NOTICE
THIS MATERIAL MAY BE
PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
LAW (TITLE 17, U.S. CODE)

"History Hits the Heart"

Albuquerque's Great Cuartocentenario Controversy, 1997–2005

Phillip B. Gonzales

The year 1998 marked the four hundredth anniversary of the "founding" of New Mexico by the Spanish *adelantado* Juan de Oñate. Considerable pride rode on a grand Cuartocentenario. Nuevomexicano groups, anticipating statewide pomp and commemoration, prepared their devotions to don Juan. He was already a cultural icon: the state honored him in 1910 for founding la Villa de Santa Fé; his 1605 etching, *pasó por aquí*, was given prominence of place among the old inscriptions at El Morro National Park; a movie theater, several schools, and a university building were named for him; he appears on a prominent Las Cruces mural pioneering el Camino Real; and there's the Oñate Monument and Cultural Center in Alcalde with its imposing statue of the adelantado in armor astride an elegant steed. The anniversary would amplify this whole thread. The town of Española pronounced "El corrido de don Juan de Oñate," penned by a local singer, the "official song of the 400-year celebration of the first [European] settlement in the United States" (Herrera 1997, H1).

In Albuquerque, the nonprofit Albuquerque Founder's Day Inc. conceived the idea of a bust of Oñate for permanent display on Civic Plaza. Because Civic Plaza was designated for other cultural purposes, Gordon Church, manager of the City's Public Arts Program, recommended Tiguex Park in Old Town. In May 1997, Founder's Day formally requested that the

city use its One Percent for Art Program to commission a bronze headpiece at a cost of $16,000. Success seemed assured, for Founder's Day president, Millie Santillanes, was the city clerk and the head of the city's "Cuartocentennial" Project. Dedication of the artwork in the fall of 1998 would climax the city's four hundredth jubilee.[1]

Alas, as the proposal came under committee review, it hit what one editorial called a "buzz saw" of opposition ("Give Oñate Sculpture Artists" 1998, C2). Native Americans and Chicanos launched a campaign to stop the city from representing Oñate. A rancorous dispute ran through a series of factional maneuvering and countermoves, vitriolic confrontations in overflow city council meetings, strategy sessions, demonstrations, and prayer vigils. Scores of letters, op-ed pieces, sidebar debates, and volunteer lessons by history buffs appeared in the press. Events wound to a trio of artists, a team of consultants, the direct involvement of city officials, and escalating costs for the project.

The Oñate episode turned purely on symbolic intangibles—in particular, how New Mexico's cultural history should be imagined and commemorated. In this, it served to show the force of ethnocultural identity in the public square. This chapter uncovers the group and ideological forces that converged to ignite the dispute. It traces the controversy's political process and shows how contenders reconstituted their group boundaries in Albuquerque's civic arena through their historical remembrances. Finally, it argues that this fight was not simply over Juan de Oñate's moral fiber or if he should be celebrated. The incident exploded in the symbolic domain of social space, but it had a direct parallel to embattlement in the Spanish-Indian wars in the misty past.

Three Communities of Memory

"Collective memory," states Irwin-Zarecka, "is intricately related to the sense of collective identity individuals come to acquire" (1994, 8). "Frames of remembrance" are collective in that the prominent frames of historical acknowledgment trade in representations of social categories (e.g., a citizenry or a regional folk) and because public representations of history are commonly produced by "communities of memory." Ethnic communities are among the most active. Ethnic memory seeks to change the way the past is conventionally, or officially, portrayed. To have their group sagas inscribed on monuments, memorials, textbooks, and other public moldings, adherents adopt what Joseph Rhea (1997) calls Race Pride, but not simply to raise their self-esteem or mark temporary holidays. Rather, it is power they are after (J. Rodríguez 1999, 182). Eric Wolf explains this well: "The ability to bestow meanings—to 'name' things, acts, and ideas—is a source of power. Control of communications allows the managers of ideology to lay down the categories through which reality is to be perceived. Conversely, this entails the ability to deny the existence of alternative categories, to assign them to the realm of disorder and chaos, to render them socially and symbolically invisible" (1982, 388).

In New Mexico, "Spanish American," or "Hispano," identity is an old example of Race Pride. Its community of memory rose to prominence between the 1890s and the 1930s, when the Nuevomexicanos came to a sharp awareness of their ancestry, which they compacted within the territorial bounds of New Mexico. Anglos perpetrated "Spain in the Southwest" romantically in part to assert social dominance (Montgomery 2002), but Spanish identity for Nuevomexicanos spun around challenges to Anglo dominance as found, for example, in racially discriminatory institutions (Gonzales 2000). Defining themselves as "natives," Spanish Americans resented Anglos lording over their homeland, which had existed before the United States conquered the Southwest in the 1840s. For instance, in pressuring the University of New Mexico to admit more Hispanos in 1933, one Hispano called the fraternities "those usurpers who come into our beloved land of our inheritance with their prejudiced minds pretending to be superior in class to our ancestors" (qtd. in Gonzales 2001, 117).

As this example suggests, and as Irwin-Zarecka theorizes, "history supplies examples of the rallying power of a shared memory of oppression" (1994, 58). But collective memory also idealizes history in great "success stories." Irwin-Zarecka notes that a "mixed narrative . . . is needed even under the best of circumstances" (58). The other Spanish American "strategy of remembrance" (Bruner 2002), then, claimed a glorious legacy. If Anglos boasted of a powerful expanding nation, the Hispanos matched it with their own European heritage of empire and conquest (Horton 2001). Spanish American pride staked its legacy of victory and glory in New Mexico. In a context in which New Mexico was finally realizing statehood after sixty-four years as a federal territory, the Spanish conquistador assumed his significance as an origin hero. For example, a 1916 election ad said that the "enterprising spirit" of "el gran conquistador," don Diego de Vargas, "appeared to live" in "don Isidoro Armijo," the Republican candidate for secretary of state ("El Hon. Isidoro Armijo" 1916, 1).

Of course, Spanish American remembrance disavowed Indians and relegated them to the realm of chaos and disorder. To establish the homeland, the conquistadors had to civilize it. The memory of Nuevomexicano wars

with the Navajos, Comanches, Utes, Kiowas, and Apaches, which did not end until the 1870s, helped spur this aspect of identity. Land disputes with the Pueblos later contributed to the distancing from Native Americans (Nieto-Phillips 2004). Another dissociation involved Mexicans in part because a Mexican identity would reach beyond the boundaries of New Mexico and therefore prove less than useful for the politics of statehood. Spanish Americans argued (speciously) that little intermarriage occurred between their ancestors and Indians, and that New Mexico's time as a Mexican possession paled in comparison to its status as a Spanish province, leaving a legacy apart from the development of the Mexican mestizo (mixed Spanish-Indian) nation (A. Chávez 1979).

Spanish colonial memory was later sustained in Hispano-authored books and grandly by the 1935–40 state of New Mexico–sponsored commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Coronado expedition (Simmons 1998, 38). The notion of a Spanish culture was laid on the communities whose founding predated the U.S. annexation of the region. Colonial New Mexico was emblazoned in the dominant ethnic name *Spanish American*, in the growing fame of the Santa Fe Fiesta, and in public emblems that displayed conquistadors.

Soon, rivaling Latino identities appeared. *Mexican American* came with the League of United Latin American Citizens and other civic groups. In the 1950s, U.S. senator Dennis Chávez was quoted in the press as preferring *Mexican* to *Spanish* (Gonzales 1993). A more determined challenge came from the Chicano community of memory. The era of widespread Race Pride arose in the 1960s, when African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Latinos organized for their "liberation" from white oppression. These mass movements addressed the neglect of their histories in many public texts. As the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act led to greater inclusion of the politically disenfranchised, "so too the cultural identity of the nation would have to change to include the culturally disfranchised" (Rhea 1997, 3).

The Chicano narrative of oppression turned on the legacy of land robbery, labor exploitation, and Manifest Destiny racism after Mexican citizens were incorporated by the United States in the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (Rendón 1971). Some of these issues overlapped those that the Spanish Americans previously addressed, but the scope of group membership expanded to the Mexican-origin population. As Chicano activism organized for the material and political redress of its history of victimization, it sought to have its vision posted onto dominant cultural frameworks—for example, at the Alamo. Chicano identity affirmatively took from the

Mexican Revolution of 1910 to glorify mestizo nationhood, weighted toward the indigenous. On its own, it claimed Aztlán, or the American Southwest, not any particular state, as the imagined homeland (Rhea 1997, 80–93, 72). Accordingly, Chicano "Brown Power" challenged the "white ethnic vision" of the Spanish heritage as a politics of racial accommodation and an elitist denial of the "true" roots of Mexican culture. In a rift within this group, elders continued with a Spanish identification, and youth rallied behind "Chicano." This identity conflict weakened Mexican Americans. In the confrontation at the Alamo, the factions could not agree upon a single vision of their past (Rhea 1997, 93). In the celebration of the founding of San José, California, the Spanish types, emphasizing unity and progress, pitted themselves against Chicanos emphasizing racism and discrimination (J. Rodríguez 1999, 182).

In Old Town Albuquerque, Spanish Americans rejected in the 1970s the offer of a fiberglass statue by famed Chicano artist Luis Jiménez. Old Town, settled in 1706 as the original "villa de Alburquerque," commercialized Spanish colonialism in art galleries, "Spanish" restaurants, and souvenir shops around a plaza with gazebo and mission church. But the neighborhood in Old Town kept to its own. Led by the indomitable Millie Santillanes, its community of memory fought Jiménez's *Southwest Pietá*, a take on a well-known Mexican image, an Aztec warrior cradling his beautiful woman who has been mortally wounded by Spanish conquistadors. Old Towners condemned the sculpture as "too Mexican" and for defaming the Spanish conquistadors. Against token Chicano resistance, the Albuquerque Arts Board was forced to take the piece out of Old Town (Gonzales 1993). Spanish Americans next faced a more formidable challenge.

For centuries, American Indians suffered both hostility in being considered vestiges of the uncivilized "savage" and condescension in being connected to the quaintly primitive. In the 1972 Caravan of Broken Treaties, Indians protested the policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and helped launch an effective national movement. After a gun battle with the FBI at the Oglala Pine Ridge Reservation, the Red Power movement turned to the issue of Indian history in public places. The white Big Man Tyrant represented a strategic enemy. In the standard account, Colonel George Armstrong Custer and his troops were "massacred" at the Battle of the Little Bighorn as a sacrifice to American progress. Indians turned Custer into the advanced guard in the subjugation of the Plains peoples. As Vine Deloria redefined Custer, he represented "the Ugly American of the last century who got what was coming to him" (1969, 148). In print, speeches, and protest at the Custer Battlefield National Museum, Native Americans again fought Custer.

Testimony to the effectiveness of their community of memory to influence historical representation, they persuaded Congress to change the name of the Custer national site and to erect an Indian memorial on it (Rhea 1997, 31–34).

The most evil of the Big Men is Christopher Columbus. The Quincentenary of his landing in the hemisphere provoked major mobilization. The American Indian Movement's (AIM) educational campaign denounced the claim that Columbus "discovered" the Americas, and the Columbus legacy of domination and colonialism. In Denver, AIM asked that the name of the Columbus Day Parade be changed. When negotiations broke down, AIM protestors blocked the parade, four getting arrested. At the five hundredth anniversary of Columbus's voyage, sponsors stopped the event over a fear of violence.[2] In Albuquerque, Spanish Americans tried to mount a Quincentenary, but Native Americans short-circuited the celebration by persuading the sponsoring foundation to withdraw its support. Fifteen years later Spanish Americans bitterly recalled this intervention in their heritage with regret that they had not fought it at the time.[3]

In contrast to the Spanish-Chicano divide, the secret of Native American power is a seamless stitch of pan-Indian and tribal identities. New Mexico thus saw the rise of Pueblo Power, the Race Pride of the nineteen Pueblo nations scattered in central and northern sections of the state. One of its projects challenged the Santa Fe Fiesta. In 1680, the Pueblos—angered by attacks on their religion, ill treatment, taxation, and forced labor—had united to overthrow Spanish rule. In the famed Pueblo Revolt, they killed hundreds of colonial settlers and chased two thousand of them to El Paso. The fiesta commemorates the return of Diego de Vargas thirteen years later and his taking back of New Mexico. Pueblos of the late twentieth century resented the glorified "Reconquest of New Mexico" and objected to the "savage" portrayal of them in the staged enactment of de Vargas's march into Santa Fe. Demanding an end to the Conquest theme, they forced the organizers to emphasize group harmony (Horton 2001). Next came the *Surviving Columbus* program. The Pueblo contribution to the Quincentenary, this prize-winning public television documentary, sponsored by the Institute of American Indian Arts, told in dramatic relief the struggle of the Pueblos to maintain their culture against the destructive Spanish, Mexican, and American forces. Oñate figured in the epic, another Big Man Conqueror with his own trappings of violent conquest, many of which would reverberate in the approaching Oñate controversy.

Pueblo Pride had its own Counter Big Man. In 1993, Pueblo leaders proposed a statue of Popé, the San Juan leader who had led the Pueblo Revolt, for Congress's National Statuary Hall, alongside that of former U.S. senator Dennis Chávez. Again in collective disunity, one Hispanic legislator introduced a bill to promote Popé while another sought to kill it because Popé had "massacred a lot of our [Spanish] people." In 1997, the year Founder's Day Inc. introduced its proposal for an Oñate statue, the state legislature designated Popé for Statuary Hall. The governor approved the designation, but vetoed an appropriation to kick off its fund-raising drive ("Battle Brews" 1997, A1, A8; "Rounding the House" 1993, B2).

A Monument for Oñate?

In the 1990s, Spanish American remembrance blossomed in renewed vigor. Founder's Day Inc. yearly dramatized "Alburquerque's" founding (Dingmann 1997). Santillanes publicly in writing proclaimed herself a "proud Spanish-American, proud to be suffering from delusions of grandeur" (1992, A10). For her and the company, a bust of Oñate meant a "monument." The projection of history in Western monuments goes back to ancient times. The building of structures of public memory has broadened and intensified in exhibitions, museums, public squares, parks, parades, and civic commemorations. A monument embodies the "myths of beginnings"; its codes emphasize victory, national ideology, and the significance of place (Freise 2003, 106). In this vein, Santillanes designated Albuquerque's official Cuartocentenario "Hijos de Oñate: Nuestra Patria y Herencia, 1598–1998" (The Children of Oñate: Our Homeland and Heritage). Because Oñate represented "the father of the Hispanic culture and our State," the piece needed to be "of monumental design."[4]

The plans also highlighted *los pobladores*, the five hundred families who accompanied Oñate, the hardiness of the Nuevomexicano folk, and the "unique" culture they sowed on the land. The first European settlement in the United States also held value, dovetailing with the notion that Oñate turned New Mexico into a "tricultural state." Reparation appeared as well. Because modernization had eroded Spanish traditions, the Oñate story would promote knowledge before it lay forgotten among the youth. The commemoration would rival the Mexican holidays Cinco de Mayo and Diez y Seis de Septiembre (Santillanes 1997, 3). Planners dreamed of building "cultural pride" and leaving a "rich heritage" for the generations. Hispanic leaders met with "upbeat excitement" at the promise that 1998 would be "a very exciting year."[5]

As Lustiger-Thaler observes, it is not surprising that "acts of public commemoration have as much strategically inscribed within them as they have

excluded. Memory and forgetting are part of an embedded historical discourse that evokes as it simultaneously erases, inevitably unfolding on many different social registers and in different 'memory encounters' between groups, as they attempt to articulate their sense of (dis)location within the present" (1996, 190). The very process of remembering requires forgetting. To glorify Oñate it was necessary to leave major episodes of his story aside. When in 1598 Ácoma Pueblo, fifty miles west of Albuquerque, was slow to yield cornmeal to a Spanish reconnaissance party, a skirmish erupted. Thirteen Spanish were killed. Oñate had seventy soldiers lay siege on Ácoma, located atop a 350-foot-high mesa. In the three days of battle, ten Spanish and approximately eight hundred Ácomas died. Surviving Ácomas were taken to Santo Domingo Pueblo to stand trial before Oñate and the other Pueblos for rebelling against the king of Spain. Oñate sentenced five to six hundred of them to twenty years servitude and ordered that the right foot of twenty-four men be cut off. Oñate was eventually tried in Spain for these and other abuses of power, found guilty, and banned from New Mexico (Simmons 1991, 145).

Following its human rights policy on the portrayal of historical figures, the Albuquerque Arts Board asked that the Oñate proposal address the "contributions by the Spanish, good and bad, and the Ácoma experience" (Sálaz 1999, A15). Before Founder's Day Inc. could answer, critical public opinion began to take precedence. A key communiqué for the board arrived from Ácoma native Conroy Chino. To Pueblo Pride, the proposal felt as if Oñate were once again encroaching on the Ácomas as he did in 1598. Chino called the project a "slap in the face of the Pueblo people," an honor to a "butcher and a brutal savage" who had "inflicted tremendous pain and suffering, death and destruction, especially among Ácoma people." In the sentencing after the Ácoma battle, Oñate committed "one of the greatest atrocities in New Mexico recorded history, hardly the person the City of Albuquerque would want to pay homage with a memorial." Chino not only hailed from Ácoma: he was a member of the Pueblo's governing body, a well-known local television newscaster, and, quite tellingly, the first-person narrator of *Surviving Columbus*. His hard-hitting letter reflected the civic war leader's defensive shot against this Spanish assault. On the use of tax dollars for Oñate, he pointed to the many Ácoma families living in Albuquerque, property tax payers, purchasers of goods and services from city vendors, and payers of gross receipts taxes for city coffers. "They are just as involved in this community as they are at the Pueblo of Ácoma where I was raised," he emphasized.[6]

The board asked Marc Simmons, the Hispanophile historian who had

written a biography of Oñate, to respond. Simmons took issue with Chino's "uninformed statements" and "rantings."[7] Luis Brandtner de Cásares demanded that the board place a statue of New Mexico's "founding Patriarch . . . front and center" in Civic Plaza.[8] The battle was on. Rather than a spectacular with costume pageants and displays of Spanish coats of arms that Nuevomexicanos had enjoyed in the Coronado commemoration, 1998–99 witnessed a symbolic reenactment of the Spanish-Indian conflicts of yore, the weapons consisting of choice word brandishment and factional influence on city councillors and the mayor, the officials who would make the ultimate decision on the statue's content.

With the war clouds gathering, the Arts Board hired three artists—a Hispanic, an Anglo, and a Pueblo—to propose a sculpture to include Oñate, the pobladores, and the Pueblos (Associated Press 1997). But it rankled many that the Oñate figure remained in the planning. In January 1998, a secret Indian raiding party, in what its anonymous message said was the "darkest, coldest, night of the year," sawed the right foot off the Oñate bronze in Alcalde (Diaz 1998, A1). The first public confrontation came at a Cuartocentenario meeting. Present were the three artists: Reynaldo "Sonny" Rivera (the Alcalde Oñate sculptor), Betty Sabo, and San Juan Pueblo Native Nora Naranjo-Morse. Rivera fretted over the whirl: "Who do we please, whose knowledge do we bow to?" (qtd. in DellaFlora 1998h, C1).

As the issue became news, a new mayor, the progressive Jim Baca, replaced Millie Santillanes with his friend, the Chicano movement veteran Arturo Sandoval, as Cuarto Centenario Planning Committee head. Sandoval packed the committee with Ácoma natives, including Darva Chino, Conroy's wife and a Native American curriculum specialist for the Albuquerque Public Schools, and with Chicano activists. He vowed to make the commemoration "a bicultural affair, and to reaffirm Pueblo sovereignty" (qtd. in DellaFlora 1998a, C1). Sandoval, Chino, and others formed the Circle of Voices to fight Oñate. More verbal confrontation came at the two public meetings held to discuss the artists' model, a seven-foot Oñate next to an Aztec-style temple. One Puebloan said, "We don't need another fetish to injustice hung around our necks" (qtd. in O. Reed 1998, A1). A new objection was made to Tiguex Park as the statue's site, for it had been ceremoniously named in the 1980s for the Pueblos who had once lived in that area (DellaFlora 1998g).

Resistance to Oñate only stiffened Spanish American resolve. Founder's Day Inc. denounced the Arts Board for allowing the Ácomas to influence the process, "pitting two culture groups against each other." Calling for immediate approval of its request, it admonished the board not to fear controver-

sial public art.[9] The board tentatively approved the compromise, Oñate now humbled into kneeling atop stone steps next to a Pueblo ceremonial kiva. Pairs of moccasins led out from the kiva. Symbolizing the 1598 Ácoma battle, one of the pairs missed a mate. Pillars detailed Hispanic settler contributions to New Mexico culture. To accommodate the artists and the piece's new scale, the board committed another $180,000 (DellaFlora 1998f).

The multicultural scheme pacified no one. Condemning the presence of Oñate, Sandoval demanded an open request for proposals. Together, Founder's Day, the Hispanic Anti-Defamation League, the Hispanic Genealogical Research Center, and the Hispanic Round Table blasted Conroy Chino and the move on Oñate as so much "hatred and bigotry at our ancestors." Crying, "We will not be jerked around in this manner!" they swore to "destroy" the Arts Board. In reprisal, Chicanos charged them with being racist against Indians, "browbeating" the board, and dividing the Hispanic community with its Oñate obsession.[10] Spanish Americans regrouped under the New Mexico Culture Preservation League and announced their petition signed by 1,100 property owners in support of an Oñate-only statue (Dingmann 1998). But Mayor Baca refused to meet with the league (DellaFlora 1998e; Dingmann 1998).

The board created still another planning committee and supplied $16,000 to hire a team of mediators to decide who should be on it. A Santa Fe firm selected a cross section of Hispanics and Indians. Santillanes charged that its closed-door proceedings violated the open-meetings law. A mediator, in the manner of an international peacekeeper, justified the small-group sessions on conflict resolution principles, so that people could "set the goal of reaching mutual understanding before they try to solve a problem." In response to a Spanish American petition for an injunction, the state attorney general allowed the closed sessions (DellaFlora 1998b, 1998c; Dingmann 1998).

This planning committee report hailed the "co-existence of Hispanics and indigenous people" and ejected Oñate. Gordon Church praised its "remarkably sensitive" portrayal of New Mexico cultures, but Darva Chino said the key point was not to have Oñate acknowledged. Santillanes fumed: "What has happened here is that the Hispanic culture has been denied an expression of what is important to them for the sake of political correctness. We have been denied what we asked for. It was never meant to be a piece of art representing two cultures, only a commemoration to the 400th anniversary when Don Juan de Oñate arrived here." Ruben Sálaz, a dissenter on the committee, objected to the rule that the Ácoma experience be acknowledged, "like saying you've got to make a memorial to smallpox"

(quotations from DellaFlora 1999e, B1, and 1999f, A1). Going unremarked, the price of the project shot to $300,000.

The defeat of Oñate seemed imminent, but then the Spanish American city councillor Adele Baca-Hundley suddenly introduced a motion at a city council meeting to commission a statue of Juan de Oñate and the settlers who arrived with him in 1598. It passed eight-zero with no discussion. "I'm so grateful to the City Council for standing up and resolving an issue that has lingered too long," said Santillanes, who had lobbied the councillors, three of them Hispanic. Another round of protests, demonstrations, and quotable reaction sprung forth. Disgust was expressed at the "under-handed power move," the "governing by innuendo," and the "trashing" of community efforts. A Pueblo native grieved that city government never listened to Native peoples, dashing their "dream" to have it "rise above the conflict." Church felt sorry for the board: "It's just painful when there's two valid, competing notions of what this Cuarto Centenario should be." Sandoval and Darva Chino threatened a recall of Baca-Hundley. Chicanos attacked the paean to the "butcher" because it negated a memorial to Cesar Chávez that the city had earlier approved. "City Council Celebrates Indian Killer" read signs at one demonstration.[11]

At the next city council meeting, more than a hundred Ácomas, other Indians, Chicanos, and Anglos took two hours berating and heckling councillors for their "racist, shameful, and damaging" decision against "a community recognized for its diversity." The room fell silent as someone played a flute to honor his ancestors and another recited a native prayer. "How can you so blatantly disregard us? Can you really be that deeply racist?" interrogated Chicana Teresa Cordova. Council members "sat stone-faced" (Chunn 1999a, A1, A2; Zoretich 1999b, A1, A5).

Mayor Baca chastised the council for dividing the community. Declaring the need for "some healing," he vetoed the Oñate resolution. "It feels good that somebody's finally listening to us—and that's all we were asking," said the governor of Ácoma Pueblo. "Fantastic!" Sandoval exulted. "This veto shows three things, [the mayor's] respect for the incredibly diverse cultures who reside in the city, his respect for the democratic process that was our major concern . . . and . . . that good things can happen when people of good will come together to demand basic justice and peace." Santillanes, for her part, challenged Baca's judgment: "He doesn't realize that we have been at this since 1995, and here it is 1999, and he wants us to go do it again?"[12]

The planning committee now envisioned a walk-through timeline bas-relief meant to educate about the founders' impact on society today, inspire

respect for ancestors, evoke the spirit of community and coexistence of distinct cultures, underscore family roots and values, honor the state's unique heritage, and create a "life affirming, emotionally engaging and spiritually uplifting atmosphere." Any suggestion of cultural dominance was ruled out. Text about Oñate's historical significance was allowed, but his person could not appear in the free-standing forms (DellaFlora 1999h, D1).

Most on the committee considered its consensus a historic meeting of cultures. Former Ácoma governor Ron Shutiva expressed relief over the "long, hard struggle to become as close-knit as we are today." Members and mediators emphasized in an op-ed piece that their vision arose "out of the confrontation of the creative conflict within the committee, which in turn reflects and acknowledges, rather than denies, the conflict between the two cultures. This conflict, which goes back to colonial times, still exists today. The process required a respectful listening to each other's concerns, deep hurts, ideals and values." Nevertheless, they also expressed frustration at the interference of outside Oñate forces. Spanish American dissenters objected that non-Albuquerque taxpayers were allowed on the committee and alleged that the model missed the point. "The process was so flawed, the outcome could never have validity," said Conchita Lucero, because the committee was "not knowledgeable about history," nor did it "want to become educated in this area."[13] The Hispano Chamber of Commerce came out in favor of Juan de Oñate as "the primary focus" of the art, with President Loretta Armenta joining other key Spanish American women in calling for an honor to the first governor of New Mexico. In opposition, Arturo Sandoval prepared his legion to support the mayor's veto. City councillors Alan Armijo and Tim Kline met with groups on different sides to hammer out a compromise. Mayor Baca expressed support for a compromise if it included a public hearing.[14]

"Tears ran down the cheeks of the Ácoma Indians and their allies after losing another battle against the Spanish conquistador Don Juan de Oñate," began one news report of the three-hour debate at the council meeting. The council had indeed overridden the mayor's veto, seven to one. Fifty speakers and one hundred placard-waving spectators had packed the chambers. The Armijo/Kline/Baca-Hundley compromise provided for the inclusion of Oñate, but "just part of a larger work of art." Kline reported 800 faxes, phone calls, and letters opposing Oñate, but 1,630 in favor. Yet Oñate opponents at the meeting dominated two to one. Although disappointed that Oñate survived, Sandoval and Darva Chino declared the defeat of a sole focus on him a victory. As Indians gathered in prayer circle, Santillanes bemoaned that her group had been asked to compromise its vision several times; nevertheless, it would accept this one (Chunn 1999b; "Tears Trickle" 1999).

The artists would take the ideas as inspiration for a representational model. Sonny Rivera and Betty Sabo came up with an advanced concept, *La Entrada* (The Entry). However, Naranjo-Morse found it incompatible with the inclusion of Ácoma, the regional landscape, and healing. She threatened to pull out, and when differences of interpretation appeared deadlocked, Sabo did too. Mediators and city councillors reconciled the artists to work with a landscape architect and a historian. In the new complex, *La Jornada* (The Journey), Oñate was, as Sabo said, "obvious but not prominent." As Rivera said, "It's going to be for everybody concerned, a kind of understanding."[15]

Circle of Voices filed a complaint with the city's Office of Human Rights, arguing that the Chicano and Indian peoples were being victimized and harassed by this "symbol of oppression, genocide, slavery, and the violation of fundamental human rights." When the city ruled it had no jurisdiction, Sandoval tried a federal civil rights grievance, charging city officials with "deliberate indifference" to the pleas of Indians, Hispanics, and others and requesting elimination of the Oñate image. That attempt also failed.[16]

The Structure of Ethnosymbolic Warfare

"History hits the heart," remarked the pastor of Ácoma parish at one of the council skirmishes.[17] Father Antonio Trujillo's truth applied to all on both sides of the Oñate debate. Indeed, the story thus far suggests that it was the emotional identification with actual and cultural ancestors that rendered the symbolic violence in the Oñate controversy a virtual extension of the real violence of the past. Those emotions turned fundamentally on interpretations of history. The collective memories may not have been grounded in direct, immediate experience of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century events, but they were, in fact, "textually mediated," based on "textual resources" (Wertsch 2002, 5). Amid the political wrangles, the invocation of those memories fired up an intense "interpretive fight" (Rhea 1997, 33) in which one side approached the Oñate legacy as monumental heroism, but the other framed it in terms of unjustified violence and tyranny. In the heat of verbal warfare, previously constructed frames of remembrance were sharpened, expanded, and refined. Novel historical interpretations led to propositions on present group relations.

At the Custer protest, Russell Means asked, "Can you imagine a Hitler national monument?" (Rhea 1997, 29). Ward Churchill equated Columbus with the Nazi Heinrich Himmler (1997, 81–83). Picking up the trusty weapon, Conroy Chino called the "outrageous" use of public money to honor Oñate like committing a memorial "for a historic figure like Hitler."

A Sandia Pueblo council member said that "Hitler and Oñate would make two good blood-thirsty partners." Another Oñate critic incredulously asked if the city would erect on Civic Plaza a statue of Hitler next to the city's Holocaust memorial.[18]

This level of intensity issued from a hard-line remembrance that held Oñate personally responsible for generations of trauma. "The treatment of the Indians has been so brutal and the atrocities so cruel that they've been buried deep in our collective psyche, deep in our collective past, never to be brought up again, never to be talked about, never to be referenced," said Conroy Chino at a symposium on the Oñate controversy. At contact with the "European attitude," the Natives were forced to combat an "ongoing loss and separation," whole communities taken over, lands stolen, "women raped, children forced into slavery, field and farmlands taxed by colonial rule," as well as a "feverish attack [made] on our spirituality" by missionaries who viewed Indians as "uncivilized and unholy," who "put their churches on top of [sacred] kivas." Lack of healing spelled loss of self-worth, manifest partly in alcohol and dietary abuse. Indians were not allowed to "properly grieve, have not been allowed the time to mourn, to lament, and the result has been a deepening of our wounds in the collective psyche." Pueblos were like Jewish Holocaust survivors, "with the crucial exception that the world has not acknowledged the Holocaust of native peoples in this hemisphere."[19]

This interpretation pierced the "worshipful memory" (Rhea 1997, 32) of hard-line Spanish Americans. "To compare Oñate to Hitler is staggering," reacted Ruben Sálaz, the historian of New Mexico Hispanics.[20] To call Oñate Hitler, declared Marc Simmons, was "selective indignation," for there was no genocide, "defined as the deliberate extermination of an entire people."[21] Rather, from his viewpoint, Oñate was an Enlightened Big Man:

> If any single person deserves the title "The George Washington of New Mexico," it is Don Juan de Oñate y Salazar, first governor and founder of the new Spanish kingdom on the upper Rio Grande in 1598. Since our Don Juan came first, perhaps we should properly refer to our president as "The Oñate of the United States." Both were remarkable men and with extraordinary powers of endurance who overcame monumental hardship and dangers, while creating political entities that survive to this very day. (Simmons 1998, 38)

This regional patriotism formed a core Spanish American sentiment, classic Hispano remembrance awarding *primacy* (Doob 1964, 188–89) to the conquistadors for having created "New Mexico" in the first place. As the lawyer John Salazar said, Oñate was a George Washington because he was the "European founder and first governor of New Mexico, a new kingdom within the Spanish empire" (1998, A13). The sculptor Sonny Rivera thought Oñate "a hell of a man" for being the "father of New Mexico" (qtd. in Hummels 1998a, A1). The families and clergy who had come with Oñate were also infused with primacy, for they "established and founded our great State as the farthest outpost of Spain's Kingdom," said the social activist Gene Hill.[22]

The birthing of culture also received its due. Oñate was "the godfather of the Franciscan missionary program of the northern frontier"; he launched the livestock industry in the Southwest, inaugurated mining, and clarified the "true geography of western America." Spanish American memory reified the notion of a new settler culture. "New Mexico Hispanos have a distinct Spanish culture, which is second to none," wrote a local historian, "complete with its own Spanish dialect, regionalisms and colloquial expressions. We have our own history which is not Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Mexican. We have our own heroes, our own traditions, and our own heritage." Historical isolation had preserved old cultural forms and phenotypical features. Some intermixing with Indians may have occurred, but New Mexican culture remained intact.[23]

Hispanos would divest the Indians of their entrenched victimology. The colonials had actually improved the lot of the Natives, Hispanos claimed, by introducing them to valuable cultural items such as the wheel, log housing, many crops, stock animals, advanced irrigation, and cowboy gear. Christianity was a critical innovation for the Pueblos, it was said.[24] The Spanish guaranteed the survival and general well-being of the Native tribes with the paramount goals of "peaceful settlement and colonization of the area and the care of the spiritual needs of the Indian inhabitants." In contrast to a Pueblo woman's claim in the documentary *Surviving Columbus* that every Pueblo Oñate encountered in his northward trek booted him out until he arrived at compassionate San Juan Pueblo, Spanish Americans saw friendly encounters all along the route of his entry. It was the Ácomas who violated peaceful relations at the famed battle at their Pueblo. Simmons showed that the Ácomas ambushed the Spanish troops in 1598, killing ten, including Oñate's nephew. Obeying colonial law, Oñate ordered to have peace arranged with the Ácomas, only to be met by a warring party, went the Spanish argument (Salazar 1998, A13).

Slicing feet off seems harsh today, but Spanish Americans, in their historicism (judging the past by the different standards of the day), argued that in the brutish frontier, this ancient penalty, dating to the Moors in Spain,

was not particularly extreme. The Ácomas were actually fortunate Oñate did not exercise the right to impose a death sentence, and he charitably placed their children with Franciscan friars for a Christian upbringing (Salazar 1998). Besides, it was the Ácomas who started the war, acting with treachery and premeditation. "God did not give the Indians acquisition of the entire province. Where did they get this idea?"[25] Yes, Oñate was later convicted of crimes against the natives, but what militant Indian memory conveniently forgot was that he eventually cleared his name, was reimbursed for his costs in establishing the province, given an important appointment, and awarded the prestigious Military Order of Santiago. "With the passage of time and a more complete review of his record, Oñate's remarkable achievements, in trying circumstances, were ultimately acknowledged at the highest level" (Salazar 1998, A13). An incomplete record contributed erroneous interpretations. Citing a "noted" historian, Santillanes (1998b) doubted that the foot cutting even happened.

According to Hispanos, Native Americans forgot other important historical facts. In a great achievement, Oñate halted the internecine wars among the Pueblos, and he pacified the particularly violent Ácoma people. Had he not brought a government, the Pueblos would have destroyed themselves in warfare.[26] In thinking reminiscent of the nineteenth century, Hispanos essentialized Indians as savagely violent. "Frankly, I'm getting tired of all this compassion pouring out [to the Indians]," one Hispano declared. "After all, the Indians were less than perfect. . . . The Spaniards suffered also. . . . [T]he death records for the late 1600s [show that] every other Spaniard who had died was massacred by an Indian."[27] New Mexico "was full of roaming Apache warriors who frequently ambushed and killed pueblo warriors, including many from Ácoma," one José Valdez contributed. Raiding Apaches carried off Pueblo women and children "to a life of slavery," and "caused more death to the pueblo peoples than the Spaniards."[28] As Simmons argued, "For examples of true genocide close at hand, one can cite the near-extermination of the Lipan Apaches of eastern New Mexico by the Comanches, and the total extermination of the Hopi pueblo of Awatobi in 1700 by other Hopis who resented the village's acceptance of two Spanish missionaries." Conroy Chino, it was felt, conveniently ignored all this important history.[29]

Another strategy demonized Popé and denigrated the Pueblo Revolt. The local historian Ray John de Aragón wrote that to honor Popé was like honoring "any mass killer"; the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was a "blood thirsty rampage" on the hundreds of Spanish men, women, children, priests, and Indians who sided with the Spanish; "little girls and women were raped prior to being killed, and numerous victims were also tortured before they were mercilessly and brutally murdered."[30] Popé "attempted to murder the whole Spanish community. Do we want a genocidal murderer to be represented in the U.S. Capitol?" asked one Robert Rodriguez.[31] Luis Brandtner de Cásares, author of the most inflammatory lines from a Spanish American, typified the revolt as

> a rampaging band of drunken Pueblo Indians high on peyote and tequila under the leadership of the deranged San Juan Pueblo witch doctor known as *el Popé* (who had recently murdered his own son-in-law) massac[ring] more than 400 Hispanic New Mexican men, women, and children. El Popé proceeded to systematically kill off his political opposition, and the Apaches and Navajos promptly resumed their raids on the Pueblos. The following year and every subsequent year, numerous Pueblo Indian delegations came to El Paso pleading for the return of the Spanish, which the Spanish obligingly did, reimposing law and order in 1693.[32]

If Indians intruded in the Oñate proposal, asked Lilly de Castillo,"shouldn't Spanish Americans be part of the Popé monument?"[33]

In the pro-Oñate memory, Spanish colonial policy was benevolent compared to the genocidal Anglo-American approach to the Indians. "Try to find the 500 *Nations* that A. M. Josephy wrote about, and New Mexico is one of the few places where Indians weren't exterminated, which they certainly were east of the Mississippi," Sálaz lectured. Next to the brutalities wrought by John Smith, the Puritans, and Lord Amherst, Oñate appeared virtuous.[34] Calling the criticism from the "big news celebrity" Conroy Chino "deliberate calumnification," one Spanish American said there were plenty of statues to the English settlers, Plymouth Rock, and Jamestown, even though they "decimated Indians on the eastern seaboard," whereas the Spanish had guaranteed native water rights and protection from marauding tribes.[35] Santillanes, for her part, did not fear the proposition of Conquest. "There have been no benevolent conquerors in the history of mankind," she contributed. "The Native Americans in New Mexico, although they suffered greatly, fared much better under the Spanish flag than did their counterparts under Anglo American rule"; the Pueblos still live on their lands, "speak their native language, and practice their unique life style. They are among the few Indians in the continental United States who can make that claim" (1998a, A13).

It pained Spanish Americans to see the assault on Oñate reigniting the "Black Legend," the historical "denigrating, ridiculing and wholesale chastis-

ing of Spanish traditions, heritage, culture and history." Black Legend myths were extremely difficult to dispel, wrote de Aragón, "but it is hopeful that Hispanics in New Mexico are finally given the credit they deserve for their glorious contributions."[36] Sálaz saw the worldwide "tree-of-hate" spreading into New Mexico and calling Spanish heroes like Oñate villains, while championing the Indians, "who were in reality preserved by Hispanic government" (1999, A15). The news media slanted their reporting toward the Legend and were, in fact, "pro-Indian," said Founder's Day member John Lucero.[37] Public television "refused to do a single documentary to honor the 400th anniversary of the founding of New Mexico, but produced the anti-Hispanic 'Surviving Columbus,'" complained Sálaz (1999, A15).

Ethnic cleansing constituted another memory. According to Brandtner, an "ethnicidal dynamic" had been in place

> since that fateful day in August of 1846 when Col. Stephen W. Kearny crossed the Arkansas River into New Mexico with an army of Anglo-American and immigrant Irish mercenaries. One hundred fifty-three years later Spanish New Mexicans are supposed to have vanished into thin air, or turned into brown mestizos or white Anglos. But according to what law of nature? . . . [or] what man-made law? The declaration of the Rights of Man? The declaration of Independence? The Constitution of the United States of America? What it does do is expose the lie of the melting pot and its successor lies, the theory of multi-culturalism.[38]

Because the Pueblo Revolt started on St. Lawrence's Day, Brandtner proposed that this day be a holiday to "signal the beginning of the end of the cultural and historical rape of indigenous Hispanic New Mexico at the hands of its sworn racial and ethnic enemies whose genocidal passions are daily fed by a media-sponsored, politically-correct, culturally-diverse ideological and group hatred of everything Spanish and Spanish-American alike."[39]

Brandtner chided the mestizo and *coyote* (half white) Hispanics for enabling the cultural genocide of the *criollo* (pure-blood Spanish person born in the New World). The mestizo Arturo Sandoval and the coyote Mayor Baca conspired, Brandtner wrote, to exclude the New Mexico criollos. Resign as chair of the city's Cuarto Centenario Planning Committee, he demanded of Sandoval. Non-Hispanics allied to the Indians were also doing their part. In a most irreverent plaint, Brandtner asked, "How is it possible that in 1998, the year of the fourth centennial of New Mexico's founding, a group of immigrant Ashkenazic refugees would manage the symbolic takeover of Albuquerque's Civic Plaza with a memorial to their European kin

while the descendants of Albuquerque's Founders and Pioneer Settlers are literally . . . reduced to begging for a symbolic presence in the city of their forefathers?" Indian problems did not stem from the Spanish Conquest, so "those Anglo-Americans, Ashkenazim and Chicanos who support the Pueblos, in their deluded and misguided opposition to a memorial to Gov. Oñate[,] are ensuring that the Indians remain stuck in their delusional state of mind, oblivious to present reality and to the true causes of their present condition. The Pueblos . . . would surely benefit from some true friendship."[40]

"Give us our statue!" demanded an indignant Hispano.[41] In the celebration of Oñate, then, Spanish Americans labored mightily to etch deep boundaries around their Hispano nation, a tendency reinforced by the historical reputation of New Mexico as the harmonious tricultural state, a myth intended to convey friendly relations among Anglos, Hispanics, and Indians, but also a story "whose multiple sides vie for attention" (Freise 2003, 78).[42] The nonnegotiable stance on Oñate inflated the suggestion of an autonomous Hispano people. As Richard P. Quintana propounded, the statue was needed "without native distractions," for this time "it is the turn of the Hispanos."[43] For Santillanes, "This is not about fairness, it's about history, our history, not the rich multi-ethnic history of our state. That is a different work of art" (1998b, A10). "If they want their own statue, I don't care what it is. I won't fight it," she said. "But don't interfere with our culture and our history" (qtd. in Zoretich 1999a, A1). Gene Hill told the Native Americans, "I honor your fire and spirit. Honor mine."[44] Why "clutter up" the Oñate commemoration "with other histories?" asked one Tony Romero.[45] "If you wish to honor Ácoma or any other Pueblo by all means do so," Sálaz allowed. "But please remember that they are a distinct people who can celebrate perhaps a millennium in . . . whatever it was that they used to refer to what we now call New Mexico."[46] In the anniversary celebration, "Oñate and our ancestors are the only guests of honor," Hispanic organizations emphasized.[47] History could not be erased or changed. "It is time we honor our culture. It is time we recognize (the Ácomas) cannot come to our city and tell us that we cannot acknowledge our proud history" (qtd. in Chunn 1999a, A1).

"How is it possible to have a New Mexico without its founding governor?" an incredulous Brandtner queried. "If you kill Gov. Oñate, you kill New Mexico, for without him there is no New Mexico. Without New Mexico's founding governor, there is no Anglo New Mexico and there is no Indian New Mexico."[48] However, in hard-line Indian memory, "New Mexico" holds no value; it is "a totally artificial construct," one contributor deemed.

The Pueblos "were here long before the various immigrant colonizers drew their boundaries; these borders have little to do with our own world view," said Conroy Chino.[49]

The Indian narrative was thus defiantly sustained on the "moral high ground of the past" (Rhea 1997, 25) by the remembrance of their ancestors' prior presence on the land. "Honoring the so-called colonizers is an insult to the scores of Pueblos that already existed in New Mexico at the time the Europeans arrived," said Conroy Chino. "Native people had settled this land hundreds, perhaps thousands of years before any Spanish colonist set foot here." The idea that Oñate ushered in a cornucopia of cultural benefits was trumped by the argument that the Pueblos already had "sophisticated dams and irrigation systems in place for farming, that captured the fascination of early Spaniards. Pueblo people had domesticated animals, raised crops, lived in harmony with the land, had government, established religions, put ceremonies in place, and homes and communities firmly built." While Spanish Americans heralded their brave, hardy colonists, the Indian interpretation relegated *them* to disorder and insignificance, for history had recorded that "whatever dreams Oñate had for a 'New Spain' vanished. In its place stood a barren and impoverished colony, a handful of Spaniards and an overwhelming Pueblo majority." Indeed, the settlers would not have survived had the Pueblos not extended a hand. As Darva Chino argued, the sculpture needed something to represent this fact, such as "an Hispanic other than Oñate getting food and water from Native Americans."[50]

Citing a history book, San Juan Puebloan Elena Ortiz wrote in an *Albuquerque Journal* article that most of the crops called imports were already being used by Indians. The Spanish "did not 'introduce' the crops listed by [Ruben] Sálaz. They merely came along with the conquistadors as they rampaged throughout the southwest searching for gold" (1998, A11). The Spanish came not in peaceful exploration and spiritual mission, but in a "greedy violent colonization which led to the deaths of many native people who stood in their path." True, the natives of New Mexico may have fared better than many east coast tribes, but "are we really supposed to be thankful for the lesser of two evils?" Ortiz railed at the idea of Christianity as a saving Spanish contribution, a religion "whose followers enslaved, mutilated, co-opted, converted and attempted to genocidally destroy an entire nation of people." Given that the Pueblos were forced, under threat of death, to accept Catholicism, Ortiz asked, "Was the Pueblo Revolt merely a temper tantrum?" What Sálaz called the "atrocity" of the 1680 Revolt was "the first successful fight for religious freedom on this continent." Echoing *Surviving Columbus*, she argued that the Pueblos "would not give up their culture, and religion was the reason why the pueblo people exist and thrive to this day. To attribute that fact to the benevolence of the Spanish is both insulting and misleading."

In claiming the land as theirs before arrival of the conquistadors, Mexicans, or Anglos, the underground vandals of the bronze Oñate at Alcalde scoffed at the idea of positive Spanish institutions, recalling that "Indians were forced to work in the mines, plant crops and build Roman Catholic missions" ("Statue Foot Shown" 1998, A6). One terrible arrow hit on the vaunted Nuevomexicano land struggle. "Today, we hear cries of theft and racism by a large part of the Hispanic population when they address Spanish land grants and Anglo settlement and issues related to the disparities between Anglos and Hispanics," one critic said. "Opening the history on Oñate should allow us to open the history books and evaluate them honestly. If we do so, then the hollowness of the Hispanic argument that Anglos stole their land becomes apparent. The Hispanics stole it from the Acomas and other pueblos and, in the process, committed unspeakable crimes."[51]

"No one is denying that the Indians were here first," Millie Santillanes countered, "but the propaganda spread by Conroy Chino that the Spanish destroyed a peaceful, harmonious society, living in a productive land, is just not reality. Why was Ácoma built on top of a rock which did not even have water? . . . [T]o protect themselves from the aggression of other tribes. It was not the Spanish who brought slavery, brutality, and inhumanity to this land, it was here well before the Spanish arrived" (1998a, A13). The claim of the region's various tribes warring with each other prior to the Spanish intrusion was apparently not answered by anyone representing Native American remembrance in this issue.

Cast in a supporting role, Chicanos shared in the repertoire of Native American remembrance, but they took the opportunity to insert their distinct historical paradigm. Thus, whereas it suited Indian opposition to a European power to accept the claim of a Spanish culture in New Mexico, the Chicanos fell back on their classic critique of Spanish American identity as false consciousness, invoking the defense mechanism explanation popularized in the 1930s and 1940s by Arthur Campa and Carey McWilliams. "The reason for the Hispanic denial of being Mexican is because of the white racism and discrimination against half-breeds and Indians," said Chicano movement veteran Carlos Cansino. While Indians and Spanish Americans drew boundaries around themselves, Chicanos, in their mestizo interpretation of history, pushed intermixing. Cansino said the settlers of New Mexico were not Spaniards, "most of the Spanish soldiers [being] Mexican born and [bringing] with them their Indian wives and their mestizo chil-

dren."[52] According to Jeanne Cauna of the Southwest Organizing Project, after the Spanish "wove their way north from Mexico into what is now New Mexico, they mixed with indigenous women[,] and a mestizo culture, the Chicano people, were born." Rather than being Spanish gilded, Cauna's homeland nation was defined by its legacy of resistance: "Many of the traditional people of New Mexico do not view our state as simply one of fifty in a political union but as our homeland. By understanding our history we have protected our homeland against the many colonizing forces we have faced over the last 400 years" (Cauna 1998).

However, Native American activists keenly upheld their sociocultural and historical boundaries, and so Chicano convergence in the present had less to do with blood merger than with intergroup alliance. This was especially keynoted by the leadership of Arturo Sandoval and Darva Chino, whose joint statement "Convergence of Two Worlds" stressed cooperation, not *mestizaje* (DellaFlora 1998a). Chicanos viewed the prize in terms of alliance with the Indians on the Oñate battlefield. "What's more important than the monument is the underlying ability that it gives Native American peoples and Hispanic people in the city to meet together and discuss issues that are important to them," Sandoval stated (qtd. in DellaFlora 1998i, A7). "It's taken many years to get where we are with pueblo communities and tribal communities in New Mexico," Cauna observed, only to be threatened by the "disservice" of the Spanish Americans (qtd. in DellaFlora 1998e, A1).

Chicanos lit up the postmodernism that Spanish Americans were prone to loathe. "Millie Santillanes has given us a tremendous gift by making the choice clear," planning committee member Margaret Barela declared, "either to look back and choose someone as a hero that was a butcher, or look forward and declare what we are as brothers and sisters in a multi-cultural society" (qtd. in Chunn 1999d, A1). Columnist José Armas antagonized the Spanish view as elitist and bigoted, and he joined the "real leaders throughout the state who have a more inclusive, humanistic and historically accurate perspective of New Mexico's Cuartocentenario" (1998, D1). The syndicated columnists Roberto Rodríguez and Patricia Gonzales believed "that a day of prayer, reflection and healing ceremonies among friends, neighbors and people who disagree with each other is necessary to begin healing the memories" (1998, A13).

Spanish Americans responded. "[O]ur ethnicity was determined by what our grandmothers taught us," Santillanes lectured Armas. "We were Spanish Americans. Never, never, never did our families tell us that culturally we were Indian." The Chicanos were outsiders. The Texas native Armas, she declared, was "our Chicano apostle, preach[ing] his philosophy of oppression with a fervor that rivals the finest of fire-and-brimstone preachers. Do not be misled. . . . He is not alone. . . . [T]here are many among us working to destroy the pride we feel in our Spanish roots and country" (1998c, B3). One Gilbert Maldonado took on the politics of race. "Armas defines Hispanic people as 'people of color' . . . a definition that is not only incorrect for many Hispanics but is more harmful to Hispanics in general than the discrimination Armas is describing. . . . This erroneous definition of all Hispanics as colored people . . . has created a new level of prejudice that Hispanic-American children will pay for dearly in the future." Armas refused to see that "Hispanics were the first 'white' people of European descent in this country."[53]

Robert D. Martinez called the Chicano "militants" Rodríguez and Gonzales "just plain wrong" in defining *Mexican* as "Indian" or "indigenous" or "mestizo," for it simply meant "a citizen of Mexico." True, New Mexico was part of the Mexican Republic for twenty-five years, but Rodríguez and Gonzales "obviously need to be reminded that this area was part of the Spanish Empire for more than 200 years, so those who choose the label 'Spanish-American' are not denying a thing" (2000, A13). The columnists and others "of their mentality," Martinez continued, were the ones in denial, "from ignorance of their cultural past and heritage. Mexican culture is very Spanish. It is also, of course, very native, but Rodríguez and Gonzales would have one believe that the Spanish contributed almost nothing to Mexican culture. This is simply not so." The Castilian language, architectural forms, and political traditions of Mexico were European in origin. Moreover, "[a]nyone who has traveled to Mexico and really looked at the country knows that it is hardly a racial heaven of equality and mestizaje. . . . Mexicans who hold economic and political power are of Spanish/European descent. And the poor, it is sad to say, are of a more indigenous background." Mexican Americans traveling to Mexico were considered "gringos by our Mexican brethren," Martinez argued. "They do not accept us as their own, rather they see us as interlopers, or long lost cousins who abandoned the family long ago. . . . I believe it's time the denial ends and we embrace Spain once again."

Alongside the hard-line positions, moderate voices weighed in. Both Native Americans and Hispanics had a local historian who tended to emphasize ethnoracial harmony without confronting other points of view. In his column, Joe Sando, of Jemez Pueblo and director of the Institute for Pueblo Indian Studies, looked well on the impress of Catholicism on the Pueblos, a positive contribution illustrated by the fact that all Pueblo communities today retained local parishes and annual commemoration of saints. He cited the heroic colonial cleric Bartolomé de las Casas, who defended

Indian rights. As Spaniards arrived in Pueblo country, "there was always a *paere* [priest] with the main group. There was some mistreatment of natives, but not nearly so harsh as in the saga of Columbus. Juan de Oñate did not create as much havoc as did some others." Not to put this view as dogma, Sando declared, "But the reader must decide" (1998, C1). Sando was one Indian to break down ethnic boundaries by pointing to actual race mixing in the present day. "It's a strong point that we are surviving because of our contact with the Spanish," he wrote. "We have intermixed and many of them are part-Indian, and we are part-Spanish."[54]

The Hispanic regional historian Miguel Encinias offered a non-Chicano version of convergence. His history column stressed the coming together of Spanish and Indian, but rather than deny the block of Spanish culture and identification, he argued against a "unilateral" memorial in favor of one to "celebrate the 400th coalescence" of Spanish and Pueblo (1999, A9). At one of the city council meetings, he took the microphone to proclaim, "We're not fighting against a statue. . . . We're fighting for brotherhood and harmony" (qtd. in Smallwood 1999b, C1).

Other soft-liners acknowledged Spanish transgressions and asked for forgiveness. "We may have been enemies 400 years ago," Father Trujillo conveyed to the Pueblos, "but now our only enemies should be racism, prejudice, and ignorance." The emotions in the Oñate controversy showed Trujillo that "[w]hen there isn't reconciliation, we become prisoners. We become caught in the past." To receive forgiveness was to escape negative history. "I would like to apologize, personally. . . . All cultures are here to stay, like it or not. What are we going to do to live together?" (qtd. in Linthicum 1998a, A1).

A Compromise Resolution?

It was decided to float a bond to help cover the $600,000 cost of the bifocal art work, with the double name *La Jornada* and *Numbe Whageh* (Our Center Place, also known as *The Environment*). The Hispanic Cultural Preservation League (formerly the New Mexico Culture Preservation League) braced for an expected skirmish at the city council session to review this latest model (DellaFlora 1999d, 2000a; Uyttebrouck 2000b). Circle of Voices demanded that the maquette be made available for public observation and continued to protest placing the statue in Tiguex Park. But no confrontations took place at the viewing. People were reportedly "generally impressed." Santillanes praised the "magnificent" portrayal of the Spanish settlers, seeing it as the "pride of the Southwest."[55]

However, the council meeting did prove long and trying. As antagonists faced off from opposite sides of the chamber, the aisle down the middle looked "like a DMZ, occupied only by members of the press lugging cameras, microphones and notepads." Speakers weepingly argued over what happened at Ácoma Pueblo four centuries earlier and at times laid down ugly accusations. In the end, the council approved the statuary, seven to two. On Baca-Hundley's motion, reportedly on Millie Santillanes's recommendation, the council decided to place the work on the property of the neighboring Albuquerque Museum instead of on Tiguex Park. Calling the vote "wonderful," Santillanes "laughed and cried tears of happiness." Conchita Lucero said that children would finally learn about their ancestors. Opponents of the Oñate image held a prayer ceremony in front of the council dais. Darva Chino swore a continued struggle to see that the design include accurate Native American history. Arturo Sandoval considered it a solid victory that the piece would not go to Tiguex, hailing the "wonderful bridging of cultures between Chicanos, Hispanos, and Native Americans," advising that "after more than two years of very intense emotions on both sides, this is a reasonable compromise."[56] Acknowledging the disappointment of many of his allies, he applauded their victory in the democratic process and grassroots action, and he counseled, "Rather than a single Spaniard acting alone, visitors will experience a monument that bears witness to the dynamic—sometimes brutal and always culturally rich—history of New Mexico."[57]

Conclusion

Around the world, conflict about the past can result in people killing others (Irwin-Zarecka 1994, 71). In the United States, however, Race Pride means that history greatly matters to educated ethnoracial segments for whom identity is a paramount vehicle for civic participation. Physical violence against persons did not occur in the Oñate controversy, yet the form and intensity of the debate suggest a ligamentary connection between its rhetoric of emotions and the violent points of reference in the past. As Race Pride arose, it initiated memory conflict to redress historical violence. Each protracted argument between rivaling communities of memory was in a sense an extension of the historical violence about which the groups presently contended. Just as partisans in actual violence will differ in their purposes and interpretations of the war, so did the Native and Spanish Americans strategize to place the historical violence that they shared in memory within distinct frames of civic and moral significance.

Participants in the controversy claimed that an objective look at history

would reveal the truth. But clearly, collective memory, if angry in particular, is selective remembrance shaped preeminently by group loyalty. Differing outlooks on the same facts served to mobilize the civic warlords and foot soldiers of the present. Spanish Americans imagined their historical heritage that of New Mexico itself, for their presumptive ancestors once dominated the region. This view violated the heritage of resistance that Native Americans and Chicanos had been forging. The latter groups' vivid histories demanded dislodgement of the symbols of conquest from the state's overarching cultural framework. If the ultimate meaning of the violence at Ácoma concerned the sovereign ownership of the literal terrain that the Spanish sought to capture under the rubric *Nuevo México*, the fundamental prize in the contemporary conflict lay in controlling a parallel terrain, the discourse that grants the right to determine how New Mexico's cultural history will be publicly represented.

So who won the great civic battle over Oñate? Irwin-Zarecka feels that the final analysis of memory disputes, concerning the extent to which existing ways of remembrance are affected or changed, requires a long-term historical approach (1994, 70). Rhea finds that immediate change can happen, as in the challenge that resulted in "a complete interpretive transformation of the Custer Battlefield" (1997, 30). Perhaps there are stalemates. Thus, the Spanish Americans originally requested a modest $16,000 piece but came out of the battle with a massive figurative montage, their hero figure of Juan de Oñate at its head, and a major Native American artistic counterpart was also extracted.

However, the war of remembrance and status involving Spanish Americans, Native Americans, and Chicanos has been on for four decades and is not yet over. In 1999, the New Mexico Statuary Hall Commission created a nonprofit to raise funds for a statue of Popé for the national capitol (B. Smith 1999). The Popé debate had a brief renewal. When one Spanish American called him an Adolf Hitler, a Picurís Pueblo native suggested George Washington as the more apt comparison.[58] In September 2005, a marble Popé by San Juan artist Cliff Fragua was finally unveiled in the U.S. capitol's Statuary Hall. The occasion seemed a vanquishing of the Spanish. U.S. senator Jeff Bingaman proclaimed in his speech that Popé's "victorious struggle against those who sought to tear apart the people of New Mexico's pueblos, ensured that the culture, tradition and religion of those people would remain as strong and vibrant as it is [*sic*] today" (qtd. in Linthicum 2005, A1).[59] Meanwhile, the question remains in relation to Albuquerque's Oñate dispute: What significance does its final statuary hold for New Mexico's cultural sense of self? The next chapter will address this question.

Council member had left with her husband for southern California in the 1950s. Her husband became extremely wealthy as an executive of a steel company. As an illustration of her continued ties to the area, she requested that her funeral be held in the St. Francis Cathedral in Santa Fe and that she be buried in a local cemetery. When she passed away in March 2002, it was found that she also bequeathed two hundred thousand dollars to the cathedral to pay for an elaborate new baptismal font, of which council members are extremely proud.

9. In a study of the Taos Fiesta, Sylvia Rodríguez provides a brief glimpse of how this event, too, has become symbolic of a homecoming for Hispano returnees. A *taoseña* herself, she describes her own nostalgic homecoming to Taos for its fiesta. She and fellow members of the Northern New Mexican Club—a group of fellow Nuevomexicanos "living in the urban wilderness of Los Angeles"—rode on a float during the event's Historical/Hysterical Parade (1988, 42). Although the Taos Fiesta may powerfully symbolize "home" for displaced taoseños, the Santa Fe Fiesta provides a homecoming for a broader regional group of northern New Mexicans because of its enacting of the origin myth of this homeland site.

10. The complaint that "fiestas aren't what they used to be" is also routine among old-timer native Hispano Santa Feans, who frequently use this opening as an opportunity to complain further about changes in the city. Such a complaint may be read not only as referential but also as performative in opening up a space in which native Hispano Santa Feans can lay claim to an authoritative idea of what the fiesta "really" is.

Chapter 9. "History Hits the Heart": Albuquerque's Great Oñate Battle, 1997–2005

1. Santillanes 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Albuquerque Founder's Day Inc., Hispanic Anti-Defamation League of New Mexico, members of the Hispanic Genealogical Research Center, and the Hispanic Round Table to Jim Baca, Alan B. Armijo, and All City Councillors, 13 March 1998, Albuquerque Arts Board Documents (hereafter AABD).

2. For the details of this chronology, see http:// www.transformcolumbusday.org.

3. Gene Hill to Albuquerque Arts Board (hereafter AAB), 16 March 1998, AABD; interview, Sálaz 2005.

4. "Four Hundred Yrs. Ago... in 1598," *Oñate Cuartocentenario, 1598–1998* (newsletter) 1 (February 1997); Millie Santillanes to José L. Rodríguez, chairman, AAB, 19 May 1997, AABD.

5. In *The Oñate Cuartocentenario, 1598–1998* newsletter, see, "Statewide Meeting a Success," 7–8 (August–September 1977); "Four Hundred Yrs. Ago . . . in 1598," 1 (February); "La Cultura Hispana," 2 (March 1977); "Our Goal," 1 (April 1977).

6. Conroy Chino to Gordon Church, 19 December 1997, AABD.

7. Marc Simmons, Open Letter, 5 January 1998, AABD.

8. Luis Brandtner de Cásares to [Cuarto Centenario Project Planning Committee chair], 23 December 1997, AABD.

9. Members of Albuquerque Founder's Day Inc. and the Hispanic Genealogical Research Center to members of the AAB, 8 February 1998, AABD.

10. Members of Albuquerque Founder's Day Inc., the Hispanic Anti-Defamation League of New Mexico, the Hispanic Genealogical Research Center, and the Hispanic Round Table to Jim Baca, Alan B. Armijo, and all city councillors, 13 March 1998, AABD. See also DellaFlora 1998d, 1998e, 1998j.

11. DellaFlora and Smallwood 1999; Sandoval 1999; Sandoval and Chino 1999; Smallwood 1999a, 1999b, 1999c; Arturo Sandoval, press release, "Solidarity Rally at Noon in Tiguex Park, This Friday," 5 March 1999, AABD; Ysaura Bernal, e-mail distribution, 3 March 1999.

12. Chunn 1999d; DellaFlora 1999d; Anne Cooper to *Albuquerque Journal*, 17 December 1999, A23; "Arts Board" 1999, A22; Zoretich 1999a.

13. "Panel's Vision" 1999, A1, A6; Barela and Aragon 1999, A15, also signed by Ron Shutiva, Felice Lucero, Ron Martinez, Diane Reyna, Ed Ordonez, Pete Pena, and John Garcia, as well as committee facilitators Roberto Chene, Merida Blanco, and Kathy Sanchez.

14. Chunn 1999c; DellaFlora 1999c; Arturo Sandoval, e-mail distributions, 3 March 2005 and 1 April 2005.

15. Nora Naranjo-Morse, fax distribution (Box Pack Mail), 25 June 1999; DellaFlora 1999g; Uyttebrouck 2000a.

16. Circle of Voices 1999; "Group Set" 1999, D1; DellaFlora 1999c, 1999i.

17. Author's field notes.

18. Conroy Chino to Gordon Church, 19 December 1997, AABD; Hummels 1998a; Chunn 1999a; Zoretich 1999b.

19. The symposium took place 20 November 1998, Albuquerque City Council Chambers. Excerpts from Chino's remarks are from a recording made by Sarah Horton.

20. Sálaz to Gordon Church and Albuquerque Arts Council [Board], 16 March 1998, AABD.

21. Marc Simmons, Open Letter, 5 January 1998, AABD.

22. Gene Hill to AAB, 16 March 1998, AABD.

23. Salazar 1998, A13; Ray John de Aragón to *La Herencia del Norte* 21 (March 1999), 6; Linthicum 1998b; Hummels 1998b; Millie Santillanes quoted in staff notes of the AAB meeting, 24 February 1998, AABD.

24. Dan Chavez to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 15 December 1999, C3; Greg Chavez to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 24 March 1999, C2; Sálaz 1998; Santillanes 1998b.

25. Viola Chavez to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 21 January 1998, A9.

26. Gene Hill to AAB, 16 March 1998, AABD.

27. Greg Chavez to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 24 March 1999, C2.

28. José Valdez to *Albuquerque Journal*, 27 February 1998, A15.

29. Marc Simmons, Open Letter, 5 January 1998, AABD.

30. Ray John de Aragón to *Daily Optic* (Las Vegas, N.Mex.), 2 March 1999, 2.

31. Robert Rodriguez to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 24 March 1998, A12.

32. Luis Brandtner to (New Mexico) *Daily Lobo*, 2 December 1998, 4.

33. Staff notes, Albuquerque Cuarto Centenario Committee meeting, 2 February 1998.

34. Ruben Sálaz to Gordon Church and Albuquerque Arts Council, 16 March 1998, AABD; see also Sálaz's (1998) long essay on this topic.

35. Richard P. Quintana to Gordon Church, n.d., AABD.

36. Ray John de Aragón to *La Herencia del Norte* 21 (March 1999), 6.

37. Staff notes of Albuquerque City Council meeting, 4 February 1998, AABD.

38. Luis Brandtner to *Daily Lobo*, 15 April 1999, 4.

39. Luis Brandtner to *Albuquerque Journal*, 29 December 1997, A7.

40. Luis Brandtner to the AAB, 23 February 1998, AABD; staff notes, Albuquerque City Council meeting, 4 February 1998, AABD; Brandtner to *Daily Lobo*, 15 April 1999, 4.

41. Richard P. Quintana to Gordon Church, n.d., AABD.

42. The four hundredth anniversary and the tricultural myth were aligned in "La Cultura Hispana," *The Oñate Cuartocentenario, 1598–1998* (newsletter) 2 (March 1977).

43. Richard P. Quintana to Gordon Church, n.d., AABD.

44. Author's field notes, Albuquerque City Council meeting, 2 February 1998.

45. Tony Romero to *Albuquerque Journal*, 5 April 1998, A16.

46. Ruben Sálaz to Gordon Church and Albuquerque Arts Council, 16 March 1998, AABD.

47. Members of Albuquerque Founder's Day Inc., the Hispanic Anti-Defamation League of New Mexico, the Hispanic Genealogical Research Center, and the Hispanic Round Table to Jim Baca, Alan B. Armijo, and All City Councillors, 13 March 1998, AABD.

48. Brandtner to *Daily Lobo*, 15 April 1999, 4.

49. Don Beaucage to *Albuquerque Journal*, 4 February 1998, A11; Conroy Chino to Gordon Church, 19 December 1997, AABD.

50. Conroy Chino to Gordon Church, 19 December 1997, AABD; Darva Chino quoted in Albuquerque City Council staff notes, 2 February 1998, 2, AABD.

51. Denman Ondelacy to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 9 March 2000, C3.

52. Carlos Espinosa Cansino to *Albuquerque Journal*, 2 February 1998, A5.

53. Gilbert Maldonado to *Albuquerque Tribune*, 12 August 1998, A10.

54. Joe Sando, remarks at the Pueblo Cuartocentenario forum, Indian Pueblo Cultural Center, qtd. in "The Pueblos' Turn" 1998, D1, D2, D3.

55. Darva Chino and Arturo Sandoval to Friends and Allies, e-mail distribution, 13 December 1999; DellaFlora 1999a.

56. All quotations in DellaFlora 2000b, A1, A2, and Potts 2000, A1, A2.

57. Arturo Sandoval to Dear Friends, 20 April 1999, fax, AABD.

58. C. A. Tsosie Jr. to *Albuquerque Journal*, 24 December 2000, B3.

59. The Pueblos changed the spelling of the leader's name from its Spanish derivation "Popé" to "Po'pay," and San Juan Pueblo began the process of changing its name back to its Tewa-language origins.

Chapter 10. Contesting Oñate: Sculpting the Shape of Memory

1. Prospectus, City of Albuquerque Public Art Program, "Capital Implementation Program for the Creation of a Sculptural Memorial Commemorating Spanish Contributions to the Founding of New Mexico, Don Juan de Oñate, the first Governor of New Mexico and the Native American Experience of the Arrival of Oñate and the Colonists," 1998, City of Albuquerque Public Art Program files, Department of Municipal Development.

2. Ibid.

3. *Numbe Whageh*, Nora Naranjo-Morse, director, nine minutes, forty seconds, City of Albuquerque Public Art Program, 2005, videocassette.