Indian life will read the book and believe it. Most Pueblo people will not read the book, since they will be turned off by the title. When I first heard Gutiérrez talk about his manuscript, I told him the title is not true and will not be true for many centuries. I am sure I will not see the day when that happens.

To a Pueblo Indian, the book is extremely offensive. The author likens ancient Pueblo Indian life to a litany of sexual orgies in both the daily life and the ceremonial life—promiscuous and lascivious.

I grew up in a traditional Pueblo Indian life and was initiated, but I never shed a drop of blood. There is not one organization in the Pueblo culture that calls for nudity. We are not in Florida or the Caribbean. In my early years, I never witnessed or experienced any activity mentioned in the book. I never heard of nor knew what a berdache was until I was in the navy during World War II.

For many years, the name of the game in writing about Indians had been to put them down as savages and pagans. As we review history now, we know who the savages were. It appears that Friar Marcos de Niza was not the only one who stretched his stories.

But today we live in a free country (original Indian Country), where freedom of speech is the law—the freedom for which my peers and I fought and sacrificed in the wars in which many received little recognition or compensation.

Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz, professor of ethnic studies, California State University, Hayward, and author of *Roots of Resistance: Land Tenure in New Mexico, 1680-1980*

This book garnered ten prestigious scholarship awards in 1992, including the Herbert E. Bolton Prize in Latin American History, the Haring Prize in Latin American Studies, the John Hope Franklin Prize in American Studies, the Frederick Jackson Turner Prize, the James A. Raleigh Prize on race relations from the Organization of American Historians, the prize for the best book of 1991 from the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, and, significantly, the Quincentenary of the Discovery Prize from the Embassy of Spain.

At the University of Wisconsin, Gutiérrez wrote the book as a dissertation under historians Peter Smith, Thomas Skidmore, Thomas McCormick, and Steve Stern. William Taylor read the whole manuscript. Others read all or part—Tomas Almaguer, George Reid Andrews, Hal Baron, Evelyn Hu-DeHart, Nancy Farriss, Robert Frost, Sheldon Garon, Deena González, David Gutiérrez, Christine Harrington, Margaret Hedstrom, Steve Koblik, Murdo MacLeod, Michael Monteón, Vicki Ruiz, Harry Salzburg, David Weber, Richard White, and Allen Woll.

Nancy Farriss, a well-known historian of colonial Mexico, states on the book jacket that the work is

[a] monument of stimulating scholarship, full of sensitive, astute, and often erudite insights. The work's value is not merely its considerable theoretical innovation and sophistication, but the fact that these qualities are solidly grounded in evidence. Gutiérrez knows what he is talking about.

Yet I spent six years of research and writing on the same subject matter and find nothing new in the book, except for an overlay of crackpot theory disguising (barely) the same tired, old colonialist "facts," gleaned from Spanish church and state documents, and pseudoscientific ethnographic "data" from the 1920s through the 1940s. The book is a setback for Native American history and for women's history. "This is not even not right," a physicist said of Nostradamus's theories of the universe, and this statement applies to Gutiérrez's theory and allegations, which are so vague that they cannot be tested or challenged.

Because the footnotes are gathered at the end of the book and most of the notes reference key abbreviations, the reader is likely

not to consult the notes and will become discouraged if she does so. For example, the following assertions are made:

After feeding, the activity of greatest cultural import to Pueblo women was sexual intercourse. Women were empowered through their sexuality.

When women gave the gift of their body to men with whom no obligational ties existed, they expected something in return, such as blankets, meat, salt, and hides. For a man to enjoy a woman's body without giving her a gift in return was for him to become indebted to her in a bond of obligation (p. 17).

The footnote to this passage states,

The gifts women demanded for sex are mentioned numerous places. See NCE, p. 248, RNM, p. 206; RBM, pp. 43-44; HD vol. 3, pp. 149, 184; AGN-INQ 587-I: 19, 60, 64, 140.

The note reads like an impressive code, so the reader flips back to the abbreviations key, only to find that the sources are simply the Spanish documents, a Franciscan memoir, eighteenth-century Spanish documents, and Spanish Inquisition documents. I suppose if Gutiérrez were studying Hindu ritual, he would use British colonial and missionary documents to interpret the *Kama Sutra*. Making use of colonial documents is not the problem, but using them unexamined and uncited without the reader's ten-minute exercise searching for each one, is fraudulent.

However, Gutiérrez does not rely only on unexamined colonial documents:

Through the gifting of food and the offering of hospitality in the form of intercourse women assured communal peace And through the issue of women's bodies—children—foreigners and natives became one and were incorporated into households (p. 19).

Gutiérrez's sources here are Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics*, and Whitehead, "Fertility and Exchange in New Guinea." Gutiérrez does not explain the legitimacy of these sources to support such a conjectural assertion, but rather poses it as unquestioned canon.

Some amazing statements have no citations at all:

We focus here on deer hunting because deer meat was the most abundant and highly prized, and because men thought of women as two-legged deer (p. 30).

Gutiérrez even interprets, without attribution, the role of the berdaches (male-woman) as reducing the female role:

On the basis of the berdaches' role in Pueblo ritual we see again the male assertion that they controlled all aspects of human life. Women had power only over half of creation; through ritual men controlled its entirety—male and female—and were thus equal if not superior to women (p. 35).

Although Gutiérrez lists in the bibliography Walter L. Williams's *The Spirit and the Flesh: Sexual Diversity in American Indian Culture* (1986), he neither cites nor argues with Williams's opposing view:

Many cultures that recognize berdaches, the Keres Pueblos, for example, believe that masculine qualities are only half of ordinary humanness. But feminine qualities are seen as automatically encompassing the masculine as well as many other characteristics that go beyond the limits of masculinity. Consequently, there is a recognized enhanced status for those males who have the ability to transcend the limits of masculinity . . . Women of many cultures have sporadically participated in activities normally associated with men, without leaving their female gender role. But for a male, it is not as easy to be feminine while remaining within the confines of the man's role. If a male wants to incorporate feminine aspects, he has to move beyond masculinity (Williams, p. 66).

Nor does Gutiérrez cite Paula Gunn Allen's *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions* (1986). Indeed, Gutiérrez does not even list Allen, herself a Laguna Pueblo, in his bibliography. She would disagree with him as Williams does.

In Keres theology the creation does not take place through copulation. In the beginning existed Thought Woman and her dormant sisters, and Thought Woman thinks creation and sings her two sisters into life (Allen, p. 16).

The problem of unexamined sources plagues the entire book, but especially the first chapter, "The Pueblo Indian World."

Gutiérrez's wild, uncited assertions and the narrative in that chapter, built on mainly Franciscan documents, pop up throughout the rest of the book as established facts:

The Spanish narratives of the conquest are silent on the hospitality the Indian women offered the 'Children of the Sun.' Because sanctity and sex were so closely related in the Pueblo world, it was common for men and women to give their bodies to persons they deemed holy, in order to partake of their supernatural power The Pueblo women cooled the passion of the fierce fire-brandishing Spanish katsina through intercourse, and by so doing, tried to transform and domesticate the malevolence of these foreign gods (pp. 50–51).

The proof of this, Gutiérrez finds, is that when Spanish soldiers were investigated in 1601 for abusing Pueblo women,

the soldiers recounted no exploits, admitted no faults. Rather, they spoke of the licentious Pueblo women who had 'no vices other than lust.' Normally, Spanish soldiers might have bragged about their sexual triumphs in words evocative of the terror of their victims—rape, vanquishment, violation. But in 1601 the conquistadores seemed to scratch their heads in collective befuddlement, wondering what had transpired between them and their Pueblo subjects (p. 51).

Is this a part of the "solidly grounded evidence" that Nancy Farriss praises in the book?

In the second chapter, "The Spanish Conquest," the soldiers largely disappear to make way for the Franciscans. Gutiérrez's point of view here is suspect. Throughout, he inexplicably capitalizes "Him" when referring to God, and ponders,

One will never really know how deeply the Indians understood the meaning of the cross, considering that from the very start of the conquest they defined it in native terms The idea that the cross represented Christ's sacrifice for humanity's sins must have resonated at least partially in their imaginations . . . (p. 83).

How much of the mystery of Christ's crucifixion the Indians understood is open to speculation Perhaps the caciques and medicine men listened some, eager to learn

what gave Christians their power. For only by admitting a superficial understanding of Christianity by the medicine men can we make sense of the calculated profanities of Christian icons that occurred during the 1680 Pueblo Revolt (p. 87).

No wonder Gutiérrez devotes only ten pages to the successful Pueblo revolt, which he never refers to as resistance but rather explains,

The Puebloans' discontent hardly needed stoking. For years they had resented the Spanish . . . (p. 130).

.....
The tables were now turned in this contest of cultures (p. 135).

Gutiérrez poses the “comprehension” of Christianity as a valid objective that the Pueblo Indians were incapable of grasping, rather than that they understood it as an institution of conquest. Other references give away his procolonial view: “hostile Indians” (p. 102); “[The Spanish] Isolated amid a sea of barbarism . . .” (p. 103). He refers to “native hunting and warfare” as primary pursuits of the Pueblo, a strange characterization for intensive horticulturists who employed irrigation techniques and lived in cities (p. 127). In describing Vargas’s brutal reconquest in 1693, Gutiérrez writes,

All along the road north, the expedition’s members were greeted as gods with rude arches, dances, hymns of praise to the Blessed Sacrament and Our Lady of the Conquest, and gifts of corn (pp. 144–45).

The latter unexamined source is J. Manuel Espinosa’s 1942 apology for Spanish colonialism, *Crusaders of the Rio Grande: The Story of Don Diego de Vargas and the Reconquest and Refounding of New Mexico*.

Gutiérrez pretends to present a balanced view in equally blaming the colonizer and the colonized:

49 of the hundred or so friars who served in New Mexico during the seventeenth century died as martyrs, suffering pains not unlike those they meted out to the Indians (pp. 128–29).

Here, Gutiérrez achieves symmetry rather than analyzing colonialism and how it works: a pox on both houses. The colonial victims, the Pueblos, turn out to be as fundamentalist and oppressive as the colonizers, creating symmetry. This guise of objectivity—a cultural conflict with good and bad on both sides—is a favorite approach of United States historians who want to evade a systematic analysis of colonialism.

Gutiérrez laments that the Franciscan friars fell into sins of the flesh, but he blames the Pueblo women:

It would have been amazing if lapses of chastity had not occurred among the Franciscans, given their ministry to a culture that glorified sexuality, given that Pueblo women offered their bodies to men they deemed holy, and given that the mystical marriage and union with God the friars so desired were likened to human intercourse . . . for as we saw in Chapter I, successful men who became caciques, as the friars in essence had done, were surrounded by secondary wives and concubines who offered their love and bodies in return for gifts and benefits for their children The Puebloans always transformed that which they deemed potentially dangerous and malevolent into a beneficial force by offering it food and sexual intercourse. Just as the Spanish soldiers had fallen into the loving arms of Indian women, so too eventually did the friars . . . (p. 123).

Gutiérrez argues that, when the Spanish reconquered the Pueblos in 1692, Pueblo women no longer offered their bodies to the Spanish:

[B]y the eighteenth century Indian women were less willing to give their bodies to Spanish men because they knew that they would receive nothing in return (p. 156).

And despite the fact that the Pueblo had murdered every Franciscan friar in sight during the 1680 revolt, Gutiérrez coolly asserts:

In the previous century [seventeenth] the friars had been the principal intermediaries between the pueblos and Spanish institutions. As men who enjoyed great political authority in the pueblos, the Franciscans had supervised mission life, had interpreted Spanish secular demands for the Indians, and as much as possible had kept the outside world at bay (p. 157).

Halfway through the book, the Pueblos largely disappear, and the *genízaros*, or detribalized Indians, are born. Gutiérrez dates their appearance to 1693, while other, uncited scholars—Swadesh, Forbes, myself—who have written on the *genízaros* date their origin as early as 1610, congregated in the Barrio del Analco near Santa Fe. They were Mexican Indians brought as servants in the Spanish conquest. Later, Apache, Navajo, Ute, Comanche captives, and Pueblos who left their people burgeoned the *genízaro* population.

Gutiérrez labels the condition of the *genízaros* as “slavery,” confusing their status by relying on studies of African chattel slavery (pp. 180–90). He does mention that they were legally under ten-year contracts but brushes that fact away (p. 295). Yet, in a quantitative analysis of social status, he states,

Genízaros were primarily artisans (blacksmiths, silversmiths, masons, carders, spinners, weavers). Some *genízaro* ex-slaves had acquired land by 1790, and thus 21 percent of them were listed as farmers . . . increasingly employed as interpreters, guides, and muleteers. Muleteers were petty entrepreneurs who owned the mules on which they transported goods (p. 203).

These are unusual situations for chattel slaves; obviously, the term is misleading. Gutiérrez simply ignores Frances Swadesh’s *Los Primeros Pobladores: Hispanic Americans of the Ute Frontier* and her thesis that the granting of land to the *genízaros* was similar to the practice of the United States during the early nineteenth century, transforming a potentially rebellious proletariat into loyal land owners and defenders of empire.

Gutiérrez’s purpose, if he has one, in excluding important material about the *genízaros* appears to be to support his contention that the *genízaros* were the “real Indians” and were more oppressed than the Pueblos, thereby neatly justifying colonialism:

A Spanish aversion to physical labor and the lack of lands had placed them at the mercy of the Puebloans, totally dependent on whatever surplus they wished to sell. Governor Francisco de la Concha further described the severity of the problem in 1789. ‘Generally the Indians of this province because they possess the best lands live in more comfort than the Spaniards. Many Spaniards are forced to rent land from the Indians to produce their food, and some years, particu-

larly if there is famine or drought, Spaniards are even forced to serve the Indians' (p. 305).

This explanation sounds remarkably like complaints of early nineteenth-century white frontier farmers in the United States complaining about the Cherokee.

Gutiérrez sees the *genízaros* as having reinvented being Pueblo Indians once they acquired land, changing their names to Indian names, introducing Pueblo farming and irrigation practices. They are described by a friar as "great soldiers, very warlike and the ones most feared by our enemies" (p. 306).

The book is filled with unsubstantiated and fabricated "facts," as well as outright errors, for instance placing the Comanche originally in Illinois: "Already the French had armed the Comanches and driven them south from Illinois into Apache hunting grounds . . ." (p. 298).

This error may appear inconsequential, but I believe it is emblematic of the tone and purpose of this book: Gutiérrez simply does not see the indigenous peoples as human beings. What does it matter that the Comanche are Shoshonean people who migrated from the intermountain west and by the early 1770s had captured a good part of the horse and gun trade on the southern Plains, even selling to the Spanish in New Mexico? They are simply Indians inevitably to be conquered. Why consult contemporary Pueblo Indian scholars, educators, and writers such as Paula Gunn Allen, Joe Sando, Dave Warren, Ted Jojola, Leslie Silko, Simon Ortiz, Wendy Rose, Carol Lee Sanchez, Glenabah Martinez, Penny Bird, Rina Swentzell, Evelina Lucero, Diana Ortiz, Manuel Pino, Gilbert Ortiz, and others, for their insights and views about such a controversial reconstruction of early Pueblo culture? I am not arguing that Gutiérrez should have done ethnographic or oral history for his project, rather that he should have read the writings of and consulted with the many bicultural Pueblo intellectuals for his study to have any validity.

Gutiérrez appears not to have received the message yet—nor have those dozens of scholars who have heaped his book with awards and praise—that, as Edward Said puts it in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993),

only recently have Westerners become aware that what they have to say about the history and the cultures of 'subordinate' peoples is challengeable by the people themselves,

people who a few years back were simply incorporated, culture, land, history, and all, into the great Western empires, and their disciplinary discourses (p. 195).

Susan A. Miller (Seminole Nation of Oklahoma), Ph.D. student, Indian history, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

As an Indian historian and a former editor at Texas Tech University Press, I have followed the reception that the scholarly community has given to Ramón Gutiérrez's *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*. I view the book with respect and appreciation for its complexity and for its conceptual framework, a commonplace in gender studies whereby a social system's gender relations are considered as synecdochic of that system's class structure. I suspect, however, that the book's success is undeserved and that this case should provoke some reconsideration of our routines of scholarly review.

Scholars rely on their friends and colleagues to make comments and suggestions about a manuscript in preparation. Multidisciplinary studies usually need special attention from specialists in the contributing fields. In the case of *When Jesus Came*, the author's inexperience in Indian ethnohistory has admitted recurrent blunders, including the howler on page 298: "Already the French had armed the Comanches and driven them south from Illinois . . ." Some of the author's prepublication readers, whom he acknowledges, may blush at that overlooked error; his publisher should blanche.

What happened in the publisher's review procedure? Why were those Comanche still displaced from their western habitat after the publisher's expert reader or readers had made their reports? Scholarly publishing is in such severe fiscal difficulty that presses are dispensing with fact-checking, and I commiserate with the staff of Stanford University Press, for I have faced the same problems. Nevertheless, scholarly publishing should leave Indian removal to the government, keep Comanche history west of the woodlands, and find a way to pinch pennies without compromising our standard of accuracy.

The first round of post-publication reviews of *When Jesus Came* came out in 1992 and were almost uniformly laudatory. Who among the authors of those reviews took the trouble to examine Gutiérrez's sources? The historian Ralph Vigil did so, and his

forthcoming review in *Hispanic American Historical Review* lists serious misuses of Spanish primary sources. Furthermore, the gathering controversy over the book is provoking a more careful consideration of its merits, but that discussion will appear too late to influence the judging of the book in the ten prestigious competitions that it has won. What is the relation between the awarding of prizes and the history discipline's standard for accuracy and fidelity to sources? It smacks of the infamous relation between history and fashion.

Rather than challenging Gutiérrez's carelessness with fact and source, the early reviews reflect an appreciation of the novelty of his interpretation of history on the Upper Rio Grande. The discipline should recall that originality characterizes fiction as well as groundbreaking historical conception. In light of the recent questions about Gutiérrez's research and reporting, historians should become more skeptical of his interpretation. In particular, they might pay more attention to the objections being raised about his conception of Pueblo gender roles and about native social behavior in general.

When Jesus Came might be merely disappointing or exasperating did it not bid to become our generation's standard interpretation of "Puebloan" gender as well as history of relations among peoples of the borderlands. My colleagues from the pueblos appear correct to me in their assertion that Gutiérrez looks at native gender relations through the lens of a taboo-laden Euro-American conception of human sexuality. In an approach that is neither New [sic cap] nor responsible, historians are largely ignoring what these native thinkers are saying. Perhaps they are indifferent to the Puebloan voices because persons who have not experienced the balance and reciprocity in native gender relations have difficulty appreciating them. Such a failure of understanding would be a loss to scholarship and to American culture, which needs help with gender relations. The task of promoting understanding may be set back not so much by the book's misconception of Indian ethnohistory as by the scholarly community's uncritical acceptance of the misconception.

STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE SYMPOSIUM ON
WHEN JESUS CAME, THE CORN MOTHERS WENT AWAY,
AT THE 1993 ANNUAL MEETING OF THE
ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS

On 16 April 1993, a symposium was held at the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians in Anaheim, California, on Ramón Gutiérrez's *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*. At the meeting, I read excerpts from oral and written statements submitted by Ted Jojola (Isleta Pueblo), Rina Swentzell (Santa Clara Pueblo), Penny Bird (Santo Domingo Pueblo), Glenabah Martinez (Taos Pueblo), Jimmy Shendo (Jemez Pueblo), and Evelina Zuni Lucero (San Juan/Isleta Pueblo), all of whom are respected Pueblo scholars with strong ties to their communities. Diana Ortiz (Acoma Pueblo) personally read the statement she had prepared for the conference. These statements appear below. Some of the scholars chose to edit their contributions for this journal in light of Gutiérrez's comments during the symposium, which were transcribed and distributed to them.

It is extraordinary that none of the Pueblo scholars I have spoken with were ever asked to review this book, either for journals or newspapers. In fact, the Organization of American Historians symposium was the first time that Pueblo views of the book became public.

An excellent alternative to *When Jesus Came* is a video that premiered on 12 October 1992, entitled *Surviving Columbus: The Story of the Pueblo People*, a two-hour program coproduced by the Institute of American Indian Arts, Santa Fe, and KNME-TV, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Alison Freese
Native American Studies
University of New Mexico

Ted Jojola (Isleta Pueblo), Director, Native American Studies, University of New Mexico; associate professor, School of Architecture and Planning, University of New Mexico

The treatise of Ramón Gutiérrez is fatally flawed, not on the basis of its supposed scholarly merits (from which I assume it has

attained its acclaim and for which it has also been heavily criticized), but in the concept that it has uncovered new meanings about Pueblo sexuality. Instead, it has artificially projected the cultural bias and machinations of the Spanish colonial interpretation upon a Pueblo worldview. On this basis, it has no merit for representing Pueblo thought.

The basic argument of the book is that the sexuality of the Pueblo people at the time of colonization resulted in the debauchery of Spanish colonial norms, values, and morals. What is interesting about this interpretation, however, is not to be found in the validation of the argument; in fact, the thesis is supported by the standard archival materials of this colonial time period. Rather, the interesting aspect is contained in the point of reference by which Gutiérrez has masterfully projected a Spanish colonial worldview onto a Pueblo worldview.

As a revisionist, Gutiérrez has manipulated the context of the meeting of these two disparate civilizations into what appears to be a historically objective treatise of both worldviews. For the most part, though, the only direct voice of the Pueblo people is in the translations of the Acoma women's emergence story. This emergence story, of itself, is not meant to be literal but is a mnemonic device full of complex allegories and metaphors. Gutiérrez has made no attempt to explore these meanings elsewhere in his treatise. As such, the interpretative voice of the Pueblo people is categorically unstated.

From a hermeneutical standpoint, therefore, the basic flaw of Gutiérrez is not in the interpretation but in the conviction that his interpretation is representative of the Pueblo worldview. It is a simple, known fact, for example, that, in the New Mexico colonial archival materials, Pueblo people are not represented by their own chroniclers or by a written literature. Instead, Pueblo viewpoints were interpretations recorded by the largely "untuned" ears of Spanish clerics. The basic concept of "fertility" is a good example: What the Pueblo people interpreted as fertility—whose basic symbolism of generational renewal is embodied in both the color and the seed of the corn—would be reinterpreted by a skeptical and culturally hostile priest as heresy and sexually lewd in connotation. The latter becomes the archival memory.

The whole of the Gutiérrez treatise, as substantiated by such culturally biased interpretations, resonates with this archaic Spanish colonial worldview. Desperate times call for desperate reinter-

pretations. In the context of colonization, where few, if any, women of upstanding Iberian descent were brought to the frontier, Spanish men and priests needed to rationalize fornicating among the less-civilized native women. Native women were consigned to becoming the unholy instruments of Spanish lasciviousness. The Spanish men would commit lewd acts upon native women that they would never dare commit with their own women.

Furthermore, the colonizers protected their moral virtue by abusing the holy rite of confession, a rite that was administered by their fornicating priests. A rather timely example of this is the present predicament of Robert Sanchez, archbishop of Santa Fe, whose recent resignation is being interpreted as an admission of fornication. Sanchez is a native of New Mexico and the first United States Hispanic appointed to the position of archbishop. In the context of the Spanish colonial experience in New Mexico, Archbishop Sanchez's situation is not that of a lone "sinner" but a perfect example of how a priestly "tradition" continues, apart from any Pueblo ploy (the latter of which would be a conspiracy, as construed by the logic of Gutiérrez).

Rina Swentzell (Santa Clara Pueblo)

When I first came across Gutiérrez's book and saw its intriguing title, I was quite excited about it, because I thought the writer might have an understanding of the different perspectives held by people in the Pueblo world and the Christian world. It is a wonderful title with a lot of promise, but I felt as I read the book that the understanding was not there. Instead, Gutiérrez had created ideological constructs of the Pueblo world that are gross exaggerations and suppositions based on the ethnographic literature and colonial documents. He creates illusions using "facts" and what he claims to be objective research.

What Gutiérrez has done with the information he finds in these sources is very disturbing. For example, in claiming to glean his premise of Pueblo sexuality in the sixteenth century from Spanish records, he does not realize that the Spaniards who wrote about the Pueblo had a completely different view of the world from that of the Pueblo people. There is a serious lack of comprehension on Gutiérrez's part that the statements he uses to describe Pueblo culture at Spanish contact were made by one group of people

interpreting another group from their own point of view. Gutiérrez then builds on the perception that he claims to have gleaned from the Spanish documents and uses it to create his own interpretations of who the Pueblo people were. One of the most striking things about his use of these sources is that the Europeans who made those statements lived in one of the most degraded eras of European history—the Inquisition period in Spain—when social mores were extremely rigid and morality and ethical issues were of paramount importance. It is no surprise then that Gutiérrez talks about power as an integral part of sexuality. That is what the Inquisition was all about. That is what the whole conquest of the Southwest was about—power and control by males.

To a great extent, this entire book revolves around the question of female sexuality, but one has to ask what exactly is involved in Gutiérrez's discussion of Pueblo female sexuality. Again, it is male conquerors defining who Pueblo women are, and Gutiérrez does not question these interpretations at all; in fact, he promotes them. It is difficult to believe that he accepts them at face value. As a consequence, his view is essentially no different from that of the conquerors themselves who came into the region. This actually comes as no surprise, since, in my opinion, he is obsessed with sexuality and places that personal obsession on the Pueblo people. Pueblo notions of sex and sexuality simply are not as he describes them. He has no understanding that sexuality in the Pueblo world is very much an integral, natural part of life and is not in any way the obsession that Gutiérrez describes. In essence, Gutiérrez simply does not comprehend the mind, the action, or the worldview of Pueblo people as he claims he does.

Another example of Gutiérrez's lack of understanding involves the concept of reciprocity among the Pueblos. He claims that sexuality is used as a way of gifting, of receiving or gaining favors, and that Pueblo women offer sex as a way to receive gifts in return. This is a gross misrepresentation of the Pueblo concept of reciprocity. Reciprocity is, of course, an integral part of Pueblo life, but that concept stems from something altogether different from what Gutiérrez claims. It stems from the fact that all of these things are part of each other and that giving and receiving cannot happen one without the other. Sexuality is a part of that whole notion of giving and receiving, which is a very healthy approach to life and not the obsession that Gutiérrez represents it to be. The notion of giving and receiving also goes beyond the human context, because people honor the sun and give their energy to the sun to

make his journey across the sky. It is a recognition that male and female are a part of the universe and that reciprocity is not the tiny, perverse thing that Gutiérrez makes of it. And it is certainly not a source of personal power.

There are other basic ideological concepts of Pueblo culture that Gutiérrez distorts and grossly misrepresents. He employs a hierarchical model for social and political ordering in the Pueblo world. He claims, for example, that men have precedence over women, when, on the contrary, underlying *everything* in that world, the male and female order is very equal. The whole cosmological as well as social and political ordering take into consideration the fact that there is a male sky and a female earth, without saying that the male sky is better than the female earth. There is a continual reiteration in Pueblo thought that these elements are equal and that there is no hierarchical ordering in the world. It is not about power, it is about balance.

Another basic concept that Gutiérrez distorts is the notion of possession. He relies completely on the European sense of ownership and imposes that notion on the Pueblo people. He states for instance that "men fertilize *their* women," as if women belong to men, which is an absurd notion. He also talks about ownership in other terms, such as "men *own* kivas," but we know that the concept of ownership in the sense used by Gutiérrez was a very, very late idea to enter into Pueblo thought.

The notion that the Pueblo people were afraid of the Spaniards is another misrepresentation by Gutiérrez. He claims that fear is the reason why the Indians submitted to the Spaniards when they saw the horses coming and they saw these men in metal. Of course, the Spaniards were quite a sight to see, but, as a matter of fact, the Pueblos did not react with fear. Their reactions stemmed from a completely different understanding, which is that all things—people and other beings—are to be considered in the world. It was not that there was fear, but that there had to be respect for everything. They had to have respect for those people who came. Fear was not the overriding factor as much as respect was.

Gutiérrez's discussion of other topics indicates that he had simply no understanding of Pueblo culture. For example, he claims that bloodletting is associated with the act of penitence or sacrifice. In truth, sacrificial action and penitential action were not a part of and still are not a part of Pueblo life. Instead, this practice involves the recognition of the physical body and what makes up the physical body. It is an acknowledgment that we have flow

going through our bodies, just as there is flow in the sky with the sun moving through it and as water flows through the land. It is a recognition and an honoring of the flow that exists in the world and not a sacrificial activity. It is similar to another basic concept, namely that one of the other flows of life is the breath itself that we breathe. Instead of recognizing these fundamental concepts in Pueblo philosophy, Gutiérrez promotes a false view of the Pueblo that is, in fact, extracted from European concepts and superimposed on Pueblo ideology.

Gutiérrez did not even make himself familiar enough with the Pueblo world to acknowledge the variations that exist among the Pueblos. Instead, he uses information from one pueblo and then makes assumptions about all of them based on that information. For example, he makes untenable generalizations based on Acoma history—if he uses Acoma history accurately at all—emphasizing the roles of the inside and outside chiefs. What does that mean for the Tewa pueblos? What does it mean for the Tiwa pueblos? He assumes that the Acoma model can be applied to the Rio Grande pueblos, but it simply cannot be done.

He works directly from the European worldview, using assumptions of power and control that emanate from that European world. He uses the notion of scarcity of resources—of scarcity per se—as a premise for the world. He is a product of the western European world of Puritanism that is still obsessed with sexuality. Gutiérrez promotes a very aggressive interpretation of the Pueblo world that is personally very offensive to me.

***Penny Bird* (Santo Domingo Pueblo), Education Consultant,
New Mexico Department of Education, Indian Education Unit,
Santa Fe, New Mexico**

After reviewing Ramón Gutiérrez's perceptions of Pueblo life when the first Spaniards entered our country, I cannot accept his book as an authoritative source. Any information on Pueblo community life—what we are about and what we perceive our past to be—should come from those people who are from the Pueblo communities themselves. Gutiérrez's use of what he calls reliable sources and what many historians accept as authoritative records is questionable; the people who kept those journals and records came from a very different framework, so they themselves could not begin to understand Pueblo community, Pueblo

life, Pueblo philosophy, Pueblo religion. Their eyes were completely closed to everything that made our people who they were, and I find Gutiérrez's book a direct reflection of that attitude. He mirrors the perceptions of those priests and explorers who, by virtue of the fearful country they came from, were afraid of anything else they encountered. They were not open-minded at all, so there was no way they could accept a civilization that had been here for thousands of years, much less understand the intricacies that held that community together.

Gutiérrez interprets much of the social activity that occurs within the Pueblo communities purely from an economic standpoint. If he were to grasp a real understanding of Pueblo philosophy, he would see that it is not just based on economics. The sharing, the balancing of relationships was much more than an economic activity.

If Gutiérrez relied on accounts written by the Franciscan priests and other European men, then the derogatory way in which he perceives relationships between male and female is also questionable. These men were from a country where women did not hold the status that Pueblo women held. There was no equal participation in the community operations in their country, so they could not understand what was actually happening in the matrilineal Pueblo community.

I also find Gutiérrez's reliance on ethnographies written by anthropologists problematic. People have gone into our communities—and still do today—saying that they want to record history because they believe we are dying out and our way of life is not going to remain the same. Indeed our lifeways are changing, but there are certain things that continue, and the philosophical foundations of our community continue. I do not recognize any authority from any culture except ours for a discussion of those foundations.

Research can benefit our people. For example, when the Zuni were doing their land claims research and wanted to document for (again) outsiders what was really valid for them and what areas they had used, they had many outside experts in their community—from historians to geographers to geologists—but these people had to consult with the local people to find out what the basis was for all of their information. Then these professionals agreed to validate what the Zuni said and accept it as the truth. If they had come in and imposed their own interpretation, it would not have been the same. That is what happens with many of the

interpretations made by people coming into the communities. There are people in our communities today who can relate the real experiences of the people and explain them in a meaningful way, rather than basing their views on supposition and questionable records. The fact that historians continue to accept those questionable records as fact supports the claim by Native Americans throughout the country that our history is not validated. We as a people are continually minimalized, and if these research practices are accepted, historians will continue to perpetuate them.

Glenabah Martinez (Taos Pueblo), chair, Social Studies Department, Rio Grande High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico

My major concern with Ramón Gutiérrez's *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away* is the generalizations he makes about Pueblo culture and the lack of references in relation to those generalizations. What may be a specific pattern of behavior or set of values for one group of people, in this case a certain pueblo, may not be found among other pueblos. In Gutiérrez's book there is a serious lack of acknowledgment of the diversity that existed and continues to exist among the Pueblo people.

Some general statements that Gutiérrez makes have no foundation; for example, he writes, "After feeding, the activity of greatest cultural import to Pueblo women was sexual intercourse [S]exuality was deemed essential for the peaceful continuation of life" (p. 17). Where is the evidence for this statement? What is the source? To which Pueblo group, if any, is he referring? The following statement presents the same problem: "Erotic behavior in its myriad forms knew no boundaries of sex or age If the Indians sang of sex, copulated openly, staged orgiastic rituals, and named landmarks 'Clitoris Spring,' 'Girl's Breast Point,' 'Buttocks-Vagina,' and 'Shove Penis,' it was because the natural world around them was full of sexuality" (p. 17). Gutiérrez needs to check his sources for inaccuracies and question the reliability of those "researchers" of the early twentieth century. Which specific Pueblo group uses these landmark names? In another broad generalization, Gutiérrez states, "Modesty and shame were not sentiments the Pueblo Indians knew in relationship to their bodies. Before European contact they wore little clothing and were 'entirely naked except for the covering of their privy

parts'..." (p. 18). Again, which group or groups are being referred to? In Taos, people would have died of exposure if this were the case!

Fundamental to my criticism of Gutiérrez's book is the uncertain reliability and validity of his sources. A review of his sources shows a heavy reliance on the interpretations (and probably misinterpretations) of Europeans, specifically the Spanish. Where are the voices of the sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century indigenous people that he claims to be describing and analyzing when he states that his book "gives vision to the blind, and gives voice to the mute and silent" (p. xvii)? The interpretations he so heavily depends on are the perspectives of the conquerors and invaders. Who were the informants for these Spanish note-takers? Were they coerced? Were they paid? Were they truly representative of the societies from which they originated? Some type of acknowledgment by Gutiérrez of the uncertainty of his sources would definitely help his book.

There are also serious problems with the paradigm from which Gutiérrez is operating. Can he remove the lenses of a twentieth-century Chicano or Hispanic and be able to tell his story objectively? Is Gutiérrez aware that history and the social sciences are human constructs, interpretations, theoretical frameworks, and paradigms that are not eternal but are evolved by humans operating within and influenced by their particular construct? Our understanding of the world is socially constructed and thus subject to change and to discussion. Is Gutiérrez cognizant of the fact that events are the products of multiple causes? Is he aware that the very complexity of our world and of the ways we can comprehend it are based on ambiguity, uncertainty, and diversity? In my opinion, there is not sufficient acknowledgment of these issues in Gutiérrez's book.

Jimmy Shendo (Jemez Pueblo), student resource specialist, Native American Studies, University of New Mexico

In Ramón Gutiérrez's comments during the Organization of American Historians panel in April of this year (see transcript, Native American Studies archives, University of New Mexico), he stated that he used archaeological and ethnographic evidence to prove his points. Evidence, however, is only something legally submitted, and I question how some of Gutiérrez's information

was obtained. It reminds me of the time I was in an audience while Florence Hawley Ellis, a well-known Southwestern anthropologist, gave a talk on how she undermined the Pueblos in order to obtain information and how she interpreted the information according to her own understanding. As she was explaining her deceitfulness, I stood up and said I was a Pueblo Indian and did not appreciate the example she was setting for other future anthropologists. I let her and the audience know how disgusted I was with her talk and her methods. Her final exploitation of Pueblo religion occurred a few years ago when she returned to Jemez Pueblo. Tribal officials noticed the strangers and followed them. When the officials pulled them over to investigate, they found that Ellis had stolen some items from a shrine and had already had them documented and drawn on paper. She was banned from the pueblo for the rest of her life. So if a writer such as Gutiérrez bases his research on this type of evidence, how could a person know the true facts? Apparently, Gutiérrez thinks there are seventeen pueblos (there are nineteen in New Mexico) and believes that Pecos is one of them (Pecos Pueblo was abandoned in 1828) (see OAH transcript). When someone makes a statement like that, it is evident that he is not familiar with the Pueblos. He may not write history the way it used to be written, but we still practice our Pueblo ways the way they were handed down. Of course, he will not understand, because that part is not written.

Diana M. Ortiz (Acoma Pueblo), Center for the New West, Albuquerque, New Mexico

I am from Acoma Pueblo in northwest New Mexico, a culturally diverse and rural region. Navajo, Pueblo, Apache, and Hispanic communities dominate the area. I grew up within this environment very aware of the sensitive, delicate, and respectful relationship Pueblo and Hispanic communities maintained, especially toward religious and cultural customs and practices. Ramón Gutiérrez has ignored this relationship and grossly misrepresented Pueblo practices and behaviors.

Gutiérrez has attempted a scholarly study of the Pueblo world and has used Acoma Pueblo teachings as one example. He is, for all practical purposes, an outsider to these teachings and therefore is very limited in understanding or interpreting the customs and practices that are unfamiliar to him. Gutiérrez has perpetrated a

great injustice on all people, but especially non-Indians, because of this lack of validity.

Studying Indians as research objects denigrates us. Assuming that alleged sexual behaviors can be put forth as public information is humiliating to us! The Gutiérrez book does both.

Finally, it is ridiculous to believe that any Pueblo teachings, especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, could be correctly and accurately translated from Pueblo dialect(s) to English. Yet Gutiérrez takes the work of other scholars which he has referenced and does just this. A principled and ethical approach to this dilemma would have been for the author to approach the Pueblo people to validate the information throughout the book.

I want to believe that something of benefit could come to Pueblo people from the publication of this book, since it is being widely used. Perhaps it has created more interest among non-Indians toward the Pueblo world. But, more than anything, it has benefited Ramón Gutiérrez, who, after all, used the American educational system to achieve yet another American dream.

Evelina Zuni Lucero (Isleta/San Juan Pueblo), writer and instructor, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque and Valencia

Ramón Gutiérrez's argument for and rendition of a Pueblo worldview in *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away*, taken together with his statements at a symposium of the Organization of American Historians in April 1993, reveal disturbing inconsistencies in reasoning.

Gutiérrez expects that readers should unequivocally accept his pronouncement of a "unitary (Pueblo) world view," a thesis based on his unsubstantiated assertion that "cultural similarities that once existed among the Pueblos were never more pronounced than they were in the 1600's" (p. xxxi). At the symposium, he dismissed Pueblo scholars' criticisms that he ignores variations among the Pueblos, claiming that the variations of today are a result of the impact of the conquest, which nucleated, isolated, and then diversified a once-unified Pueblo worldview (OAH transcript of Gutiérrez's comments, Native American Studies Archives, UNM, 7, 8). This argument seems to indicate Gutiérrez's failure to carefully read the essay by Alfonso Ortiz, which he cites as the basis for his "scholarly" claim.

In his introduction, Gutiérrez cites Joseph G. Jorgensen as sweepingly concluding that the Pueblos “form one large group” and further states that “this is a conclusion about the pre-Columbian past with which the eminent Pueblo anthropologist, Alfonso Ortiz, agrees. Based on his own meticulous research on the Tewa, he too asserts that an ancient common world view still binds the Pueblos” (p. xxxi). He cites Ortiz’s essay, “Ritual Drama and the Pueblo World View” in *New Perspectives on the Pueblos* to back this assertion. However, Ortiz makes no such claim in the essay. Rather, he carefully proposes a general Pueblo worldview and cautions against postulating a Pueblo worldview that is too abstract or metaphysical to be of value. He states simply, “I do believe there is a general Pueblo world view” (Ortiz, p. 142). This statement falls far short of Gutiérrez’s implication that Ortiz agrees there was a unitary pre-Columbian Pueblo worldview.

Furthermore, Ortiz explains that, in establishing a general Pueblo worldview, he draws on various Pueblo rituals of the present (rituals that are clearly of the *post*-Columbian timeframe) to “abstract certain recurrent themes from them which illustrate the most general unifying principles of Pueblo existence” (Ortiz, p. 139). In its reliance on rituals of the present, then, Ortiz’s general Pueblo worldview is in direct conflict with Gutiérrez’s statements at the OAH conference that the Pueblo worldview of the 1500s cannot be inferred from the present (OAH, 7).

Ortiz’s statements as presented in the full context of his essay further refute Gutiérrez’s claim that it is not necessary to look at variations among the Pueblo when discussing a Pueblo worldview. Ortiz clearly and explicitly sets the limits for his extended definition of a Pueblo worldview: “First, one should be very clear about what one means by a world view. Second, one must focus on data of a kind available for *most of the pueblos*; otherwise any pretensions of talking about a general Pueblo world view would be unrealistic” (Ortiz, p. 138, emphasis mine). One has to wonder how Ortiz’s extended definition of the Pueblo worldview, with its obvious basis in the variations that exist among the Pueblos of today, can be a foundation for Gutiérrez’s thesis of a unitary pre-Columbian Pueblo worldview that takes no account of present variations.

Equally disturbing is Gutiérrez’s claim to set forth a dialogue that includes the voice of the Pueblo people. He states, “This book, then, is profoundly a project in point of view. It gives vision to the blind, and gives voice to the mute and silent. The conquest of

America was not a monologue, but a dialogue between cultures, each of which had many voices that often spoke in unison, but just as often were diverse and divisive" (p. xvii).

Gutiérrez audaciously claims, "I presented different Pueblo views" (OAH, 8); however, use of a single creation story, a case example from Zuni here, an example from Hopi there, an occasional reference to an incident only vaguely referred to as "Pueblo," with no village specified, do not constitute representative data from which to make credible claims of any sort. Furthermore, how can citations of a few Pueblo stories and reliance on data recorded by non-Pueblos possessing a vastly different worldview constitute a Pueblo view, a Pueblo voice? I find an unexplainable contradiction between Gutiérrez's claim that there was a historical dialogue that included the Pueblos and his statement that he could find "no way around" using what he admits is European-biased information because "there are no Pueblo Indian records of the seventeenth, eighteenth, (and) nineteenth . . . century" (OAH, 8, 9). Absent a strong articulation by the Pueblo people themselves in the form of oral history, documented statements, and/or research conducted by Pueblo scholars, and a carefully laid thesis, one cannot and should not claim to be offering a historical dialogue that includes a Pueblo voice. I see Gutiérrez's argument against presentism as disqualifying any Pueblo person from questioning the marriage, sexuality, and Pueblo worldview he presents. A dialogue between cultures, at least one that includes Pueblos, cannot occur if Pueblos continue to be spoken for by "others" but are not heard from directly.

Although Gutiérrez claims marriage offers a window into the social, political, and economic workings of a society, his rendition of Pueblo marriage and sexuality offers Pueblo people only a distorted, unrecognizable view of ourselves. He describes a repressive social system that lacks any intrinsic human motives such as love and kindness. Instead, strangely enough, he uses economic terms of enslavement, failing to see Pueblo people as engaging in reciprocal acts of love. Gutiérrez sees Pueblo people as entrapped in "bonds of obligation," a social indebtedness that persists for a lifetime and produces a dubious legacy. Children are not seen as a blessing; instead, they trigger a new cycle of indebtedness. In this line of reasoning, Pueblos respond to one another out of mere duty, hastening to satisfy social debts because more are sure to follow. Valued social qualities such as cooperation, sharing, or mutual respect are not acknowledged at all. Gutiérrez

reduces marriage and sexuality to a base level of prostitution by suggesting that women share their bodies with men in exchange for goods. Again, this is a concept that is devoid of any signs of love or affection or respect—an interpretation I find demeaning and insulting to Pueblo people.

As a Pueblo, as an educator, and as a writer, I take issue with inaccurate renderings of Pueblo history and culture, because they perpetuate ignorance, prejudice, and misunderstanding. I hope that Gutiérrez will take to heart his responsibilities as a writer and a scholar.