CHARLES LUMMIS: SPANISH KNIGHT-ERRANT

by

Benjamin Jason Prior

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University

2023

CHARLES LUMMIS: SPANISH KNIGHT-ERRANT

by Benjamin Jason Prior

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2023

APPROVED BY:

Copyright Page

DEDICATION

I would like to thank my wife, Ashlee for her support and praise during this process. Without her support, I could not have been able to get this done. I also want to thank my children, Matthew, Caidan, and Peyton, for making me the man that I am today. You three are my inspiration for being a better man and a better father. You were there at the beginning of this educational journey, and I am so grateful that you'll be there when this journey is complete. I hope that I am half the inspiration to you that you are to me. Thank you especially to Caidan, who challenged me to take this enormous step and having the faith in me to be able to finish the process. You saw more in me than I did and I hope you see in yourself what I do. The world is yours, go get it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIS	Albuquerque Indian School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Liza Posas, Katlynn Friedman, and the rest of the staff at the Library and Archives of the Autry Museum of the American West. Their assistance in my research was invaluable and I would not have been able to gain the insight into Charles Lummis without their expert guidance and tutelage. The Archives at the Autry are beyond anything that I could imagine and their foresight into providing helpful resources that I had failed to request led me to a much better understanding of Lummis, his work, and contributed to the development of my thesis.

I would also like to thank Christian Rodriguez of the City of Los Angeles and the Charles Lummis home for the first professional conversation about Charles Lummis that I was able to have with a fellow historian. I am so deeply indebted to Christian for his insight into Charles Lummis's life, and the initial three-and-a-half-hour conversation that sparked my interest and provided me with clear direction towards my eventual thesis. Christian's understanding of Charles Lummis is second to none, and I am eternally grateful for his assistance in helping me get to know the Lion of the Southwest.

To Dr. James Ricker, who assumed the role of my Dissertation Chair deep into this process has been absolutely influential in developing a successful thesis, and one that I was not able to disprove through my research. Thank you for your assistance and influence in developing this paper into what it is.

VITA

2014 Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies, Southwestern Assemblies of God University

2020 Master of Arts in History with a Focus on Education, Grand Canyon University

2024 Doctor of Philosophy in History, Liberty University

FIELD OF STUDY

Field of Study: United States History

Studies in the American West

Professor James Ricker

ABSTRACT

Charles Lummis was a complicated and contradictory figure in the American Southwest. He was a classmate of Theodore Roosevelt at Harvard, and later an unofficial advisor to the president in the matter of American Indian issues; He took on the Albuquerque Indian School and helped found the Sequoya League, a group that fought for Indian rights and assisted in the purchase of land for a California tribe after they had been evicted from their home. Charles Lummis was also a major force in cultural preservation, working to save the California missions, through his group, the Landmarks Club. He was a controversial figure in all aspects of his life, making as many enemies as friends. Although largely ignored by many historians, his impact upon the American Southwest and California is still felt in the region today. Since his death in 1928, historians have analyzed his life and work, focusing on aspects such as his Indian rights activism, his cultural preservation work, as well as his tenure as Los Angeles City Librarian. While the scholarship has been limited, the majority has focused on his cultural preservation and Indian activism. However, there is a significant intersection where these two aspects of Lummis's work met and that has not been explored by many researchers. This is especially true when considering Lummis's favorability of the Spanish over the American Indians. He believed that the scholarship about the Spanish conquest of the New World was incorrect, and sought to revise the story of how the Spanish took control over the Americas and the natives that inhabited it. However, Lummis's dedication to the positive Spanish heritage of the American Southwest often stood in contradiction against his activism for the rights of American Indians and the celebration of their cultural history. Charles

Lummis sought ways to celebrate the Spanish legacy in the American Southwest and return the region to a time of romance, heroism and chivalry, much like the fictional Don Quixote.

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

After a brief recovery from a bout of malaria, 25-year-old Charles Lummis prepared for his big journey. He had just accepted a job with the *Los Angeles Times* and had to make the journey from his home in Chillicothe, Ohio to the booming area of Southern California. It was September 1884, and a rail trip from Ohio to California would have been a quick and easy trip. However, Lummis did not plan to take the easy way. For him, walking was the only option to get from Ohio to California. Dressed in a knickerbocker suit and light shoes, he set off for his trek. He had $300, a hunting knife, and had shipped his .44 caliber rifle ahead to Kansas City. After 143 grueling days on foot, he entered the city of Los Angeles and into the history books of the American Southwest. He spent his life writing about the cultures that he experienced on this one journey, fought for the rights of people that he believed could not fight on their own, and worked to save the remnants of the Spanish conquest that had occurred three centuries before Lummis's exploration.

But who was Charles Lummis? Has any work on Charles Lummis accurately presented the complex contradiction that was Lummis's life? Charles Lummis was considered an Indian rights activist, as well as a cultural preservationist for both the American Indian and the Spanish. However, it is the purpose of this dissertation to show that both of these aspects of Lummis's life were contradictory. His love for the Spanish was the stronger of the two and his advocacy for the Spanish far outweighed his love for the American Indian. When the two worlds intersected, Lummis chose to always side with the Spanish. It will be argued that Lummis was a modern knight-errant, akin to the fictional Don Quixote. Like Quixote, Lummis saw a problem and traveled the Southwest

in order to solve said problem. The problem that Lummis perceived was the incorrect telling of Spanish colonial history, an issue that only he himself could remedy. In 1884, Charles Fletcher Lummis had no concept of what his life would become, what impact he would have, nor would he have been able to see what his legacy would be.

After he failed out of Harvard during his finals, Lummis moved to Ohio to live on his father-in-law's farm. He accepted a position with the local newspaper in Chillicothe and found his passion in journalism. Desperate to move west, he made an agreement with the publisher of the *Los Angeles Times,* Harrison Gray Otis to write a weekly column documenting his trip from Ohio to California in exchange for a paycheck and the job of city editor when he arrived in Los Angeles. While on his 143-day cross-country trek, Lummis encountered numerous people that opened his eyes to a world that he could not have experienced in the East. Meeting potential thieves, homeless wanderers, pioneers, and villages of Mexicans and American Indians, Lummis actively worked to become an American that knew his own country, unlike the majority of his fellow Americans.[1] After what he considered an exceptionally boring trip through Illinois, he traveled through Liberty, Missouri, where he met with Frank James, and discussed his criminal enterprises as well as what the famous outlaw had been doing following his criminal days. However, in his documentation of his trip, which he later published in a collection called *A Tramp Across the Continent*, Frank James is a single paragraph side note along with an unfortunate encounter with vagrants and hunting elusive antelope.[2] Lummis's curious documentation of his travels through the American West dedicated more space and

[1] Charles Lummis, *A Tramp Across the Continent*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982, 2.
[2] Lummis, *Tramp*, 9.

colorful descriptions to his experiences hunting antelope and fishing for trout than it did concerning his meeting with the legendary historical figure, Frank James. While this may appear as an oversight, or merely a creative incongruity of a self-described historian, it actually illuminates Lummis's perspective on what he considered the most important aspects of the American West, along with Lummis's tendency to exaggerate or invent aspects of his trip to make it more interesting for his readers, both on the West Coast and in Ohio. According to Lummis, the untouched sections of the frontier represented the best part of the United States. While not unique by any means, this perception of the superiority of an untouched land contrasted greatly with the national mindset of Manifest Destiny and the benefits of constant progress.

Exploring Lummis's experience with his cross-country trek, as well as the change in his own mindset towards Native American tribal people becomes imperative when analyzing his actions in the following decades when he advocated for those same people. While Lummis was walking across the country, the precursors to the Dawes Act continued the forced Americanization of the American Indian that begun concurrently with the nation itself.[3] In Kansas, Lummis visited one such Indian school, modeled after the Carlisle Indian School, and his letter to the *Chillicothe Leader* expressed what he experienced at the school. Lummis referred to the school in a glowing review. He believed it to be the answer to the "Indian Question."[4] As it had since the birth of the United States, the federal government and many Americans saw the American Indian as

[3] United States Congress, "The General Allotment Act," 25 U.S.C. §§ 331-334, 339, 341, 342, 348, 349, 354, 381. 1887. The Dawes Act allowed the federal government to divide reservation land and allot it individually to members of the tribe.

[4] Charles Lummis, *Letters from the Southwest*, Ed. James W. Byrkit, University of Arizona Press, 1989, 19-20.

an impediment to the expansion of the nation. The prosperity of the nation as a whole, required the American Indian to be removed from their lands, and pushed west or outright exterminated. In order to continue to exist, native peoples needed to abandon their traditional ways, faith, and language, giving way to a complete adherence to American societal norms. Lummis, like other Indian rights advocates, was initially supportive of the concept of forced assimilation and the purpose of Indian schools, but soon became engaged in a battle over that same school system. However, while this is how historians have classified Lummis's work and advocacy, the truth is far more convoluted and contradictory, much like the rest of Lummis's life. From the beginning of the nation, federal law had sought to provide the white settlers with more land, increased safety, and better opportunities for expansion. The Spanish had been doing the same in Florida and the American Southwest, but were a full century ahead of the other European nations that would eventually influence the New World. This is why the majority of the established families within the Southwest were of either native or Spanish heritage.

When he arrived in the American Southwest, Lummis met with groups of Mexicans, Spaniards, and Native American tribes such as the Pueblo of New Mexico. Having read previous stories of the Southwest from writers such as Thomas Mayne Reid, Lummis had significant preconceived notions about these cultures that were predominantly negative.[5] It had been written that those groups were lazy people, unworthy of a second glance, and the evidence of this prejudice is apparent in Lummis's account of his walk across the nation, with his first description of the Mexicans of the

[5] Mayne Reid, *The Scalp Hunters; Or, Romantic Adventures in Northern Mexico*, London and Glasgow, Collins' Clear Type Press, 1855.
Mayne Reid, *The White Chief*, London. George Routledge and Sons, 1851.

West as lazy "Greasers" as well as his justification thereof.[6] However, when he was welcomed in amongst the Mexican communities and the Pueblo people, Lummis developed a kinship with them and an appreciation for their culture. He later described his relationship as a lifelong friendship and that he was immediately impressed upon meeting them.[7] It was on his journey where he met Amado Chaves, beginning a love affair with Spanish culture, history, and influence upon the Southwest. His change of perception was evident when he published a complete account of his journey years later, publicly acknowledging the error of his prejudicial beliefs, seeking to correct his words to a national audience.[8]

This new-found cultural appreciation followed him through the Southwest, into Los Angeles. When he suffered a stroke in 1888, he moved back to New Mexico to recover among the Spanish friends that he had made while on his walk, and the people of the Pueblo of Isleta. He lived as one of the Pueblo people, recorded their stories, and documented their culture. In New Mexico, after living amongst the Pueblo people of Isleta, Lummis became involved in the battle over the Indian schools and their forced assimilation of the tribal children. To Lummis, this was a personal attack on friends of his, as well as a criminal racial issue. While he had once approved of the Indian school system's practices of educating the American Indians in order to provide them an opportunity at a better life, his experiences with the people had shown that the education that they were given often segregated them from their tribe, making them outcasts. Lummis also had the opportunity to witness the tactics used by the Albuquerque Indian

[6] Lummis, *Letters*, 96-97.
[7] Lummis, *Tramp*, 93.
[8] Lummis, *Tramp*, 74.

School, both in the means of increasing enrollment and in the treatment of the students and parents.

Lummis published books and articles that celebrated native culture and acknowledged the issues that faced the American Indian tribes, especially in the Southwest. An article from the *Las Vegas Free Press* of Las Vegas, New Mexico, written during the time of Lummis's initial activism, illustrated the conditions that natives faced in the Southwest. "Mr. Charles Lummis says that one rime (time) he was offered a Navajo girl for ten horses. The price of girls has evidently gone up since this writer traveled in that region, for a brave offered us his wife and little 6-year-old girl for a breech-loading shot gun."[9] The concept of the American Indian as less-than-human was not an uncommon sentiment in the United States at the time. Lummis himself possessed prejudiced ideas of the American Indians during his walk across the western United States and continued to hold prejudicial beliefs with respect to certain American Indian tribes throughout his life and career.

Before Lummis's articles and books, the majority of Americans perceived the American Indian as an incredibly primitive being, in desperate need of civilizing. This idea was what gave birth to the practice of forced assimilation of the American Indians into the Eurocentric American cultural identity. The United States, from the moment of the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1783, had informed the American Indians of the supremacy of whites, and this began the official removal of the tribal people from their

[9] "Territorial," *Las Vegas Free Press* (Las Vegas, New Mexico), July 14, 1892, 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn96061021/1892-07-14/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1892&index=0&rows=20&words=Charles+Lummis&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=New+Mexico&date2=1892&proxtext=Charles+Lummis&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

native lands by the United States government.[10] For years, Indian rights groups, such as the Indian Rights Association, had promoted the forced assimilation of American Indian tribes, as they saw it as a better alternative to the previous practice of complete annihilation.[11] The annihilation policy had been so efficacious that by 1890, the population of American Indians had decreased by roughly 95% from its pre-conquest totals.[12] This forced assimilation policy took the form of compulsory education in residential schools for native children. While Lummis was initially a supporter of this Indian school policy, his experiences with the Pueblo people altered his perception on the practice. He realized the dangers of forced assimilation, and following a legal battle with the superintendent of the Albuquerque Indian School, as well as the commissioner of Indian affairs nationwide, Lummis came to the realization that there were numerous ills associated with the Indian school system. He also recognized that there was corruption not only in the school system, but the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a whole that needed remedying. This does not, however, imply that the entire concept of assimilation met with Lummis's condemnation.

This is where many historians have focused on Lummis's work. Lummis has been considered an Indian rights advocate and a cultural preservationist for the American

[10] Horsman, Reginald, "American Indian Policy in the Old Northwest, 1783-1812," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (January 1961): 36.

[11] Benay Blend, "The Indian Rights Association, the Allotment Policy, and the Five Civilized Tribes, 1923-1936," *American Indian Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (1983): 67. When the concept of forced assimilation was developed, Indian rights groups supported it as it would be a better way to preserve the native people than the previous policy of forced removal and death. However, they could not see that the policy would have unintended consequences as shown in (Ahern, Wilbert H. "An Experiment Aborted: Returned Indian Students in the Indian School Service, 1881-1908." *Ethnohistory* 44, no. 2:(1997). 266.)

[12] Ward Churchill, *Kill the Indian, Save the Man*, San Francisco, City Lights Books, 2004, 12. By 1890, it was estimated that the total American Indian population in the United States was approximately 500,000. Donald A. Grinde Jr, "Taking the Indian out of the Indian: U.S. Policies of Ethnocide through Education," *Wicazo Sa Review* 19, no. 2 (2004): 25.

Indians, Mexicans, and the Spanish. Unlike Helen Hunt Jackson's advocacy, Lummis's work was not universal to all American Indians, but specifically those of the American Southwest.[13] Unfortunately, historians have focused on Lummis's work with native tribes like the Pueblos and the Spanish independently. They see both as two sides of the same proverbial coin, but that would assume that everything that Lummis did happened within a vacuum. This is not the case, and needs to be examined more closely. Lummis's support of American Indian tribes and the Spanish were often quite contradictory, nullifying his support of the Pueblo people. What is also vital is understanding the influence that his love of the Spanish had on his advocacy for the American Indian. What effect did Lummis's love of the Spanish have on his advocacy of Native American rights? Though they were different battles, they were ineffably linked, and his support of the Spanish became a self-imposed sacred duty.

As soon as Lummis became involved in journalism, be began to understand the power of print. He leveraged this understanding when he made the deal to trek across the nation for the city editor's position and documented his journey. After he left the *Los Angeles Times* for New Mexico, following a series of strokes, Lummis became a freelance writer and traveled down to Peru briefly. Following his return to Los Angeles, Lummis spent his time utilizing his skills as a writer to increase acknowledgement and preservation of Spanish culture, especially in Southern California. In this time, he published *The Spanish Pioneers*, correcting what he believed were incorrect beliefs about the Spanish conquest of the New World. Lummis believed that the stories of Spanish

[13] Helen Hunt Jackson, *A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Government's Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1881.

cruelty against the native peoples during the conquest and occupation were not only false, but were an afront to the heritage of the Spanish people. In 1894, after six years away from California, Lummis returned and began his role as the editor of the *Land of Sunshine* magazine, which was renamed *Out West* in 1902. As editor, Lummis wrote over 500 pieces for the magazine, not including his monthly commentary called, "In the Lion's Den." It was in this way, along with publishing *Pueblo Indian Folk Stories, Some Strange Corners of Our Country,* as well as newspaper and magazine articles, that Lummis was able to get the stories of the native peoples, including the Pueblos, into the hands of Americans. Lummis also used this platform to share his opinions on major American issues like the Spanish American War.

Along with his work enlightening the masses on the cultures of the native peoples of the Southwest, Lummis formed the Landmarks Club in an effort to save and restore the Spanish missions of California to their former glory. This work became something that consumed his time for the remainder of his life. It also began his personal work promoting the preservation of not merely Native American culture, but Spanish culture as well. Following the assassination of President McKinley in 1901, Lummis dedicated a great deal of time working personally with President Theodore Roosevelt and the federal government on issues that faced different tribes. In order to be able to complete the scope of the work that he knew needed to be done, he joined with other like-minded individuals that would use their knowledge, influence and abilities to positively change federal policy to protect tribal people of the American Southwest. This group, the Sequoya League, was formed and its first battle was a land conflict concerning a group of Mission Indians that

had resided in the same area of California since before the Spanish arrival 400 years prior.

Because of Lummis's activism with the American Indian, he was a relatively frequent visitor to Washington D.C. and the Roosevelt White House. President Roosevelt sought the advice of his former college mate on matters of the American Indian and the Southwest. Not one to ever be inconspicuous, Lummis often stood out among the people of Washington because of his unique corduroy suit. One such visit was reported in *The Evening Star* in 1907.

> Charles Lummis, the author, of the southwest in general and Los Angeles in particular, was one of the President's callers today. Mr. Lummis was arrayed in a tasteful costume of green corduroy, with gold pins in the corners of his collar and a red and green sash around his waist. He had a heavy silver bracelet of Navajo workmanship on his wrist, and wore a big sombrero with a leather band…He said he was seeing the President because Mr. Roosevelt is one of the honorary members of the Archaeological Society, and the southwestern branch, with headquarters in Los Angeles, is putting up what will be one of the finest museums of the sort in the world.[14]

Lummis's visit to the White House was news not because of the purpose of the visit, but Lummis's distinct clothing. The majority of the article was utilized describing Lummis's clothing, and not the specific details about his visit with the president. Despite its lack of specificity, the article did illustrate Lummis's fame nationwide and the notoriety that his written works had earned him.

However, the news of Lummis's visit was not limited to merely the newspapers of the capital. By this point in his career, Lummis had become a national figure, and his

[14] "At the White House," *The Evening Star* (Washington D.C.), June 4, 1907, 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83045462/1907-06-04/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1907&index=0&rows=20&words=costume+Lummis&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1907&proxtext=Lummis+costume&y=26&x=17&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

conspicuousness, ever a part of Lummis's image, was news to those areas outside of his home. As far away as Oregon, newspapers reported on Lummis's visit with President Roosevelt, and as with the *Evening Star*, the news of Lummis's trip was focused mostly upon his clothing and not the details of his visit with the president.

> California sent a brave man to the Capital this week. He is Chas. F. Lummis, a writer on ethnological and archaeological subjects, and in spite of Mr. Roosevelt's complimentary reference to "nature fakirs," he called at the White House. Mr. Lummis produced a small sensation on Pennsylvania Avenue, for he wore a bright green corduroy suit, the corners of his coat collar being fastened to his shirt with gold pins. A richly decorated sombrero added to the dazzling effect.[15]

Though the article, almost verbatim, replicated the *Evening Star's* article, focusing mostly on Lummis's distinct green corduroy suit, it demonstrated how Lummis's writings, his activism, and his outspokenness had spread his fame throughout the nation. Lummis had become a national voice for the American Southwest and for American Indian rights. His development of the Southwest Society, the Landmarks Club, and the Sequoya League had also earned the attention of the president and brought to the federal government ideas and policies to further his activism.

Lummis was able to use his magazine to promote the Sequoya League, and there was no better advertisement for the effectiveness of the new group than success in assisting a California tribe find a new home. For this reason, he and the Sequoya League worked with the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to reach an agreement in the case of the Cupeño tribe that was being evicted from the land known as Warner's Ranch outside of San Diego, California. Lummis and the league understood

---

[15] "Gossip from the Capital," *Daily Capital Journal* (Salem, Oregon), June 14, 1907, 6. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn99063957/1907-06-14/ed-1/seq-6/#date1=1907&index=0&rows=20&words=House+Lummis+white&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1907&proxtext=Lummis+White+House&y=13&x=19&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

how to leverage their influence with the government to get what they desired. Their goal was to secure a new plot of land for the Cupeños. They desired a plot that was not only sufficient for what the tribe needed, but was also superior to the land that they were leaving and the land that the federal government had already found for them. While the league was able to procure an objectively better parcel of land for the Cupeños, the problem remained of the tribe being unwilling to relocate to their new home.

Immediately following his work with the Cupeños, Lummis and the Sequoya League became involved with the Hopi tribe in Keam's Canyon, Arizona over the supposed abuses allowed by the local Indian agent, Charles Burton. The primary issue was not only over Burton himself, but also concerning the enforcement of a nationwide haircut policy that had been brutally enforced by the subordinates of said Indian agent. Lummis had accused the Indian agent, as well as a teacher of gross negligence, abuse, and ineptitude. Unlike the issue with the Cupeños, the Sequoya League did not have the same level of success with the Hopi case, and it permanently damaged Lummis's reputation with the president and the rest of Washington DC. This was Lummis's third round personally engaging in Native American issues. It was also his last for another twenty years. Lummis spent the majority of that time engaged in various jobs, as well as developing and executing the Southwest Museum of the American Indian close to his own home.

If Charles Lummis was such a powerful name in the fight for Native American rights in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it poses the question as to why there is so little written about him as opposed to his contemporaries. He was certainly famous in his own time, and his impact was felt throughout the American Southwest,

especially Los Angeles, that still celebrates Lummis Day every year. He had numerous prominent friends including Theodore Roosevelt and John Muir, and yet very few people today have ever heard of him, including professors within the discipline of American history. Lummis was eccentric, braggadocious, and typically the most interesting man in the room, especially in his own mind. He is still spoken about as a hero by the Pueblo people of Isleta, amongst whom he lived and defended. In contrast, his name conjures strong feelings of animosity within the Cupeño tribe to this day due to the blame of their relocation being largely placed on Lummis himself. However, his name has all but been forgotten amongst mainstream Americans as well many historians. For all of the things that one can say about his fame, his writing, and his eccentricities, the most important endeavor that he undertook was working to preserve the cultural heritage of the American Southwest. Lummis was constantly worried that this regional culture was at risk of dying out and being forgotten, and he fought to preserve it, despite not having a background in ethnography. "Lummis had no formal training in archaeology but saw the study of Southwestern antiquities as a complement to the other strategies he used for constructing a Southwestern identity."[16]

During his early years in the Southwest, Lummis successfully made a name for himself as a writer, historian, and ethnologist, despite no concrete training in the latter two. During the recuperation period from his series of strokes, the works that he wrote became nationally recognized and made him famous as a man who knew and understood the people, history, and beauty of the American Southwest. Reviews of his work were largely positive, and his outspokenness and vibrant lifestyle made him a true character of

[16] James E. Snead, "Lessons of the Ages: Archaeology and the Construction of Cultural Identity in the American Southwest," *Journal of the Southwest* 44, no. 1 (Spring 2002): 20.

the American West. In 1892, *The Morning Call* featured an article on Lummis, exposing the popularity of his writings and the general opinion of the writer.

> Charles Fletcher Lummis, the young traveler and author of the great Southwest, has sprung into sudden and widespread favor through numerous interesting sketches that have appeared in the various leading periodicals…During the past few years Mr. Lummis' work has gained a popular place in the leading magazines. His facile pen appears to be equally pleasing and potent either in stories for children, or food for geographers and scientists.[17]

Lummis made a name for himself by presenting the Southwest to a nation by which it had largely been ignored. Yet today, few people remember Lummis or his contribution to the development of the American Southwest that exists today.

In the late nineteenth century, much of America desired, at the very least, to push the American Indian tribes to the most destitute pieces of land in the country and force American culture upon them. At most, they wished to completely eradicate them from history and the present. During this same period, Lummis stood, along with the Sequoya League, pushing against the tide of American progress in order to preserve people, cultures, and history that he deemed not only important to the respective people, but to the better understanding of America as a whole. While the tribal people still share stories of him, were he and the Sequoya League truly Indian rights activists? At the same time that he was working to preserve American Indian culture, he was also working to preserve the cultural heritage of the Spanish in the American Southwest. This same heritage often conflicted with American Indian rights, yet his support of the Spanish never wavered.

---

[17] "A Popular Writer: Sketch of the Successful," *The Morning Call* (San Francisco), June 26, 1892, 15. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn94052989/1892-06-26/ed-1/seq-15/#date1=1892&index=6&rows=20&words=POPULAR+WRITER&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=California&date2=1892&proxtext=A+Popular+Writer&y=10&x=15&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Scholars in the past have completed extensive research on Lummis and his works, focusing on his addition to the cultural history of the American Southwest, specifically Los Angeles and California as a whole. Other scholars have chosen to examine and analyze Lummis's impact on literary history with his written works. Still others have argued that Lummis was an Indian rights activist. Where this research differs from others' work on the subject, is that it will not merely provide a biographical account of his life and work in the American Southwest. Instead, this paper will explore the intersection between Lummis's Native American advocacy and his advocacy for the Spanish. It is the purpose of this paper to understand how Lummis's love for the Spanish culture and heritage affected his support of American Indian tribes and how he became a knight-errant for the Spanish crown. Was Charles Lummis truly an Indian rights activist? Can he be considered an advocate when his support of the Spanish contradicted his support of native rights, autonomy, and self-governance? How did Lummis's personal preferences and prejudices affect his advocacy? This is especially poignant with respect to the Pueblos, his beliefs on forced assimilation, and his own words on the altruistic nature of the Spanish conquest of the American Southwest.

Previous historians have missed the connection between the American Indian and the Spanish, as well as the contradictions that were clearly apparent in his work, which is where this paper diverts from previous scholarship. Charles Lummis published numerous books celebrating the cultures of the Spanish and American Indian. Through his magazine, *Out West*, he was able to reach people on a monthly basis, pushing for the conservation of native cultures and the preservation of the Spanish identity of the entire Southwest, particularly Southern California. Was his work increasing the cultural

appreciation of American Indian tribes negated by his beliefs concerning the Spanish conquest? These are important to understand because it would forever change how we research Charles Lummis, and his effect on the cultural identity of the American Southwest.

From the moment that Charles Fletcher Lummis embarked upon his 143-day journey from Chillicothe, Ohio to Los Angeles, California on September 11, 1884, he established himself as a noteworthy individual in his own right. He had been a newspaper reporter, but this trip made him a significant part of the history and culture of the American Southwest. This is partly because he chose to walk the 3,507 miles to Los Angeles instead of taking the train or a stagecoach, and the other was due to the relationships that he had formed along the journey, including Native American tribal peoples, of whom he would later work to protect.[18] While the man was renowned during his life, his legacy has faded significantly. Since his death in 1928, the scholarship that has focused on him has been relatively diverse in nature, with the majority focused primarily with respect to his effect upon the cultural protection of Native Americans, and how his influence affected the cultural identity of the Los Angeles area. Also, much of the literature on Lummis has been overwhelmingly positive in nature, bordering on promotional, with limited critical reviews of his life and works. However, there have been a pittance of complete biographical additions to the scholarship of Lummis,

[18] Lummis, *Tramp*, 2. Though a rough estimate of Lummis's journey measures just over 2,200 miles today, this estimation was made by Lummis following his journey. He had used a rudimentary pedometer along the way, and while he generally followed along the railroad tracks, he often ventured off-course. These side excursions generally consisted of hunting trips, opportunities to fish for trout, or in the case of his time in Colorado, hiking up Pike's Peak.

including a collection of five books and a brief biographical sketch in *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* in March, 1950.[19]

Charles Lummis's legacy is primarily centered around his experience and work in protecting, celebrating, and preserving the life and culture of the American Indian and the Spanish. This aspect of his life has been researched and written on extensively. In a work following Lummis's death, Henry Edmund Earle reminisced about Lummis in "An Old-Time Collector: Reminiscences of Charles F. Lummis." In the story, Earle recounted a meeting with Lummis and the cultural importance of Lummis's home in Los Angeles, El Alisal.[20] Two years later, in a 1944 issue of *The Quarterly: Historical Society of Southern California*, another article explored Lummis's experience with the Sequoya League. Exploring more of Lummis's work with Native Americans, Frances Watkins in "Charles Lummis and the Sequoya League," analyzed his work with the Sequoya League and the issue of the loss of homes for the Missions Indians from the Warner Ranch in San José, California. In the article, Watkins explained how Lummis and the Sequoya League fought for the Missions Indians after the Supreme Court ruled that their ancestral land at Rancho Valle de San José belonged to the white owners of Warner's Ranch. Watkins focused on the work that Lummis and the league did to secure a 2,370-acre tract in order to relocate the tribal members from the ranch.[21] In a biographical article for *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly*, Marco Newmark provided a brief account of the life and major events therein of Charles Lummis, titled, "Charles Fletcher

[19] Marco Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1950): 45–60.
[20] Henry Edmond Earle, "An Old-Time Collector: Reminiscences of Charles F. Lummis," *California Folklore Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (1942): 179–83.
[21] Frances E. Watkins, "Charles F. Lummis and the Sequoya League," *The Quarterly: Historical Society of Southern California* 26, no. 2/3 (1944): 108.

Lummis."[22] Focusing specifically on the written work of Lummis following his departure from the *Los Angeles Times* and his recovery from a stroke, Edwin Bingham's *Charles Lummis: Editor of the Southwest* analyzed how Lummis's magazine *Out West* impacted the conception of the American Southwest.[23]

Dudley Gordon is the most prolific scholar on Lummis, having composed six different works on the man, focusing on Lummis's effect on Los Angeles. As opposed to Bingham, Gordon took an alternative view of Lummis's work, choosing to focus on the cultural additions to the city of Los Angeles, and is the most promotional towards Lummis's life and work. In his first work on Lummis, "El Alisal: The House that Lummis Built," Gordon evaluated the cultural facet in the building of Lummis's house, El Alisal.[24] Six years later, Gordon followed the work with "Charles Fletcher Lummis: Cultural Pioneer of the Southwest". In the article, Gordon focused on Lummis's cultural additions to the city, including the Southwest Museum of the American Indian as well as his hiring as the librarian of the Los Angeles Public Library. His work with the Los Angeles Library included the acquisition of a collection of Spanish American resources and making the fledgling library one of the foremost libraries in the United States.[25] Gordon continued his work, examining the relationship between Lummis and author Jack London in his brief article, "Charles F. Lummis and Jack London: An Evaluation."[26] He followed this study into the work of Lummis in preserving culture with "Charles F.

---

[22] Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," 45-60.
[23] Edwin R. Bingham, *Charles Lummis: Editor of the Southwest*, San Marino, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1955.
[24] Dudley Gordon, "El Alisal: The House That Lummis Built." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1953): 19–28.
[25] Dudley Gordon, "Charles Fletcher Lummis, Cultural Pioneer of the Southwest," *Arizona and the West* 1, no. 4 (1959): 313.
[26] Dudley Gordon, "Charles F. Lummis and Jack London: An Evaluation," *Southern California Quarterly* 46 no. 1 (1964): 83-88.

Lummis: Pioneer American Folklorist." This article examined Lummis's recordings of wax cylinders with traditional Spanish and Pueblo folk songs in order to preserve them.[27] Focusing once again on Lummis's writings, "California's First Half-Century of Statehood, 1850-1900," Gordon assessed the impact of Lummis's written works, from his books to his articles in *Out West*.[28] The following year, this he completed his biography of Lummis and bemoaned the lack of attention that the life of Lummis had received in previous scholarship titled, *Crusader in Corduroy.* In the book, Gordon focused primarily on Lummis's work in California, limiting the attention paid to his time in New Mexico during his recovery from his stroke that prompted the move.[29]

The writings of Charles Lummis have been the focus of many scholars, as well as his time spent working in the Los Angeles City Library. In "Travel, Exoticism, and the Writing of the Region: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the 'Creation' of the Southwest." Martin Padget made the argument that from the moment that Lummis arrived in the Southwest, he had begun "mapping a new cultural geography of the Southwest."[30] Benjamin Sacks also focused on Lummis's writings with the purpose of preserving Native American and Spanish culture throughout San Diego, California.[31] In "Charles Fletcher Lummis at Hotel del Coronado: The Spanish Fiesta, Spring 1894," Sacks analyzed and praised the work of Lummis at the Spanish fiesta on Coronado Island in San Diego, in which Lummis had attempted to raise a national audience who he could

---

[27] Dudley Gordon, "Charles F. Lummis: Pioneer American Folklorist," *Western Folklore* 28, no. 3 (1969): 175-81.
[28] Dudley Gordon, "California's First Half-Century of Statehood, 1850-1900," *Southern California Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (1971): 133-46.
[29] Dudley Gordon, *Charles F. Lummis: Crusader in Corduroy,* Los Angeles, Cultural Assets Press, 1972.
[30] Martin Padget, "Travel, Exoticism, and the Writing of Region: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the 'Creation' of the Southwest," *Journal of the Southwest* 37, no. 3 (1995): 423.
[31] Benjamin Sacks, "Charles Fletcher Lummis at Hotel Del Coronado: The Spanish Fiesta, Spring 1894." *Southern California Quarterly* 78, no. 2 (1996): 139–74.

educate on the histories of the Pueblo people, some of whom he had brought to the event, and the Spanish culture.

In his Master's thesis, "Charles Fletcher Lummis: Los Angeles City Librarian," Daniel Blitz explored Lummis's time as the Los Angeles city librarian and the effect that he had on building the library into one of the most prolific libraries in the United States.[32] One doctoral dissertation that examined the works of Charles Lummis was Joseph Staples's work, "Constructing 'the *Land of Sunshine*': Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Marketing of a Post-frontier West." Staples's work studied Lummis's effect on the American literary tradition and the cultural representation of the American West.[33] One final biographical work on Lummis was by Marc Simmons, *Charles F. Lummis: Author and Adventurer*, which included a previously unpublished work on the friendship between Charles Lummis and Amado Chaves, with whom Lummis lived in San Mateo, New Mexico while convalescing from a stroke. After leaving New Mexico, Lummis and Chaves continued a correspondence for years that served as the basis for Simmons' work, both on the two men and the American Southwest.[34] A mere nine years after Lummis's death, his daughter, Turbesé wrote the first biographical sketch of Lummis on her personal typewriter. This eventually served as the primary source material for her joint venture with her brother, Keith, in what would become *Charles Fletcher Lummis: The Man and His West.*

[32] Daniel Frederick Blitz, "Charles Fletcher Lummis: Los Angeles City Librarian," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Los Angeles, 2013.
[33] Staples, Joseph P, "Constructing 'the *Land of Sunshine'*: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Marketing of a Post-frontier West," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, 2004.
[34] Marc Simmons, *Charles F. Lummis: Author and Adventurer,* New Mexico: Sunstone Press, 2008.

A central aspect of Lummis's life in the American Southwest was the time that he spent in New Mexico, both with Amado Chaves and with the people of the Pueblo of Isleta. This trip to New Mexico served two important purposes in Lummis's life. First, it cemented his love of the Spanish history of the New World, with his fascination of the old-world aristocratic families and the dons who held power. It was also the primary impetus of his desire for the preservation of native cultures, having lived as a part of the Isleta Pueblo tribe for approximately three years. Having been looked upon with trepidation at first, Lummis earned the trust of the tribe and spent the three years learning their history, folk stories, and culture. This experience was documented in Patrick and Betsy Houlihan's *Lummis in the Pueblos*. Of the many articles exploring this section of Lummis's life, as well as his work with the Isleta Pueblo people is, "The Tasks of Southwestern Translation: Charles Lummis at Isleta Pueblo, 1888-1892." In the article, Audrey Goodman made the argument that Charles Lummis's translation of Pueblo folk stories bridged a translation gap that had existed between Anglo translators and the native communities of the American Southwest. The paper focused not only on the published Pueblo folk stories that Lummis translated, but also his unpublished work, journals, and correspondences with the intent of showing the difficulties that Lummis faced in his translation of native stories that could appeal to an Anglo audience.[35] With Lummis's journey to California and his appreciation of the cultures he encountered along the way being a major aspect of his life and story, scholarship focusing on it has become a primary focus for understanding his actions. Jason Pierce dedicated Chapter 4 of his

[35] Audrey Goodman, "The Tasks of Southwestern Translation: Charles Lummis at Isleta Pueblo, 1888-1892," *Journal of the Southwest* 43, no. 3 (2001): 344.

book, *Making the White Man's West* to Lummis, focusing on his and Frank Bird Linderman's individual journeys across the American West.[36]

Not every work on Charles Lummis has been focused on his work with Native Americans, Spanish, Mexicans, or literature. In 1911, the *Los Angeles Tribune* reported that Charles Lummis had gone blind. Having suffered a debilitating stroke in 1888, Lummis's blindness was a noteworthy occurrence. However, it was his miraculous recovery that truly made the medical condition remarkable. In their article, "The Curious Blindness of Charles F. Lummis," for *Arch Ophthalmology*, Curtis Margo, Lynn Harman, and Don Smith explored the possible cause for Lummis's blindness and his recovery. Differential diagnoses have claimed a possible psychosomatic cause, but the article came to the possible diagnosis based on unchanged handwriting during his purported blindness, that Lummis was feigning his blindness all along.[37]

Because much of Lummis's work centered around his time spent with the people of the Pueblo of Isleta, it is important to understand the history of the Isleta Pueblo tribe and the historiography of the people that inspired Lummis's work so significantly. This is especially important when measured against Lummis's own account of their history in *The Spanish Pioneers*. His first work of activism in support of the Isleta Pueblo people in particular was his work with the Albuquerque Indian School, so an examination into his work concerning federal Indian policy in the United States as well as the federal Indian education system is imperative. The Albuquerque Indian School was modeled after the

[36] Jason E. Pierce, "Indians not Immigrants: Charles Fletcher Lummis, Frank Bird Linderman, and the Complexities of Race and Ethnicity in America," *Making the White Man's West: Whiteness and the Creation of the American West*, University Press of Colorado, 2016, 95-120.
[37] Curtis E. Margo, L.E. Harman, D.B. Smith, "The Curious Blindness of Charles F. Lummis," *Arch Ophthalmology* 129, no. 5, (May 2011): 655–660.

Carlisle Indian School, a boarding school for Native American children in Pennsylvania. Started by Brigadier General Richard Henry Pratt in 1879 in abandoned army barracks outside of Carlisle, Pennsylvania, the Carlisle Indian School sought to assimilate the American Indian students to conform to white American society.[38] Pratt had based the school on an experiment that he had conducted with captured native warriors, whom he sent to the Hampton Institute of Virginia during his time fighting in the various Indian wars in the West. Lummis himself, like the Indian Rights Association, was at one point a supporter of the assimilation schools in the United States. However, Lummis's opinion changed following his experience with the American Indians on his tramp and during his convalescence in New Mexico. In an article published in the *Los Angeles Times* in 1890, Lummis presented a story of an Isleta Pueblo boy that returned home from one of the Indian schools as an outcast amongst his own people because he had been Americanized by whites.[39] The story was a tragic one, showing Lummis's understanding of the issues that faced American Indians who had returned from the Indian schools to their own people, and is believed to be based upon a personal encounter that Lummis had on his journey to Los Angeles.

While Lummis was walking across the nation, he made a stop in the Pueblo of Isleta in New Mexico where he met the tribal members. While there, he met with students from the Albuquerque Indian School (AIS) and once again marveled at their education. However, when he returned following a series of strokes, one of the tribal members had a

[38] Wayne Stahl, "The U.S. And Native American Education: A Survey of Federal Legislation," *Journal of American Indian Education* 18, no. 3 (May 1979): 29.
[39] Charles F. Lummis, "Poor Pedro, the Fate of the Indian Who Was Educated," *Los Angeles Times*, April 1890.

lasting effect on Lummis, and became a major influence on the journalist when he returned to the Pueblo of Isleta in the fall of 1888, four years after his walk. Henry Kendall was a member of the Pueblo tribe in Isleta that had attended the Carlisle Indian School, and is widely believed to be the influence behind Lummis's article criticizing the Indian education system. This belief is due to the experiences of Kendall following his return to the Pueblo of Isleta from the Carlisle School. Once Kendall returned to Isleta, he found himself caught in between two worlds: the Isleta Pueblo world that he had been raised in, and the Americanized world into which he had been indoctrinated. Despite this hardship, Kendall appreciated the education that he had received in Pennsylvania and was critical of what he considered the primitive beliefs of his own people. This, however, widened the chasm between Kendall and his people. While he espoused the benefits of the education that he had received, Lummis acknowledged the hardship that Kendall and returning Indians faced following their education at the American assimilation schools. Lummis's experience with Kendall was not his last conflict with the practice of Indian education.

While he was living in the Pueblo of Isleta recovering from his stroke, Lummis was approached by Juan Rey Abeita and other members of the Pueblo that had sent their children to the Albuquerque Indian School. The school superintendent had refused to release the students to their homes, even over summer break, so parents had no contact with them, some for years. The purpose of this policy was to prevent the parents from having any contact to re-indoctrinate their children by the use of their native language as well as their cultural traditions and religion. For the Abeita family, this was especially disturbing because they had three boys trapped at the school, even though only two were

of actual school age. Their youngest son had gone back to the school with his brothers with the promise that he would be returned the following week. However, that promise was made three years prior and had not been upheld. This led to Lummis's entry into activism towards Native American rights.

The issues surrounding the Albuquerque Indian School were not limited to the events that involved Lummis, but were much broader than the immediate school itself. Historian John R. Gram has researched the overarching issue of assimilation that the Indian schools represented. His articles and book addressed the same issues that Lummis experienced while in the Pueblo of Isleta, focusing specifically on the concept of forced assimilation of Native Americans at the hands of the white Americans. In his own article, Lummis compared the policy of forced assimilation to a race of beings from Mars that conquered the earth and forced children away from their parents to be stripped of their primitive religious beliefs and customs in order to be instructed into a better, Martian way.[40] This same sentiment was shown in Gram's scholarship on the assimilative nature of the Indian schools themselves, and the contentious relationship that the schools had with the members of the Native American tribes. This contentiousness was the consequence of the loss of native culture that resulted from the forced acquisition of traditions and values outside of those of the native peoples. The specific impact of this assimilation on the people of the Pueblo of Isleta was represented by Gram, where he explained how the Albuquerque and Santa Fe Indian boarding schools were affected by the people of the Pueblo of Isleta at the turn of the 20th century. In the book, Gram showed that, as opposed to the Indian schools of the East, the schools on the edge of the

[40] Charles F. Lummis, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1892-1893.

frontier were more heavily influenced by the tribes themselves.[41] This, however, took place after Lummis's stay in Isleta, and his activism with the Albuquerque Indian School. It is likely not a coincidence that the rise in Indian control over the school followed Lummis's activism, as the situation during Lummis's residence in New Mexico was that the students of the school were unable to return home to their parents, and in their helplessness, the tribal parents requested the assistance of Lummis in rectifying the situation.

Since the central purpose of the Albuquerque Indian School and the Indian school system in general was forced assimilation, the issue of Isleta culture and religion and the desire to eradicate them played a major part in the history of the Isleta Pueblo people at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries. Tisa Wenger addressed this battle between the traditional culture of the Pueblo people and the assimilation attempts made by the conquering Eurocentric societies. The focus of her work was the concept of the traditional religious dances of the Pueblo people that had been a threat to each of the non-native societies that had settled and conquered the area and the people. The dances, taking place well into the twentieth century, were seen as a threat to the European superiority and an affront to forced assimilation attempts of the American Indians.[42] It is important to note that there were two rival groups seeking to force the assimilation of the Pueblo people of New Mexico. The Catholic Spanish had invaded and conquered the Pueblo people in 1540, but had been overthrown during the

[41] John R. Gram, *Education at the Edge of Empire: Negotiating Pueblo Identity in New Mexico's Indian Boarding Schools*, University of Washington Press, 2015.
[42] Tisa Wenger, *We Have a Religion: The 1920s Pueblo Indian Dance Controversy and American Religious Freedom*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 2009.

Pueblo Revolt of 1680 after subjecting the Pueblos to inhumane treatment as well as a forced abandonment of their culture under threat of death. Following the United States' acquisition of the New Mexico Territory, there was a new Protestant school system intent on assimilating the Native Americans, with their primary inspiration being the Indian schools around the nation.

What the works on Lummis have failed to examine in detail are the interconnecting ties between the natives and the Spanish. Lummis's advocacy for one stood in stark contrast with his advocacy for the other. However, Lummis has been viewed as a champion for both causes. Due to his direct intervention in the issues with the Albuquerque Indian School, and as a friend of Theodore Roosevelt, Lummis was invited to meet with Roosevelt shortly after he was inaugurated, following the assassination of President McKinley. Roosevelt had gotten to know Lummis when the two were at Harvard together, and had invited his friend to counsel him in the issues of the Southwest, including those of the American Indian. Lummis had experience with the American Indian tribes of the Southwest from his walk, and had created a bit of controversy in his conflicts with Indian schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This work has been grossly under-examined, as the focus of much of the scholarship on Lummis has been his work supporting native rights, and not the clear contradictions that exist within his own words, in public works, actions, and private letters. While Mark Thompson covered Lummis's time with the people of Isleta Pueblo and his battle between the Albuquerque Indian School and the Pueblos; his work with the Cupeños and Hopis; as well as the federal government's Indian policy, there is little scholarship on the influence of the so-called Spanish fantasy past in all of that work.

In order to bridge this scholastic gap and successfully understand the contradiction that was Charles Lummis, a multi-faceted approach is necessary. To fully decipher the direct effect that Lummis's praise of the Spanish had on his advocacy of the Native American tribes, a comprehensive examination of his works needs to be measured against one another. This research would also extend into an investigation into his physical work with the Pueblos, Cupeños, and Hopis; his correspondence with others involved in the same issues; as well as an in-depth look at his written works to analyze where the contradictions lie. It is also important to see Charles Lummis for exactly who he was. While the majority of the tribal people of Isleta Pueblo still share stories about Lummis as a hero, the modern Cupeños would not agree with them. To one he is a saint, to the other he is the devil, and without a comprehensive investigation, it is difficult to conclusively understand where he actually lies somewhere in between. A cursory investigation into the current scholarship on Lummis shows that no other historian has adequately explored how Lummis's support of the Spanish influenced his support of the American Indians. They have also not explored how his personal writings contradicted his actions and public support of the native tribes. Lummis's life was one of contradiction, and it is imperative to have a complete analysis of those contradictions and how they affect not only his legacy, but also what he truly believed about his own work.

The evidence provided in this examination comes directly from Charles Lummis himself. Through his published works, as well as his private letters, Lummis exposed his contradictory nature, as well as how his love of the Spanish not only superseded his love and advocacy of Native Americans, but also negated much of his Native American advocacy. His book, *The Spanish Pioneers* painted a much different view of the Pueblo

people than his writings promoting them. His private letters sent during the Cupeño removal and Hopi investigation exposed his contradictory beliefs on Indian education and assimilation. This is where previous scholarship has failed to properly examine the complicated and contradictory man that Charles Lummis was. This is not intended to denigrate Lummis's legacy, nor negate any of the good that Lummis did in his lifetime, but simply analyze the whole man, without compartmentalization of each of his works. It is well known among Lummis scholars that he was a complicated man, and it is the purpose of this paper to show that his work was not as clear as it has been presented.

Chapter 2 HISTORIOGRAPHY

For a man that walked through nine states between 1884 and 1885, went to Harvard with President Theodore Roosevelt and worked with his administration, and led an exceptionally eccentric life, there is very little written about Charles Lummis. Considering his famous friends such as the aforementioned Theodore Roosevelt, along with John Muir, and Jack London, among others, as well as his own contributions to literature, cultural preservation, Indian activism, and conservation of the California missions, there have been very few in-depth biographies or comprehensive critical works about the man. Though there was a small article published in *The Journal of Education* in 1925 on Lummis, it was a book review, not a comprehensive account of his life and work.[43] The majority of the literature surrounding Lummis's life was written within the first forty years of his death, with the most recent comprehensive biographical addition published in 2001.

For many historians, especially those outside of the state of California, Charles Lummis is an unknown historical figure, his legacy having been largely forgotten, even though the results of his actions and what he accomplished remain. His organization, the Landmarks Club began the conservation and preservation of the California missions. These same missions draw thousands of visitors every year from all over the world, including elementary students from within the state, that construct models of the missions celebrating the state's past. The creation of the Southwest Museum of the American Indian, which was one of Lummis's proudest achievements still exists in the same spot

[43] A. E. Winship, "Charles F. Lummis, Pioneer of the Great Southwest," *The Journal of Education.* 102, no. 17 (1925): 449.

that Lummis initially planned and chose at the beginning of the twentieth century. Though the contents of the museum have been absorbed into the Autry Museum of the American West, the existence of said museum continues Lummis's goal of celebrating the history of the American West. There have been a few biographies of Lummis that have analyzed his life and works, but few could be considered comprehensive. The vast majority of the articles and dissertations about Lummis have focused specifically on his work preserving American Indian and Spanish culture in the Southwest. This includes his collection of wax cylinders featuring tribal and Spanish songs that he believed would face into oblivion if not recorded for posterity, and his support of the retention of the Spanish names of California cities, streets, and landmarks. Where the scholarship has lacked is in any truly critical analyses of Lummis's life, written works, and actions. While much of the erudition surrounding Lummis's life has acknowledged his love of Spanish culture, Spanish history, and the concept of the Spanish fantasy past, it has not considered such interests and promotions through the lens of his American Indian rights activism, creating a more critical evaluation of his work and his legacy.

The first biographical work on Lummis was an undated, unpublished biography written by his daughter, Turbesé Lummis around 1937, nine years following his death.[44] The work, *Charles F. Lummis, A Brief Biography* is not a complete and comprehensive biography. Instead, it is an assemblage of recollections, including events, stories, and occurrences that Lummis had shared with her during his lifetime. While the work does include aspects of Lummis's life that are not included in other works, including his

[44] The estimation for the date of the work is based on the author's mention of Lummis's death having taken place nine years previous. Lummis died on November 25, 1928, making the addition of the nine years estimating the date of the biographical sketch on or around 1937.

attempted apprenticeship as a surgeon following his departure from Harvard, the work is not a complete overview of Lummis's life and works.[45] There are significant aspects of his life and work that would have required significant research, not merely the recollections of the man's daughter. While there is typically a concern of inherent bias when a child writes about a parent, Turbesé was not above being critical of her father. There is still a question of total objectivity when analyzing what she wrote, as she did exert a significant amount of praise on Lummis, and this work was used as the basis for a more complete biography of Lummis by Turbesé and her brother Keith, published in 1975. Many sections of the more comprehensive work include direct sections taken from this unpublished volume. Though Turbesé died in 1967, eight years before the final work was published, Keith used her brief biography as the overall framework for their joint literary work.

Like Lummis's daughter's unpublished biography, Henry Edmond Earle wrote his article, "An Old-Time Collector: Reminisces of Charles F. Lummis," from a personal perspective. Instead of presenting an overall research-based analysis of Lummis's life or works, the article focused specifically one occasion where Earle met Lummis with the intention of taking over the job of transcribing the songs from Lummis's wax cylinder collection of Indian and Spanish songs. Earle established his positive perception of Lummis in the first paragraph.

> He was a brilliant and versatile man who left a prominent stamp on the institutions of the Southwest. The Southwest Society of the American Institute of Archaeology which has done so much to preserve California antiquities was one of his creations. He founded the *Land of Sunshine*, a magazine devoted to the life and history of this section, the name of which was later changed to *Out West*. His

[45] Turbesé Lummis Fiske, *Charles F. Lummis, A Brief Biography*, (unpublished), Autry Museum Library and Archives, MIMSY MS.240 c.2, 1937.

> books and magazine articles stand as monuments to his ability and enthusiasm. The Landmarks Club for the preservation and restoration of missions and other relics of the old life remains today as an active force.[46]

Earle's overwhelmingly positive analysis of Lummis as an opening for his article set the tone for the emtire piece, but this assessment also exposed the first of the factual errors in the article. While it is a minor error, it speaks to the reliability of Earle himself. Charles Lummis was not the founder of the *Land of Sunshine* magazine. The magazine was founded in 1894 as a mouthpiece for the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and Lummis took control of the periodical as editor in 1895.

In his recounting of his meeting with Lummis, Earle made two more factual errors. First, Earle referred to Lummis's home as Casa de Arisol, when Lummis's home was El Alisal.[47] Second, Earle described Lummis's stereotypical dress, mentioning that he never wore a hat and that was why he was sunburnt.[48] However, Lummis was famous for his Stetson sombrero, which he wore almost wherever he went. In the very next issue of *California Folklore Quarterly*, the magazine printed a correction about Earle's mistake with the name of Lummis's home as well as his typical dress.[49] The errors could be attributed to the fact that Earle was not a historian, but a music composer, hired to transcribe the music of the songs, as Lummis was only able to translate the lyrics. The article, factual errors aside, focused on Earle's experience working to assist Lummis in the transcription of his Spanish song recordings on wax cylinders. While he wrote about that one encounter, a large section of the article focused on the subject of Lummis's

[46] Henry Edmond Earle, "An Old-Time Collector: Reminiscences of Charles F. Lummis," *California Folklore Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (1942): 179.
[47] Earle, "Old-Time Collector," 179.
[48] Earle, "Old-Time Collector," 180.
[49] "Notes and Queries: Charles F. Lummis," *California Folklore Quarterly* 1 no. 3 (July 1942): 291.

recordings, not the man himself, shifting the focus of the article on the music and not the man that recorded it. While the article presented a good personal story of the author and his encounter with Lummis, it provided very little information about Lummis himself and contained enough errors that the author's reliability remained questionable.

In her article, "Charles F. Lummis and the Sequoya League," Frances E. Watkins explored the issue of the Cupeños of Agua Caliente, their eviction from Warner's Ranch, and the actions of the Sequoya League during their eviction. Since Watkins specialized in the American Southwest, this subject would have been a prime example of American Indian affairs at the turn of the twentieth century, and her specialty explained why her focus of the article was the history of the issue that took place at Warner's Ranch. The article was not truly about Charles Lummis's impact on the situation, but how the issue came to be, from the initial Spanish conquest and the construction of the missions, to the members of the Sequoya League forming the Warner's Ranch Commission to locate a new home for the Cupeños. Watkins's article was generally objective in tone, but did not present any new prospective, even for the time, on the development or work of the Sequoya League. Watkins explored the formation of the Warner's Ranch Commission, with Lummis and the League involving themselves into the matter when the local Indian agent chose what the League believed was an inferior parcel of land for the tribe. Much of the information presented was also written as though Lummis and the Warner's Ranch Commission had written it.

> The Sequoya League, which had quietly permitted matters to take their own course as long as the Indians appeared to receive just treatment, now came forward with a protest. Their request for a committee to investigate conditions before a location was chosen had been ignored, but they had taken no action until the selection of the Monserrate Ranch, which they considered unsuitable, and

> inferior to many other properties in the area, which might be secured for less money. The protest of the League stopped the action in Congress.[50]

The perspective that Watkins presented was that the Sequoya League was needed by the Cupeños as they were being evicted, but the truth was more complicated than that. The Sequoya League involved themselves in the matter by their own accord. The people of the tribe did not want to relocate to any new area, even if the Sequoya League believed that the new land was objectively superior. This fact was apparent in a pair of letters from Ambrosio Ortega and Salvador Nolasquez, two members of the tribe that had been asked to be a part of the Warner's Ranch Commission. The men wrote two letters towards the end of the matter, one to W.A. Jones, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and the other to President Roosevelt, explaining that the League had not considered their protests, and that the tribe did not want to relocate, but wanted the government to purchase all or part of their home so that the tribe could remain on their land.[51] Lummis expected resistance from the tribe, which is why he recommended that the government use the army to supervise the eviction, because there could have been a confrontation.[52] This fact was not presented in the article at all, focusing more on the positive work of the League. Watkins also omitted the fact that the Cupeños were relocated onto lands of a mission of which Lummis had already arranged a purchase. She concluded the article praising Lummis for birthing the Sequoya League, as well as doling out the credit for the League's work on

---

[50] Frances E. Watkins, "Charles F. Lummis and the Sequoya League," *The Quarterly: Historical Society of Southern California* 26 no. 2/3 (1944): 108. An aspect of the article that is also interesting is that Watkins dated Lummis's death in the first paragraph at November 28, 1928, however, Lummis died on November 25. While this is a small error, the fact that it exists spoke to the factual reliability of the article itself.

[51] Ambrosio Ortega and Salvador Nolasquez to Theodore Roosevelt, undated. Autry Library and Archives, MIMSY MS.1.1.3386.
Ambrosio Ortega and Salvador Nolasquez to W.A. Jones, July 31, 1902. MIMSY MS.1.1.3386.
The two letters include the same information, and the pair had hoped to speak with the President when he visited California in 1903.

[52] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt. June 3, 1903.

the man, while placing the responsibility of the League's eventual downfall on its failure to support Lummis.

Another written work where the author had personally met Charles Lummis was Marco Newmark's "Charles Fletcher Lummis." The article was a highly subjective and brief biography, where Newmark utilized breadth over depth, attempting an entire biography in 15 pages. The biography attempted to cover the entire life of Lummis, however, its lack of depth presented a superficial perspective of Lummis, while omitting key information important to Lummis's life. Newmark established the tone of the article in the very first sentence.

> So extraordinary was the career of Charles Fletcher Lummis from early boyhood until the last day of his life that one almost hesitates, lest it be greeted with incredulity, to relate the story of his accomplishments, his adventures and his conquest over physical ills which would have discouraged any other man into surrender to permanent withdrawal from active life.[53]

In this perspective, Lummis was presented as an almost supernatural being, making other men pale in comparison. However, the article stands out not for its accurate representation of Lummis's life, but its lack of specificity and its omission of key information. Newmark first exposed this lack of specificity when he wrote, "His formal education came to an end when he left the classic halls of our country's first college before graduating."[54] This ignored the fact that Lummis failed two of his exams, and instead of re-taking them, he chose to leave. The omissions were continued when Newmark stated that Lummis then became a superintendent of a farm in Scioto, Ohio. The reason that this omission is egregious is the fact that the farm belonged to Lummis's

[53] Marco Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 32 no. 1 (1950): 45.
[54] Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," 46.

father-in-law. However, throughout the entire article, Newmark failed to mention a single one of Lummis's wives, despite their exceptional influence on the course of his life. Lummis's journey across the American West, arguably the most influential and newsworthy event of Lummis's life was represented by a mere two short paragraphs, totaling only five sentences. Newmark included no specific instances from Lummis's trek other than injuries incurred, and left out the impact that the Southwest had on Lummis, including the Pueblos and the visit with Amado Chaves and his family in San Mateo, New Mexico. Amado Chaves was mentioned, but only after Lummis's stroke took him back to New Mexico to recuperate. The only aspect of Lummis's life that was examined in any amount of detail was Lummis's experience with the Penitentes, and his attempted assassination, of which Newmark dedicated an entire page.

When he wrote about Lummis's relationship with Adolph Bandelier, Newmark praised Lummis's choice to embellish Bandelier's work, despite the fact that it caused a rift between the two and led to Lummis's return to Los Angeles from their excavation in Peru ahead of schedule. Newmark omitted Lummis's publishing of *The Spanish Pioneers*, but included his knighting by King Alphonso XIII which was the reward for his presentation of the Spanish impact on the Americas. There were a few spelling issues, where Newmark described the change of the *Land of Sunshine* magazine to "Outwest" when it should have been *Out West*[55] and then when he described Lummis' formation of the "Sequoia League" when the actual name was the Sequoya League.[56] In describing the League's work in the issue of the Cupeños and their eviction from Warner's Ranch, Newmark praised the League and Lummis. "As a result of this bill, they were moved to

[55] Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," 51.
[56] Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," 52.

Pala, an asistencia of Mission San Luis Rey, also in San Diego County, where they now dwell under decent, livable conditions."[57] This is an over-simplified the situation of the Warner's Ranch Commission, and the tribe that were largely displeased with the forced removal. Newmark also failed to mention Lummis's blindness which lasted for a year-and-a-half, while Lummis was working with the planning of the Southwest Museum. Despite the personal nature of the article, and the author's meeting with Lummis himself, the lack of depth in the biography, as well as the numerous omissions left the reader knowing very little about the complex man that Lummis was. Though the article included a wide overview, the article would have better served Lummis's legacy by narrowing the focus, and deepening the information.

The first published book to focus on Charles Lummis's life and works was Edwin Bingham's *Charles F. Lummis: Editor of the Southwest.* Choosing to forgo a biographical sketch of Lummis, Bingham chose to focus his book on Lummis's time as a magazine editor with the *Land of Sunshine*, later renamed *Out West*. Though the purpose of the book was not biographical in nature, Bingham utilized the first chapter to establish a firm understanding of Lummis's life, albeit not as deep as a complete biography would have been. Bingham concluded the first chapter with his opinion of Lummis, and set the tone for the remainder of the book.

> He was the foremost pioneer in the literary discovery of the Southwest. He was, as a subsequent chapter demonstrates, an effective crusader for the rights of Indians and a successful campaigner for the preservation of historic landmarks. He developed a distinctive and representative regional journal. He founded the Southwest Museum. He got things done.[58]

[57] Newmark, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," 53.
[58] Edwin R. Bingham, *Charles Lummis: Editor of the Southwest*, San Marino, Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1955, 35.

Bingham followed the first chapter with a history of the development of the *Land of Sunshine*, from brainchild of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, to Lummis's assumption of the editorship and the magazine's rampant success. True to its stated purpose, Bingham's book explored not only the beginnings of the monthly publication, but the minutiae of the original magazine's features, including the dimensions, length, quality and style of the paper, and price point. Bingham placed the culpability of the magazine's eventual collapse on the loss of Lummis as its editor, making the statement that, "the effective influence of the *Land of Sunshine* or *Out West* was limited to the period of Lummis' active editorship, for those who followed him could neither maintain his pace nor set a new one of their own"[59]

One aspect of Lummis's tenure with the magazine that Bingham examined was its circulation. While Bingham acknowledged that the circulation was never extraordinary, the publication did attain international recognition with "subscribers in England, Belgium, Italy, Germany, Japan, France, Sweden, Brazil, New Zealand, Mexico, Greece, Siam, and North China."[60] This is significant to Lummis's work because the only time that Lummis failed to support Spain wholeheartedly was during the Spanish American War, and those articles were published in his own magazine that was not circulated in Spain. The majority of those articles that supported America over Spain in combat, while still praising the honor and chivalry of the Spanish were a part of Lummis's editorial section "In the Lion's Den." Bingham analyzed these editorials as Lummis's personal sounding board where he had the freedom to speak his mind. Lummis's opinions often

[59] Bingham, *Editor*, 51.
[60] Bingham, *Editor*, 64.

conflicted with the popular opinions of many Americans, even those within his own political party, profession, and even readership.

Bingham also noted subjects that were conspicuously missing from Lummis's editorial section, such as his comments on industrial developments, art, music, and sports. This was due to the fact that the Lion's Den was Lummis's place for reflections that he felt were important, and those subjects were not predominant on his list of necessities upon which to critique.[61] Following his editorial inclusions, Bingham exposed Lummis's use of the magazine for his personal crusades, such as the Landmarks Club and the Sequoya League. With the Landmark's Club, Lummis utilized the magazine as a propaganda tool to increase support for the work of preserving and restoring the California missions, as well as a monthly presentation of the club's minutes and progress. The magazine also allowed Lummis and the Sequoya League to present information about Indian rights, beginning with an 1899 meeting of American Indian educators in Los Angeles, where Lummis presented his scathing critique of the American Indian education system to his readers. Lummis then followed it with a presentation of the eviction of the Cupeños at Warner's Ranch, and the issues with the Indian agent over the Moquis of Keam's Canyon, Arizona, and Bingham considered the Sequoya League to be the most influential and effective Indian rights organization in the Southwest.[62] Bingham concluded the book with a presentation of the literary contributors that the magazine supported and promoted, and the statement that the *Land of Sunshine* and *Out West* was

[61] Bingham, *Editor*, 102.
[62] Bingham, *Editor*, 112-133.

the largest literary legacy that Lummis left behind and that he succeeded in creating a publication that rivaled those of the East for quality and lasting impact.[63]

The most prolific author on Charles Lummis has been Dudley Gordon. Although far from objective in his approach to examining and analyzing Lummis's life and his impact on the American Southwest, he wrote more about Lummis than any other single author from 1953 through 1972, including five articles and a book. The first work that Gordon authored about Charles Lummis laid the focus not on the man or his writings, but on the house that he constructed north of Los Angeles in the Arroyo Secco, El Alisal. In "El Alisal: The House that Lummis Built," Gordon exposed his subjective opinion of Lummis within the first paragraph.

> Had he not already distinguished himself as author, editor, archaeologist, explorer, poet, athlete, librarian and scholar? Weren't his achievements well-known as crusader, encyclopedist, linguist, critic, newspaper man, musician, *bon vivant* and glorious host? And didn't everyone know of his skill as historian, lecturer, photographer, translator, cook, Americanist, museum builder and, some say, actor? Was it not expected that he would become his own architect, contractor, builder, mason, electrician, plumber and cabinet maker?[64]

Despite the fact that Gordon's purpose for the article was to examine Lummis's house and its construction, he began the article listing the roles that Lummis had taken on during his career, utilizing only positive attributes to describe his work, without any critical analysis thereof.

The majority of the article focused on the construction of the home, the layout of the final structure, and the famous visitors to El Alisal. However, Gordon inserted a paragraph within the article that he loosely connected to the structure itself, but was

---

[63] Bingham, *Editor*, 191.
[64] Dudley Gordon, "El Alisal: The House That Lummis Built," *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1953): 19.

actually a celebration of one of Lummis's projects that faced critical review during his life, and connected to the concepts contained within this paper, which was a continuation of Lummis's celebration of the Spanish history in the New World. Speaking of the circular tower, that was a central focal point of the house, Gordon wrote about Lummis's use of the space.

> It was there that he worked on what would have been his most outstanding achievement – his dictionary, concordance, and encyclopedia on Spain in America from 1492 until 1850. He made detailed references on 30,000 index cards but was forced to quit working on it. The public and the scientific societies lacked Lummis's vision. They were not ready for such a noble project. As a result, we have had to spend multi-millions to buy the friendship of Latin America where, earlier, a few thousands would have provided us with knowledge of our neighbors to the south that would assure us their everlasting friendliness.[65]

This break from the focus of the article presented more as a propaganda piece for Lummis's Spanish dictionary than a reflection of Lummis's use of his home space. Gordon continued his analysis of the impact of Lummis's home by celebrating it as a cultural center of Los Angeles, extolling its lasting cultural relevance even after the death of Lummis, and the house's transfer to the Southwest Museum, and eventually to the California State Park Commission. As is true with the remainder of Gordon's works on Lummis, his analysis is far from objective, presenting Lummis as a heroic, legendary Renaissance man, far ahead of his own time.

Six years after his analysis of the construction and features of Lummis's home, Dudley Gordon composed another promotional article on Lummis, this time focusing on his cultural impact in the Southwest. In "Charles Fletcher Lummis, Cultural Pioneer of the Southwest," Gordon opened the article by stating that Charles Lummis was a major contributor to the cultural growth of Los Angeles. "Lummis was an ardent Americanist

[65] Gordon, "El Alisal," 22.

who devoted forty aggressive years to the cause of cultural enlightenment in the region of his choice."[66] Like Newmark's article, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," nine years earlier, Gordon presented a brief biography of Lummis, however, Gordon was able to develop a deeper understanding of Lummis's work, and included two of Lummis's wives as impacts on his work. That being said, there were certainly omissions in the telling of Lummis's story that served to present him in a much more positive light.

One such example was Gordon's inclusion of Lummis mortgaging his home to assist Adolph Bandelier with his Peruvian excursion, and how Lummis was patient as it took Bandelier years to repay the loan. What Gordon failed to include was Bandelier's frustrations with Lummis's brevity in relation to scientific and factual statements that Lummis tended to embellish. Gordon praised Lummis's fighting spirit in each cause that he chose to champion, referring to him as being "almost quixotic."[67] This is the first connection between Lummis and Miguel Cervantes's iconic character, though Gordon utilized the comparison as a praise of Lummis, rather than an unhealthy obsession.

Describing Los Angeles as a lone source of culture in a wider intellectually empty space, Gordon granted much of the credit to Lummis for developing the entirety of California. By extension, this same credit applied to Lummis's development of the Southwest as a whole through his founding of the Southwest Society of the American Institute of Archaeology and the Southwest Museum. Among the other cultural contributions to the cultural growth of Los Angeles, and California as a whole, Gordon included the development and work of the Landmarks Club, preserving and restoring the

[66] Dudley Gordon, "Charles Fletcher Lummis, Cultural Pioneer of the Southwest," *Arizona and the West* 1, no. 4 (1959): 305.
[67] Gordon, "Cultural Pioneer," 310.

California missions; Lummis's tenure as Los Angeles City Librarian, adding many new resources and creating a nationally renowned library; his home, El Alisal, where Gordon drew upon his previous research; and Lummis's many literary works. The closest that Gordon came to being even remotely critical of Lummis was his admission that Lummis had a short temper, a lack of self-control and prudence, and that he had an uncontrollable lust for women. However, in his closing, Gordon acknowledged that his article was not a critical examination of Lummis's words, and that there are historians that have found fault with Lummis, but that he considered himself a strong admirer of the man. "Modern students of history and anthropology may find much to criticize in the words and deeds of Charles Fletcher Lummis. This student of his career has found much to admire."[68]

In his most concise and laconic written work on Lummis, Dudley Gordon compared and contrasted two contemporary littérateurs in the early twentieth century, Charles Lummis and Jack London. Although the two authors were in very different situations in 1905, the two exchanged letters after Lummis solicited London to join the newly-formed Southwest chapter of the Archaeological Institute of America. When London declined the offer, Lummis, not one to take no for an answer, continued to press London, who continued to politely refuse, wishing to focus his time, energy, and money on the issues with which he was currently working.[69] Gordon dedicated the majority of the article to contrasting Lummis, who had grown up in a loving Eastern home with London, who had survived a broken home in San Francisco. Gordon not only contrasted their home lives, but their education, influences, and political leanings. While the

[68] Gordon, "Cultural Pioneer," 316.
[69] Dudley Gordon, "Charles F. Lummis and Jack London: An Evaluation," *Southern California Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1964): 86.

majority of the two men's lives were vastly contrary, there were aspects of their lives that were similar. Both men were writers, newsmen, and loved the freedom of their ability to wander the open road. Gordon concluded the article with a contrast of the lasting impact of both writers, as well as their causes, and it should come as no surprise that Gordon made the declaration that not only did Lummis have a larger cultural impact, but that Lummis's tactic of appealing to reason and moral persuasion was superior to London's militant revolutionary tactics.[70]

Dudley Gordon continued his celebration of Charles Lummis's life and work, evaluating his contribution to the retention of the folklore of the American Southwest in his article, "Charles F. Lummis: Pioneer American Folklorist." Gordon set the tone immediately with an extolling of Lummis's work. "Most informed Southwesterners are aware of the numerous contributions to culture Charles F. Lummis has made to the region as editor, author, historian, librarian, preserver of missions, and founder of the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles, but few realize that his work as a pioneer folklorist was substantial and remains of great value today."[71] The focus of the body of the article was Lummis's education of Southwest folk songs and his attempts to memorize them and record them for posterity. The article, less of an informational writing, and more of a propaganda piece, spoke of Lummis as a heavily revered American figure. Though the article was intended to analyze Lummis's experience collecting and publishing Southwestern folk songs, Gordon dedicated a significant amount of the writing to a brief and superficial biography of Lummis, describing the man's actions in overtly positive

[70] Gordon, "Charles F. Lummis and Jack London," 88.
[71] Dudley Gordon, "Charles F. Lummis: Pioneer American Folklorist," *Western Folklore* 28, no. 3 (1969): 175.

ways. In this recounting of Lummis's life and work, Gordon presented Lummis's experience with the Penitentes of New Mexico, However, with the biographical information being vague and surface-level only, much of the context in the events of Lummis's life were omitted. One such omission was the fact that there was a significant political aspect to Lummis's experience with the Penitentes, as they were connected to Don Roman Baca, rival to Don Manuel Chaves, Lummis's friend, and this experience eventually led to an attempt on Lummis's life.[72]

The biographical information in this article was superfluous, considering the purpose of the text itself. Gordon provided only a cursory analysis of Lummis's life, excluding any negative aspects that would have presented Lummis in anything less than a heroic way. In his closing, Gordon mentioned, almost in passing, that Arthur Farwell had assisted Lummis in transcribing Spanish and Indian music, when in reality, it was Farwell that had completed the brunt of the transcription work with Lummis and was not merely a passing assistant as Gordon portrayed. The majority of the article transitioned from an analysis of Lummis's work recording folk songs, to vague biography, followed by another brief analysis of his musical preservation. Gordon's article was too desultory to truly obtain a solid understanding of who Lummis was and the effects of his work, and would have been better served focusing on one aspect, or making the article longer to better encapsulate Lummis's impact. Since not every wax cylinder in Lummis's

[72] Gordon, "Pioneer American," 178-9. While Lummis convalesced in New Mexico following a series of strokes, he became embroiled in a political dispute between his friend, Amado Chaves and Roman Baca over the continuation of the peon system in New Mexico. Chaves was against the practice, as it disenfranchised the poorer populations, whereas Baca had supported it, as it had been a way in which his family had obtained significant wealth. In order to build their personal political base, the Baca's supported the Penitentes, despite the fact that the Penitentes had existed on the fringe of New Mexico society and acted in secret. Lummis's involvement in the political fight, along with his experience with the Penitentes, placed him in danger and he relocated to Isleta for self-preservation.

collection was from his own recordings, Gordon could have further examined Lummis's work to obtain any and all sources of Indian and Spanish folk music, and how his recordings, translations, and publishing allowed the songs to avoid fading into oblivion.

Dudley Gordon continued his research and writings on Lummis into the 1970s, and in 1971, Gordon analyzed Lummis's efforts in the consolidation and presentation of the first fifty years of California's statehood. At the end of the nineteenth century, *Harper's Magazine* had chosen Lummis to be the one to write the article examining California's social, economic, and cultural impact since its addition as a state, fifty years prior. Gordon presented this decision to have Lummis compose the work as a natural choice, given his personal experience. "Lummis' background ideally fitted him for the task of evaluating the attainments of his adopted state…[H]e was more aware of the pulse of the burgeoning state than were most men; as a reformed easterner and trained observer, he had a perspective which provided him with a good basis for comparison."[73] Lummis had been raised in the East, but had chosen to relocate to Los Angeles, and became the most outspoken advocate and promoter of the American Southwest.

Gordon then dedicated the next section of the article to a brief biography of Lummis, extolling his virtues and qualifications as the spokesperson for California's first half century, including his books, the *Land of Sunshine*, and his work with the Landmarks Club, preserving the California missions. While the purpose of the article appeared to be Gordon's examination of Lummis's appointment as the scribe of the article celebrating California's fiftieth anniversary as a state, Gordon, like he had in his other articles, used the majority of the article as a promotional work for Lummis, celebrating him as a gifted

[73] Dudley Gordon, "California's First Half-Century of Statehood, 1850-1900," *Southern California Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (1971): 133.

writer, cultural crusader, and historical preservationist. Gordon was critical of Lummis only in response to Lummis's impetuousness, which Gordon had acknowledged in a previous article. In this case, Gordon used it as an impetus for *Harper's* canceling the book that they had commissioned from Lummis following his tirade about what he considered were unforgivable errors in editing and typesetting the first chapter that he had submitted, which was printed in January 1900. The book had thereafter been cancelled, and Lummis purchased every article that he had submitted to *Harper's*, and published the first thirteen chapters of *The Right Hand of the Continent* in *Out West* beginning in June 1902.[74] Gordon then presented selections of the data that Lummis had compiled to show the growth of California in its first fifty years and its impact on the nation, followed by Lummis's assertion that without California, there would have been no Civil War, because without California the nation would not have been able to afford such a costly endeavor, concluding with California's cultural maturity and its contributions to America's cultural heritage. Gordon concluded the article praising Lummis's thorough, yet incomplete work, citing it as a masterful compilation showing California's growth and a predictive work on the continued growth of the state following Lummis's death in 1928.[75]

Following his many articles promoting the life and works of Charles Lummis, Dudley Gordon published his book, *Charles F. Lummis: Crusader in Corduroy*. Like his works previous, *Crusader in Corduroy* was a largely promotional piece, written as a worshipper would about his hero. Gordon immediately set the tone for the book in its introduction.

---

[74] Gordon, "California," 135-6.
[75] Gordon, "California," 145-6.

> Belatedly, the City Fathers recognized the distinguished services rendered by Lummis over the years as he devoted a major portion of his time and energy in the conversion of a raw frontier pueblo into the cultural center of consequence that Los Angeles has become. Similar unselfish intellectual contributions had already been acknowledged by a Pope who sent him his blessing for having preserved California's ruined missions; by President Theodore Roosevelt when he summoned Lummis to Washington to assist in the preparation of his first Address to the Congress, and later when he wrote, "I know that you know how much I appreciate what your work means for the country;" by King Alfonso XIII for his having written *The Spanish Pioneers*; by the *Reader's Digest* when it carried a story on him as the Most Interesting Man, June 1947; and by *Who's Who in America* which allotted him four inches of space.[76]

Gordon's book was another opportunity for him to praise Lummis as a celebrated writer, historian, cultural preservationist, and most importantly, cultural crusader. Gordon's book did not present a chronological account of Lummis's life, but began with President Roosevelt's summoning of Lummis to Washington DC in 1901, providing background information as to how the two met, and a brief description of Lummis's journey from Harvard to becoming an advisor to the president.

Following this beginning, Gordon returned to Lummis's childhood, drawing from Lummis's own unpublished memoir, *As I Remember*, and presented a brief recounting of Lummis's childhood, connecting its impact to his later work as an adult. Gordon also presented an aspect of Lummis's life that other authors had not, and that was a genealogical analysis, using letters addressed to Lummis's father, Henry. Gordon made the assertion that Lummis's genealogy was not of importance to him, save for the fact that his family arrived in the New World in the 1630s.[77] The genealogical analysis provided Gordon with an opportunity to continue documentation of the Lummis family, beginning with Charles and Dorothea's marriage at Harvard, placing the responsibility on

[76] Dudley Gordon, *Charles F. Lummis: Crusader in Corduroy*, Los Angeles, Cultural Assets Press, 1972, 3.
[77] Gordon, *Crusader*, 38.

Dorothea for the marriage's dissolution, citing her domineering nature, that he claimed derived from a handwriting analysis.[78] This placement of blame completely ignored Lummis's extensive time away from his wife, including his move to Chillicothe, Ohio while she remained in school, his 5-month walk across the American West, and his solo recuperation in New Mexico while she remained in Los Angeles. This is a good example of Gordon's work, acting as an apologist for Lummis in each and every one of his works, ignoring any possible problems with Lummis's behavior.

Gordon followed with Lummis's marriage to Eve Douglas, included their children, and explained that the marriage had ended when Eve had discovered his diary, that documented his extramarital affairs. While Gordon did reveal the affairs, it was explained away, stating that it was merely a common practice among men of such genius as Lummis.[79] Gordon continued with Lummis's third wife, Gertrude, who had been one of his secretaries, and his illegitimate daughter, Bertha that had come from a romantic affair in which Lummis had engaged while at Harvard, which some attribute to his secret and rushed wedding to Dorothea. Gordon reached the purpose of the book beginning in chapter 4, describing the characteristics of a crusader, but did not provide any of his crusades, even neglecting to include his battle with the Albuquerque Indian School in his analysis of Lummis's convalescence in New Mexico.

Returning to Lummis's home, Gordon utilized his previous work on El Alisal as a chapter in this book. Gordon regurgitated another of his articles, "California's First Half-Century of Statehood, 1850-1900" as his thirteenth chapter, and his analysis of Lummis's relationship with Jack London from his previous work as his fourteenth chapter.

---

[78] Gordon, *Crusader*, 45.
[79] Gordon, *Crusader*, 50.

Gordon's only true focus on Lummis's crusading efforts came in later chapters with his work with the Landmarks Club and the Sequoya League. Towards the end of the book, Gordon presented a chapter dedicated to the pros and cons of Lummis. However, as this book was written by Lummis's most ardent cheerleader, save for himself, the cons were expectedly minimized. Comparing Lummis to Aristides, Gordon declared, "Lummis too, was belittled by lesser men who had read him only casually, and were but slightly aware of the substantial accomplishments of this great, many-faceted American, this crusader for cultural enlightenment."[80] The book is less an objective critical analysis of Charles Lummis, and more a book of praise to the author's idol.

Based on the unpublished biography written by Turbesé Lummis Fiske, *Charles F. Lummis: The Man and His West* presented the life of Charles Lummis in brief chapters, focusing on different periods and events. Written by Turbesé Lummis Fiske and her youngest brother, Keith Lummis, the book was intended to be a complete biography, and many sections were taken verbatim from Turbesé's previous unpublished work, *Charles F. Lummis, A Brief Biography*. The book was published in 1975, forty-seven years after the death of Lummis, and eight years after the death of Turbesé Lummis Fiske. Though composed by Lummis's children, the book was not a work of hero-worship, but could be critical of the man at times. The authors began the book admitting that Lummis was a controversial and reckless man that had acquired more friends and enemies than any other person in the West.[81]

[80] Gordon, *Crusader*, 235.
[81] Turbesé Lummis Fiske and Keith Lummis, *Charles F. Lummis: The Man and His West*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1975, 3.

The authors drew upon their own personal recollections of Lummis, as well as his personal diaries and his unfinished memoir, *As I Remember*. Each chapter was brief, focusing on the primary aspects of Lummis's life and works, leaving much of the minutiae to other authors. Some chapters are limited to only two pages, such as the chapter that focused on the development of Lummis's relationship with Dorothea.[82] The pair also omitted a significant amount of time in Lummis's life, even aspects upon which other authors have focused, such as Lummis's fight with the Albuquerque Indian School. One addition that the pair included that helped the reader better understand Lummis was a collection of photographs of the man, his home, and his exploits. The authors examined multiple aspects of Lummis's life, albeit in a brief, abbreviated manner. They included a large number of personal letters, quoted directly from diary entries, as well as Lummis's memoir. The authors succeeded in providing a perspective of Lummis that only they could offer, that of a personal relationship with the subject and being in possession of so many personal effects and writings.

Robert Fleming's *Charles F. Lummis* drew upon numerous sources that came before, providing a short general biography on Charles Lummis. The structure of the book was unorganized, and the text flowed from subject to subject without transitions that would have allowed the reader to understand the shift in topic. Fleming regularly utilized Lummis's personal writings, and appeared to accept them as fact which was evident in his acceptance of every story from Lummis's *Tramp Across the Continent*, stating that a lesser man would have turned back if faced with even a portion of the hardships that Lummis had claimed to have experienced.[83] However, Fleming made it

[82] Lummis Fiske and Keith Lummis, *Charles F. Lummis*, 13-14.
[83] Robert E. Fleming, *Charles F. Lummis*, Boise, ID, Boise State University, 1981, 6.

clear that Lummis's account of his journey was not wholly reliable, noting that Lummis embellished his own stories, and drew on previous hardship stories of the frontier.[84] Fleming examined Lummis's account of his tramp across the continent, but the majority of the book was focused on Lummis's experience in Arizona and New Mexico with the American Indians. Lummis's experience reporting on the final campaign of Geronimo for the *Los Angeles Times* was presented along with the writings of his time in Isleta to analyze Lummis's writings on the American Indian, showing that Lummis was far more partial to the Pueblos, despite sympathizing with other tribes.[85] Fleming then focused on what he considered to be one of Lummis's most emotional crusade was that of the Moqui investigation and Lummis's distaste for Indian agent Charles Burton, who Lummis considered unfit for the position that he was in. Fleming transitioned from American Indian issues to Mexican and Spanish, focusing on the groups with which Lummis was the most involved. The book then focused on Lummis's support of new literary artists, and his translation of Indian and Mexican folk songs and stories. In all, the short book was an unorganized collection of multiple aspects of Lummis's life, quickly transitioning through topics from one paragraph to the next.

Whereas every other literary work on Lummis has been an analysis of Lummis's work or a biography, *Lummis in the Pueblos* by Patrick and Betsy Houlihan chose to represent Lummis's work in a unique way. Though they provided an exceptionally brief biography of Lummis, their primary source for their book was Lummis's photographs, particularly those that Lummis took while living with the Pueblos during his convalescence from a series of strokes. The Houlihans explained the photographic

[84] Fleming, *Charles F. Lummis*, 9.
[85] Fleming, *Charles F. Lummis*, 21.

process that Lummis utilized to make his prints, such as the cyanotype that he would be able to use in the desert, away from more sophisticated equipment and a dark room. Though Lummis took a great many photographs in his life and career, the authors focused on compiling his photographs only from the Pueblos, providing the reader with a glimpse into the time period in which Lummis lived with the tribe and became a part of their home and lives. Each section of the book focused on a different pueblo, each opening with an abbreviated history of the tribe and Lummis's experience with them. The Isleta section, being the place where Lummis spent the majority of his time, opened with the tribe's history with the Spanish, and Lummis's life in the Pueblo, including his divorce from Dorothea and his subsequent marriage to Eve. The chapter on the Pueblo of Laguna opened with Lummis's honeymoon ride through the pueblo and the explanation for his photographs. The authors followed this same pattern for each of the remaining thirteen pueblos. The openings contained objective facts, not the subjective praise or criticism that is present in other works on Lummis.

Illustrating the impact of Charles Lummis outside of the United States, John Koegel's article, "Mexican-American Music in the Nineteenth Century California: The Lummis Wax cylinder Collection at the Southwest Museum, Los Angeles," printed in the Spanish publication, *Revista de Musicología* (Magazine of Musicology) for the Sociedad Española de Musicología (Spanish Society of Musicology) explored the assemblage and impact of Lummis's wax cylinder collection of Spanish and Indian folk songs. The article, which became the basis for Koegel's doctoral dissertation the following year, was objective in tone, describing the process of Lummis acquiring the hundreds of wax cylinders in his collection, as well as how Lummis and a series of musical composers

transcribed the songs from recordings to paper so that they would exist in perpetuity. The article was neither favorable, nor critical of Lummis, but simply detailed Lummis's connection with the Archaeological Institute of America, his acquisition of a wax cylinder machine, and his recording of hundreds of Spanish and Indian songs. In the first of four sections, Koegel described the process of Lummis's recording and transcribing of the wax cylinders and the lasting importance of the recordings as historical artifacts that are still used by musical historians to understand the musical history of the American Southwest.

The second section provided a brief history of secular music within California and its place within the daily lives of the musicians and audiences, stating that music and dance was an important aspect of Hispanic Californian life. Koegel utilized the third section to identify the musicians that Lummis recorded, and their role in creating the repository of Spanish and Indian music encased in Lummis's wax cylinder collection. The final section included the genres of music represented in Lummis's collection, including romance, contemporary narrative, patriotic, and non-narrative lyric.[86] Although Koegel stated that Lummis's criteria for choosing songs was not known, the importance of the collection was high. "Undoubtedly, the Lummis Collection of cylinder recordings is the most important source of secular music from the nineteenth-century Hispanic California."[87]

Martin Padget's "Travel, Exoticism, and the Writing of the Region: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the 'Creation' of the Southwest" presented a strong, objective

[86] John Koegel, "Mexican-American Music in Nineteenth-Century California: The Lummis Wax Cylinder Collection at the Southwest Museum, Los Angeles," *Revista de Musicología* 16, no. 4 (1993): 2092.
[87] Koegel, "Mexican-American Music," 2091.

analysis of Lummis's impact on the Southwest through his writings. Unlike the works of Dudley Gordon, Padget's evaluation of Lummis and his works was critical and acknowledged the writer's shortcomings, penchant for dramatizing the people and events that he wrote about. Padget described Lummis as "A Harvard-educated Eastern transplant who came to live most of his life in Los Angeles, he was hyperbolic, self-aggrandizing, and relentlessly enthusiastic in his personal writing."[88] In this assessment, Padget forwent a superficial biography of Lummis, instead choosing to focus the article on Lummis's actions that were tied to his exploration and promotion of the American West. Padget presented a thesis that from the time that Lummis entered the Southwest, he set out to create a new cultural geography of the region.[89] He examined Lummis's writings during his journey across the nation, comparing and contrasting them with his later works, showing that many of Lummis's preconceived notions of race before his journey were changed during his walk and his life in the Southwest. An example utilized to illustrate this point was Lummis's use of the word "greaser" to refer to the Mexicans that he encountered on his tramp, borrowing racial epithets that he had learned in the East. However, when Lummis compiled his letters into the book, *A Tramp Across the Continent*, Lummis acknowledged his racism, and used it as a lesson to the nation to release racial prejudices.[90] Padget also focused on Lummis's tendency to exaggerate and create sensational stories intended to entice his readers in the East.

> Significantly, it was Lummis's personal investment in the region that afforded him the expertise to make grandiose, sweeping statements about its attributes, and this expertise was in large part founded on what he and many contemporaries saw as his authentic experience of place. Thus Lummis's chief capital in claiming

[88] Martin Padget, "Travel, Exoticism, and the Writing of Region: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the 'Creation' of the Southwest," *Journal of the Southwest* 37, no. 3 (1995): 422.
[89] Padget, "Travel," 423.
[90] Padget, "Travel," 428.

> authority on the Southwest became his own experience – "authentic" experience that was created and commodified through the act of writing.[91]

Padget explained that many of Lummis's romanticized statements came from the fact that Lummis wrote about the West through his own experiences, selling the Southwest as exactly what he had found. This is first shown in his letters from New Mexico where Lummis inserted himself into the story of the people by creating a new identity for himself, which he assumed the people would believe. One aspect of the article that was unique and noteworthy was that Padget made the claim that Lummis, along with other Westerners such as Theodore Roosevelt, Owen Wister, and Frederic Remington, was concerned about the preservation not only of the cultures of the Southwest, but also of manhood, racial identity, and resources, both natural and cultural.[92] The writings that these men completed about the West were also about preserving Anglo culture, and bringing it to the West, inferring that Lummis's support of the Hispanic peoples of the area was not about ensuring more rights, but a concept. Lummis capitalized on Eastern Anglo-Americans in his overly dramatized and hyperbolic descriptions of the Southwest, selling it in order to increase tourism and the white population in the region. This was common in the beginnings of the American conquest of the American Southwest.[93]

Like Gordon before him, Padget analyzed Lummis's account of the Penitentes in New Mexico, however, unlike Gordon, Padget was far more critical of Lummis's reporting, accusing Lummis of failing to "understand the Order as anything other than an

---

[91] Padget, "Travel," 425.
[92] Padget, "Travel," 432.
[93] Michael J. Riley, "Constituting the Southwest Contesting the Southwest Re-Inventing the Southwest," *Journal of the Southwest* 36, no. 3 (1994): 228.

anachronistic and barbaric organization that had degenerated from a once noble heritage in Spain."[94] This type of critique has become more popular in modern examinations of Lummis and was not generally present in those works written in the first five decades following his death. Padget continued this criticism of Lummis in his work fighting for Indian rights, and yet using the people of the Pueblos as decoration in celebrations of the Spanish conquest, wherein the people were forced to celebrate their own colonization.[95] This concept of a battle between Lummis's desire to assist the American Indians while also celebrating the Spanish legacy of which he loved so much is a prime aspect of this paper, and one that requires further examination.

The scholarship on Lummis's work has not been limited to the discipline of history alone. Abigail A. Van Slyck included an analysis of Lummis's impact on the Southwest in her article, "Mañana, Mañana: Racial Stereotypes and the Anglo Rediscovery of the Southwest's Vernacular Architecture, 1890-1920" for *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture*. According to Van Slyck, "Lummis is synonymous with the history of the Anglo rediscovery of this area."[96] Van Slyck did not include a biography of Lummis, but focused the article on Lummis's experience specifically in the Southwest.

Though she initially presented a positive perspective on Lummis's work in the region, Van Slyck was critical on Lummis's presentation of the Southwest.

> The romantic imagery of Lummis's books, however, was still built upon stock images of the Southwest …Characterizations of New Mexico as 'the national Rip Van Winkle' or (later in the same essay) of Mexicans as 'in-bred and isolation-shrunken descendants of the Castilian world' or his choice of the burro as 'the sole canonizable type of northern New Spain' call into question Lummis's

[94] Padget, "Travel," 439.
[95] Padget, "Travel," 446.
[96] Abigail A. Van Slyck, "Mañana, Mañana: Racial Stereotypes and the Anglo Rediscovery of the Southwest's Vernacular Architecture, 1890-1920," *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 5 (1995): 96.

> admiration for the cultures he observed and his sensitivity to their religious beliefs.[97]

Van Slyck's primary criticism was that despite Lummis's supposed appreciation for the culture of the Southwest, his use of racial stereotypes betrayed a lack of true appreciation. Instead, Lummis's interest was that of a novelty, not something respected.

Van Slyck continued the critical analysis of Lummis with the construction of his home, El Alisal. In examining how El Alisal came to be, Van Slyck was critical of not only Lummis's use of multiple aspects of Southwestern architecture in his construction, but the theatrics that he utilized in its construction. She included the fact that the building was largely completed by himself, often in front of visitors, which emphasized his sense of masculinity. Van Slyck also analyzed the Victorian aspects of his home despite the Southwestern architectural themes. This included his use of a parlor, which he called his museo, and the kitchen and laundry's location in the rear of the house

Even his Spanish Noises, which were his version of a Victorian salon, betrayed his Eastern Victorian roots. "In these 'Noises,' we see most clearly that El Alisal was still essentially a Victorian household. Despite the trappings of the Spanish colonial era, this sort of ritualized fun was closely related to contemporary modes of middle-class socializing."[98] Van Slyck's final assessment of Lummis's impact was that following a realization that the presentation of Southwest architecture could bring in tourist dollars, there was a resurgence of Hispanic and Native American architectural forms across the region.[99]

---

[97] Van Slyck, "Mañana, Mañana," 97.
[98] Van Slyck, "Mañana, Mañana," 100.
[99] Van Slyck, "Mañana, Mañana," 101-2.

In 1996, Benjamin Sacks chose to forgo writing a biography of Lummis, instead choosing to write about one specific event with which Charles Lummis had been involved. His article, "Charles Fletcher Lummis at Hotel del Coronado: The Spanish Fiesta, Spring 1894" focused on Lummis's involvement in a festival intended to bring added business to a struggling hotel, as well as celebrate the very culture that Lummis had been fascinated with since his trek across the nation. While the article was a recounting of a specific event in California history, Sacks opened it with a strong support statement for Lummis. "The cast in this nostalgic story features several stars. Foremost is Charles Fletcher Lummis, a distinguished scholar, devoted to a career defending the sedentary Pueblo Indians and the Spanish colonial administration in the New World."[100] While Sacks provided two of Lummis's loves in this one statement, it is really the Spanish that Lummis loved and supported the most. Sacks then set the scene of the Hotel Coronado and its struggles in the early 1890s, and how the majority owner, Elisha Babcock, developed a plan to increase occupancy in the hotel outside of the prime months of January through March by hosting a Spanish festival staged by Charles Lummis.

Utilizing one of the most ardent supporters of Lummis, Sacks quoted Dudley Gordon in a brief biographical sketch of Lummis, explaining why he was the best choice to establish the festival. Sacks then presented correspondence between Babcock and others as well as press releases that all worked to promote the festival and Lummis's involvement therein, making the claim that it appeared as though Lummis may have

[100] Benjamin Sacks, "Charles Fletcher Lummis at Hotel Del Coronado: The Spanish Fiesta, Spring 1894," *Southern California Quarterly* 78, no. 2 (1996): 139.

written some of the promotional material, with Babcock sending them to the papers.[101] Lummis agreed to help organize the event and according to Babcock, would bring with him members of the Pueblo tribe to perform for the spectators that visited the festival. Sacks presented all aspects of the development of the Spanish festival, including the controversy surrounding the proposed idea of a live bull-fight and rodeo, as well as the challenges of procuring the animals necessary for such an event. Another issue that Sacks presented involved Lummis's work in bringing members of the Pueblo tribe to California for the festival, when there had been significant issue surrounding the Cacique, who had requested to be a part of the event, being away from the tribe for an extended period.[102]

According to Sacks, the festival was a success, having gained approval from local newspapers, and people hoping that the event would be to Coronado what Mardi Gras was to New Orleans.[103] He described the event in detail, analyzing how each aspect contributed to the festival as a whole, including the Pueblos who displayed their daily life, pottery, religion, and even took part in tea parties, as guests of honor.[104] Sacks came to the conclusion that not only was the event a success in exposing Americans to the history of the American Indians and the Spanish in the New World, but was a personal success for Lummis's message of Indian rights, promotion of the Spanish heritage of California, and the raising of funds for the San Diego mission.[105]

In "Tasks of Southwestern Translation: Charles Lummis at Isleta Pueblo, 1888-1892," Audrey Goodman analyzed Charles Lummis's translations of the Pueblo folk

[101] Sacks, "Hotel del Coronado," 146.
[102] Sacks, "Hotel del Coronado," 152-3.
[103] Sacks, "Hotel del Coronado," 158.
[104] Sacks, "Hotel del Coronado," 161.
[105] Sacks, "Hotel del Coronado," 172.

stories in the books that he published that were inspired by his time in Isleta. Goodman began by speaking to one of the primary purposes of Lummis's writings. "By rendering the Southwest exotic but unthreatening, such stories of underdevelopment made the region alluring for investors, potential settlers, and armchair travelers alike."[106] Lummis's desire to share his beloved Southwest with the Anglo-Americans of the East led him to make the region as desirable as possible, utilizing the very aspects that had drawn him to it during his walk across the West in 1884-1885.

Goodman examined Lummis's translation, focusing on the Pueblo stories to "show how one writer improvised solutions to the problem of regional translation."[107] The issue presented was whether or not an English translation of a Native American story written for Anglo audiences could adequately portray the cultural nuances and importance of the story in question. Goodman made the point that translating Native American poetry into English required an understanding of how the two cultures related. With the focus having been placed upon the fidelity of the translation to the original meaning of the stories, as well as the overall purpose of the translation itself, Goodman noted that,

> While aiming to save these particular narratives, Lummis wants even more to revive a ritual of storytelling within Anglo culture…But as I have argued, close scrutiny of both the conditions of Lummis's textual production and the surface itself yield a more complex and ambivalent result. His translations imagine a utopian relation between the text and its Anglo readers, as opposed to Clifford's "utopia of plural authorship," which "may be only a dream of no meaning.[108]

[106] Audrey Goodman, "The Tasks of Southwestern Translation: Charles Lummis at Isleta Pueblo, 1888-1892," *Journal of the Southwest,* 43 no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 343.
[107] Goodman, "Tasks," 344.
[108] Goodman, "Tasks," 369.

According to Goodman, Lummis's translations of Pueblo folk stories did not sacrifice the meanings or importance of key themes, but successfully connected the language and cultural differences of both groups in his translation

By far the most comprehensive work on Charles Lummis was Mark Thompson's *American Character: The Curious Life of Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Rediscovery of the Southwest*, published in 2001. Thompson presented a complete biographical sketch, drawing upon many of the works that came before him, including Turbesé Lummis Fiske and Keith Lummis's biography of their father, Lummis's own unfinished memoir, *As I Remember*, and Lummis's personal diary and journals.

Thompson began the book with Lummis at Harvard University, taking a brief four-page turn to examine Lummis's childhood. Unlike the work by Dudley Gordon, Thompson's work was not promotional towards Lummis, but provided an extensive biography that covered all major and minor aspects of Lummis's life. Unlike other writers that had simply described Lummis leaving Harvard, Thompson explained that Lummis was not the best student, and spent the majority of his time at Harvard engaging in extracurricular activities, not his studies. Thompson also wrote about Lummis's secret marriage to Dorothea Rhodes following a scandalous situation that Lummis became involved in with another woman. This involvement with the other woman was reiterated by Thompson later in the book, sharing the story of Lummis's illegitimate daughter.

Thompson presented a quality examination of Lummis's journey across the American West, dedicating an entire chapter to it. This analysis included both the major aspects of his walk including his visit to the Indian school, his first contact with Mexicans, meeting the Pueblos for the first time, and his life-changing encounter with

Amado Chaves in New Mexico as well as his documentation of his hunting and fishing exploits along the way. Thompson then presented Lummis's self-imposed exhausting work schedule as the city editor for the *Los Angeles Times*, showing how this work schedule eventually culminated in a series of strokes that sent Lummis back to New Mexico to recover.

Thompson detailed Lummis's self-guided recovery in New Mexico, including his exploits hunting rabbits single-handed, as he had lost the use of his left side following his initial stroke. This comprehensive analysis also explained the political quagmire in which Lummis became embroiled, leading to his move to the Pueblo of Isleta and his attempted assassination. While papers in the past had analyzed Lummis's impact on the people in New Mexico during his recovery, Thompson went into more detail surrounding the political scandal in which Lummis had involved himself, and how this issue, which had been connected to Lummis's exposure of the Penitentes had led to his assassination attempt.[109]

Unlike the previous biographies of Lummis, Thompson included all aspects of Lummis's life, even detailing the unorthodox situation between Dorothea, Charles, and Lummis's second wife Eve during the time leading up to the divorce and Lummis's second marriage.

> Apparently she (Dorothea) had just one request before she would accede to a divorce. She wanted to meet Eve. In fact, it seems, she insisted that Eve come to Los Angeles and live with her for a while. That, at least, is an inference that can be drawn from what happened next in the curious relationship between Charlie and Dolly and Eve…During that October sojourn to the mountains, Lummis broke the news to Eve about the need for both of them to travel to Los Angeles. She was not at all happy at the thought of meeting her fiancé's wife. She cried, Lummis noted in his diary. But her anxiety was relieved to a certain extent when

[109] Mark Thompson, *American Character: The Curious Life of Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Rediscovery of the Southwest*, New York, Arcade, 2001, 109-115.

> she and Charlie returned to Isleta on November 2 and found 2 letters from Dolly inviting them to come to Los Angeles.[110]

Thompson provided a detailed account of Lummis's fight with the Albuquerque Indian School, and the development of his relationship with the Pueblos at Isleta. Lummis's excursion to Peru with Adolph Bandelier was also presented from the raising of funds for the trip to the disappointment Lummis felt just before returning home to Los Angeles. Thompson's book was brutally honest at times, exposing Lummis's marital issues, his infidelity, and his sometimes-harsh treatment of his wives and children. Lummis's assumption of the editorship of the *Land of Sunshine* was covered in detail, as well his development of the Landmarks Club and the Sequoya League, examining the exploits of both and their lasting impact.

Thompson continued his analysis through Lummis's second divorce, his struggles with money, and finally, his last battles, one for Indian rights, the other, with cancer. In the end, Thompson acknowledged the critical turn that recent scholarship had taken in regard to Lummis, and while the majority of the book had been overwhelmingly objective, Thompson concluded the book with a positive defense of Lummis.

> He was a popularizer more than a groundbreaking scholar, and regularly admitted it, deferring to the greater expertise of the many scientists he counted among his best friends. He regularly employed literary devices, creating composite characters, concocting dialogue, and rearranging events for the sake of a better story, techniques that are quite common, if somewhat controversial, among reputable nonfiction writers these days. It was all for the good cause of instilling in his fellow citizens an appreciation for the nation's rich and diverse culture heritage of which many were entirely ignorant.[111]

Even in acknowledging Lummis's faults and missteps throughout his career, Thompson justified it all, stating that Lummis did it all for the greater good.

---

[110] Thompson, *American Character*, 135.
[111] Thompson, *American Character*, 336.

Much of the scholarship on Charles Lummis has focused solely on him, by way of either a biographical sketch or an analysis of one or all of his works. William T. Hagan's *Theodore Roosevelt and Six Friends of the Indian* focused on Lummis, not at the center, but as a part of a group of men that influenced Theodore Roosevelt and his presidential policies towards the American Indian. Along with George Bird Grinnell, C. Hart Merriam, Herbert Welsh, Hamlin Garland, and Frances E Leupp, Hagan analyzed how Charles Lummis influenced his former Harvard colleague in relation to the government's policies towards the American Indian. Hagan began the book with an analysis of Roosevelt's initial opinions towards the American Indian, including his strong belief in white superiority. The influence of Lummis was focused upon his initial fight with the Albuquerque Indian School, which eventually led to his work in the creation of the Sequoya League, as well as the League's work with Roosevelt to be appointed to the case of the Cupeños who had been evicted from their home on Warner's Ranch.

> Lummis hoped that the new organization would be able to work with the government rather than adopting an adversarial role. "Instead of fighting the Bureau and getting in such bad odor that it hates to see us coming–as the Indian Rights Association has done," he wrote Grinnell," "we must make ourselves so useful that the Bureau will find our way the line of least resistance." The Californian vowed that the new group "shall never fall into the hands of the impossible people. It is born of sentiment, but it must never admit sentimentality.[112]

Hagan also analyzed how the different men worked together towards the same end. Lummis, Grinnell, and Merriam were all influential in the Sequoya League and were on the executive committee. The book, while examining Lummis's influence with the president, also exposed his loss of influence through the failed fight against Indian Agent

[112] William Thomas Hagan, *Theodore Roosevelt and Six Friends of the Indian*, University of Oklahoma Press, 2002, 76.

Burton in Keam's Canyon, Arizona surrounding accusations of wrongdoing against the Moqui or Hopi Indians there. Throughout the book, Hagan presented an objective look at how Lummis and the others were able to influence federal Indian policy and how Lummis's somewhat impetuous behavior removed him as an influencer for President Roosevelt.

One of Lummis's favorite professional hobbies was photography, and it served as a major aspect of his life and a point of pride. In her article, "Photography in the Land of Sunshine: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Regional Ideal," for *Southern California Quarterly*, Jennifer A. Watts analyzed his use of photography in his magazine to promote the American West. Watts began the article by examining how the *Land of Sunshine* began, six months before Lummis joined the staff as editor. When Lummis was first mentioned on the third page, there were factual errors presented when Watts described Lummis's walk across the West and his entrance into California. Watts mentioned that Lummis was twenty-six when he decided to leave Ohio for California, but he was actually twenty-five at the time in 1884. The second error was Watts's assertion that Lummis met his new boss, Harrison Gray Otis in December of 1885.[113] However, according to Lummis's own letters from his trip, he met Otis on February 1, 1885 when he entered Southern California.[114] This error is interesting because Watts included Lummis's own assertion that he walked 3,507 miles on his journey, but not the meeting of his new boss. Watts also incorrectly stated that it was after Lummis's arrival in

[113] Jennifer A. Watts, "Photography in the *Land of Sunshine*: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Regional Ideal," *Southern California Quarterly* 87, no. 4 (2005): 342.
[114] Charles Fletcher Lummis, *Letters from the Southwest, September 20, 1884 to March 14, 1885*, Ed. James W Byrkit, Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 1989, 292.

California that Otis offered the job of city editor to him. However, this arrangement had already been made and was the impetus for his walk.

When analyzing the impact that Lummis had with the *Land of Sunshine*, Watts focused the article on his use of photography in the periodical. She noted that Lummis understood the power of the photograph, averaging thirty-five photos per issue.[115] Using letters from readers of the magazine at the time of Lummis's tenure there, Watts made the point that for some, the photographs were the primary draw.[116] Watts analyzed the purpose of Lummis's use of photographs, making the statement that it was primarily to promote the state of California and lure visitors and migrants from the East.

Watts examined the ways that Lummis promoted the state of California, and the Southwest as a whole through his use of two forms of photography in the magazine. The first was Lummis's use of children to promote the climate of California. Watts analyzed Lummis's use of photos of Anglo children in the magazine, which she described as his ideal racial image of California. This illustrated the type of person that Lummis was truly attempting to lure from the East into California and the West.[117] Another way in which Lummis utilized photography to promote California was with the plant life. Like children, Lummis claimed that the California climate was wholly beneficial for plant life in the state.[118] The article was largely objective in tone with respect to Lummis, focusing primarily on the magazine itself. However, Watts did make the point that Lummis was

[115] Watts, "Photography," 347.
[116] Watts, "Photography," 348.
[117] Watts, "Photography," 350-6.
[118] Watts, "Photography," 358-66.

the heart and soul of the *Land of Sunshine* and its renamed version, *Out West*, and his departure was the key to the periodical's eventual demise.[119]

Unlike the articles and books that focused on specific works by Charles Lummis, or his personal crusades for one cause or another, Martha J. Cutter's "Sui Sin Far's Letters to Charles Lummis: Contextualizing Publication Practices for the Asian American Subject at the Turn of the Century" examined how Lummis's assistance impacted the career of Sui Sin Far (Edith Maude Eaton). The key research questions within the article focused on the impact of Lummis's friendship with Sui Sin Far and his advocacy for her, the dichotomy between the racist stereotypes present in the *Land of Sunshine* and her own work breaking down those same stereotypes, and how Lummis's perception of her influenced his promotion. In order to allow the reader to understand the importance of Lummis's assistance, Cutter exposed the conditions in the United States at the turn of the century towards the Chinese.

> The Chinese in America were viewed as heathen, unassimilable, inscrutable, and cowardly individuals who spent their time smoking opium, gambling, and kidnapping white women into slavery and prostitution…At the turn of the century, then "exclusion and bigotry were policy at both the state and national levels."[120]

This same image of the Chinese was present in the *Land of Sunshine*, furthering harmful stereotypes that damaged the image of Chinese Americans. However, this sentiment changed when the Chinese person in question had converted to Christianity. Cutter explained that the stories about the Chinese were often sensationalized in order to

[119] Watts, "Photography," 371.
[120] Martha J. Cutter, "Sui Sin Far's Letters to Charles Lummis: Contextualizing Publication Practices for the Asian American Subject at the Turn of the Century," *American Literary Realism,* 38, no. 3 (Spring 2006): 261.

"capitalize on the 'exotic' appeal of this new group."[121] Just as Lummis had done with the American Indian, the Mexican, and the Spaniard, the Chinese were another exotic group to tantalize his Anglo readers with the sensational stories of the people that existed only in the West. As her writing talents and career grew, Sui Sin Far came to accept her Chinese heritage more, and embraced a less-anglicized name. In her earlier correspondence and writings, she signed her name, Edith Eaton. However, as her exposure grew, she adopted the name, Sui Sin Far, including that in her writings and letters. Cutter came to the determination that Lummis's letters, criticism, and editing worked to shape what he wished to tell his readers, but it strengthened Sui Sin Far's self-awareness, her personhood, and her writing.[122]

In his book, *Charles F. Lummis: Author and Adventurer*, Marc Simmons did not provide an analysis of a specific work that Lummis had completed during his career, nor did he present a complete biography, as most other works had done. Instead, Simmons's primary addition to the scholarship on Charles Lummis was his analysis of Lummis's relationship with Don Amado Chaves. Simmons opened the book with a personal story of gaining access to personal papers of Chaves's from his daughter. In this collection of papers were personal notes, as well as letters between Chaves and Lummis which shed light into the relationship between the two seemingly opposite men. Simmons analyzed how the friendship between the two began and what impact that it had on both parties throughout their life.

> During the idyllic but brief stay in San Mateo, Lummis came to revere old Manuel Chaves as a father whom he described as "a courtly Spanish gentleman, brave as a lion, tender as a woman, spotless of honor, modest as heroic…who seldom spoke of his own achievements"…If the youthful Lummis held Don

[121] Cutter, "Sui Sin Far," 263.
[122] Cutter, "Sui Sin Far," 273.

> Manuel as a father, it was the eldest son, Amado, who became a brother and remained a steadying influence throughout the rest of his life.[123]

The relationship between the two had begun during Lummis's walk through New Mexico, but continued throughout the rest of Lummis's life and Chaves was a source of information, as well as a close confidant and caretaker, as he was during Lummis's recuperation from his strokes in 1888. Chaves was also influential in Lummis's substantial love for the Spanish, their culture, and legacy in the Southwest.

> For Lummis, Amado Chaves represented all that was fine and noble in the Spanish tradition. Proud, diligent, loyal, and generous to a fault, Chaves stood by the aggressive and flamboyant Lummis through fair weather and foul…Destiny perhaps first brought them together in 1884, but it was strength of character on both sides which welded their friendship for forty years.[124]

Simmons made the argument that though they were from extremely different backgrounds and upbringings, their friendship had a positive effect on both, lasting until Lummis's death in 1928.

Shephard Krech and Barbara A. Hail dedicated the third chapter of their book, *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960* to Charles Lummis and his acquisition of American Indian artifacts for the Southwestern Museum of the American Indian. While the majority of the chapter focused on the establishment of the museum, the authors also presented a brief biography of Lummis. While much of it was accurate, the authors attributed Lummis's acquaintance with Theodore Roosevelt to a college prank. However, it was Lummis's refusal to cut his hair short and Roosevelt's class's threats against Lummis that led to their meeting, as well as their subsequent friendship and working relationship. The authors may have conflated Roosevelt with Boise Penrose, a member of

[123] Marc Simmons, *Charles F. Lummis: Author and Adventurer,* New Mexico, Sunstone Press, 2008, 36.
[124] Simmons, *Charles F. Lummis,* 64.

Lummis's student body and his accomplice in much of his college pranks.[125] In their account of Lummis's walk across the West, the authors acknowledged the role of the Chaves family in Lummis's love of the region. "Perhaps most important to Lummis's transformation was the time he spent with the Chavez family in San Mateo. Amado Chavez, Speaker of the territorial House of Representatives and scion of one of New Mexico's oldest ranching families, invited him to visit the family estate."[126]

As the chapter related to the development of the Southwest Museum, the authors made an interesting observation about the construction of Lummis's house, El Alisal. "In 1897 he began to build his own home. Set in the Arroyo Seco, about midway between downtown Los Angeles and Pasadena, El Alisal was the house of a Spanish don, where Lummis could indulge in the Western lifestyle of his dreams."[127] The authors confirmed that the house that Lummis designed and built, largely by himself, was that of a Spanish don from the period of the American Southwest that Lummis loved so much. Since Lummis's infatuation with the Spanish colonial period of the Southwest is key to understanding his Spanish apologetics, this understanding is key in analyzing Lummis's mindset.

The next sections of the chapter focused on Lummis's acquisition of objects and artifacts that would eventually be the basis of the Southwest Museum's collection of native America and the beginnings of the museum itself. The authors explained how Lummis acquired a sizable collection of Native American relics through his many travels,

---

[125] Shepard Krech, Barbara A Hail, and Smithsonian Institution. *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960*, Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Books, 2010, 76. When Lummis was a freshman at Harvard, it was expected that freshmen would all cut their hair short, but Lummis refused. It was the sophomore class, Roosevelt's class, that threatened to cut Lummis's hair for him if he refused to do so. When Lummis refused to back down to the threat, he earned the respect of Roosevelt.

[126] Krech, *Collecting*, 78.

[127] Krech, *Collecting*, 81.

purchasing souvenirs wherever he went, and collecting artifacts from his expeditions. Following the collecting of relics, Lummis developed the Southwest Society in order to complete the field research necessary in order to complete the museum itself and the appointment of curator, Frank M. Palmer. The authors then examined the battle between Lummis and Palmer, stemming originally from Lummis's accusations against Palmer of negligence.[128]

The authors then analyzed the actual construction of the museum buildings, focusing on the location and the architectural stylings. When presenting the choice of locations for the museum, the authors were objective, if not a bit sarcastic in their presentation of how the final location was chosen.

> In the search for a site for the new museum, Henry Huntington offered to donate one of the four locations in Eastlake Park, in East Los Angeles, and Abbot Kinney offered a site in his new cultural and recreational development at Venice. Lummis campaigned for a location on the side of Mount Washington, north of downtown Los Angeles, that he characterized as 'the most beautiful location and outlook of any public building in America.' Predictably, his preference was the site selected.[129]

What is also interesting about the location that Lummis chose, was that it was just up the hill from his home, El Alisal, so that he could see the museum without having to venture away from his house.

While describing the planning of the museum building, the authors acknowledged Lummis's blindness and presented the accepted cause as a disease that he acquired while on an expedition in the jungle, but may have inadvertently exposed the potential fallacy

---

[128] Krech, *Collecting*, 87. Because Palmer had failed to catalog the museum's collections after four years in his position, Lummis accused him of neglect. In response, Palmer accused Lummis of a multitude of wrongs, including "coercion, slander, manipulation, misappropriation, exaggeration, domination of the board, encouraging despoliation of sites, and conflict of interest for the School of American Archaeology." The board of directors sided with Lummis and Parker was asked to resign.

[129] Krech, *Collecting*, 88.

in his blindness. "Critics might remark that the Southwest Museum, for all its attractiveness, was designed by a blind man."[130] Lummis's exit from the managing board of the museum was objectively presented, as was his reinstatement in the 1920s and the sale of his collection and home, El Alisal to the museum. The chapter as a whole was extremely objective in tone, not overly praising, nor critical, and the conclusion expressed Lummis's ultimate goal succinctly. "Although the Southwest Museum became one of the country's preeminent museums concerned with American Indians, they were but a part of Lummis's broader focus on Spanish America."[131]

The majority of the work that has been written about Charles Lummis has been written by historians. However, "The Curious Blindness of Charles F. Lummis" by Curtis E. Margo, Lynn E. Harman, and Don B. Smith was an article written by medical doctors, and analyzed the period of time between 1911 and 1913 that Charles Lummis was blind. Where other writers had analyzed Lummis's work or presented a biography, these doctors chose to analyze his blindness itself in order to posthumously determine a cause for the mysterious blindness, though Lummis believed that he knew what had caused it. "From the earliest onset of symptoms, Lummis attributed his eye condition to 'jungle fever,' he contracted while on a 6-week expedition to the Mayan ruins of Quirigua."[132] Though Lummis believed that the blindness was caused by jungle fever, the authors questioned this diagnosis, and considered the ailment in context with the other events that

[130] Krech, *Collecting*, 89. It is believed that Lummis's blindness was highly exaggerated, if completely non-existent. Lummis's diary entries during the period did not show any difference from those beforehand, and even his friend, John Muir, implied that the blindness was fabricated. As with his series of strokes, his blindness coincided with struggles in his marriage, though his blindness occurred during a particularly nasty divorce.

[131] Krech, *Collecting*, 95.

[132] Curtis E. Margo, Lynn E. Harman, and Don B. Smith, "The Curious Blindness of Charles F. Lummis," *Arch Ophthalmology* 129, no. 5 (May 2011): 655.

were occurring in his life at the time. The doctors had noticed that Lummis's blindness curiously coincided with the loss of his job as Los Angeles City Librarian, the development of the Southwest Museum, and a particularly nasty divorce.

> Eva moved in with Phoebe Hearst, the mother of William Randolph Hearst, and then decided she must forsake her pride to win custody of her children by exposing every detail of her husband's infidelities. Eva learned to turn Lummis's obsession as a diarist against him. With some patience, she was able to decipher the cryptic entries that for years cataloged his sexual exploits.[133]

Although Lummis had intended to draw the attention away from his divorce, and it was relatively successful, news of the bitter split still made it into articles in California and New Mexico where his fame had centered.

> Mrs. Charles F. Lummis, of Los Angeles, has begun proceedings for divorce. She has been here for several months, much of the time staying with Mrs. Phoebe Hearst. Mrs. Lummis refuses to make public her grounds for divorce, but rumor has it that the separation from her distinguished husband is due to the discovery of her husband's diary, written in Spanish and Greek, giving details of his love affairs with many different affinities.[134]

This same article, had been printed in the *San Antonio Light and Gazette* verbatim two weeks later on October 30.[135]

Not being the type of man to admit his sins to his fanbase, Lummis had already answered the charges three days prior in an article in the *San Francisco Call*.

> Charles F. Lummis, author, scientist and former city library, made a general denial today of the allegations of his wife, who is in San Francisco preparing to apply for a divorce. But Lummis' denial is general and not specific. He positively refuses to enter into any controversy or discussion of the troubles that have caused

---

[133] Curtis E. Margo, "The Curious Blindness," 658.

[134] "Would Divorce Charles F. Lummis: Discovers Affinity Records in Husband's Greek-Spanish Diary – Foremost Resident of New Mexico," *Santa Fe New Mexican* October 17, 1910. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020630/1910-10-17/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1910&index=1&rows=20&words=DIVORCE+LUMMIS&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1910&proxtext=Lummis+divorce&y=19&x=25&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[135] "Revelations in Loomis Diary Start Divorce," *San Antonio Light and Gazette* (San Antonio, Texas), October 30, 1910, 7. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86090238/1910-10-30/ed-1/seq-7/#date1=1893&index=4&rows=20&words=Lummis+Spanish&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1915&proxtext=Lummis+Spanish+&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

> the separation, but intimates that at some later time he may make a formal statement.[136]

Though he denied the charges, in the end, the evidence was exceptionally damning for the writer. It had also spread farther than the Southwest and was an issue that Lummis wished to avoid completely and keep quiet. *The New York Tribune* ran a story on October 13 that made the case that Lummis had attempted to keep the story hidden.

> On account of the social and literary standing of the pair, their influential friends have endeavored to keep secret the details of separation, but there have come forth rumors of a diary written by Lummis in Spanish and Greek, which, having fallen into the hands of Mrs. Lummis, was translated and thereupon transformed into plaintiff's exhibit A.[137]

Lummis was apparently not too personally concerned with losing his wife, as he had been seen in the company of others while he was trying to minimize the impact that it had on his life. "He was singing at his home in Los Angeles when seen to-day, and with him were two women, one of whom played his accompaniment on the piano and the other listened."[138]

It was also Lummis's obsession with documenting every day of his life that provided the doctors with what they believed was the truth about his blindness, and that was that it was likely not factual. The writers examined examples of Lummis's own journal from before, during, and after his blindness, and the results showed that Lummis's writing never changed, nor did he ever fail to stay within the lines of his small

---

[136] "Lummis Makes General Denial But Refuses to Discuss Wife's Charges," *San Francisco Call* 108, no. 136 (October 14, 1910), 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85066387/1910-10-14/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1910&index=0&rows=20&words=divorce+Lummis&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=California&date2=1910&proxtext=Lummis+divorce&y=16&x=13&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[137] "Discord in Poet's Life: Mrs. Lummis Finds Diary and Consults Lawyer," *New York Tribune*, October 13, 1910, 7. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn83030214/1910-10-13/ed-1/seq-8/#date1=1893&index=6&rows=20&words=Lummis+Spanish&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1915&proxtext=Lummis+Spanish+&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[138] "Discord in Poet's Life." 7.

journal pages, presenting at best, an exceedingly low likelihood of possibility of a legitimate blindness.[139]

> Although we will never know for sure whether Lummis's blindness was real or feigned, his description of the ordeal in November 1912 offers another possible clue: "I intend to get my eyes back in time…The dark is another world and I had fun exploring it." This degree of self-confidence contradicts the humility that people typically face at the hands of a cruel and capricious disease. One wonders whether it also reflects the psychological improvisation of a complex man."[140]

While their diagnosis can never be proven conclusively, the authors presented a lot of quality evidence that showed a high likelihood of the entire episode being either psychosomatic or completely invented for a distraction away from the darker aspects of his life that coincided with his supposed blindness.

Modern researchers' determination as to whether Lummis's blindness was conceived as an attention-diversion from his divorce, genuinely occurring from jungle fever, or psychosomatic, will likely never be known. However, his recovery from this blindness was news throughout California. The author had been assisting and overseeing the design of the new Southwest Museum of the American Indian and his blindness certainly played a part in his dramatic theatrics surrounding the design, such as having his son, Quimu, guide him around, and running his fingers over blueprints in order to "see" the layout in his mind's eye. However, when his sight returned, it was equally newsworthy, inspiring news articles around the state of California. In an article for the *San Francisco Call* in October, 1912, the writer shared the news of Lummis's recovery with the paper's readers

> Friends of Charles F. Lummis, the well-known explorer and writer, who has been totally blind, have received word that his sight has been restored, the news coming from his own hand from ruins at Amoximqua, N.M., where he has been

[139] "The Curious Blindness," 659.
[140] Curtis E. Margo, "The Curious Blindness," 659-60.

> pursuing archaeological research work for the Southwest Museum of Los Angeles, with the aid of his son, Quimu, his daughter and a number of Indians.[141]

Lummis had successfully been a quality self-promoter that he was able to redirect a significant amount of the attention away from his bitter divorce to the point where the public celebrated with him when his sight was restored.

In Chapter Four of his book, *Making the White Man's West*, Jason Pierce compared the lives and works of two Easterners that migrated to the closing West, who experienced a drastic effect on their lives. Pierce analyzed the broad works of Charles Lummis and Frank Bird Linderman and their effect on the American West. With regard to Lummis, Pierce focused his work heavily on Lummis's idealization of the West, his work preserving native cultures, and his addition to the concept of the Spanish fantasy past. Pierce described Lummis in the words of historian Hal Rothman, a neo-native, or Easterner that migrated West, becoming a part of the new area.[142]

Pierce's assessment of Lummis was mostly positive, with limited criticism, which focused primarily on Lummis's contradictory ideas and statements. Pierce began this chapter by analyzing Lummis's idealization of the American West as a romantic region that served as the answer to all of the issues that faced Anglo-Americans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While Pierce produced strong evidence of Lummis's celebration and belief in the superiority of Anglo-Americans, he omitted Lummis's critique of the Anglos that settled the eastern United States, contrasting them

---

[141] "Blind Man's Eyes Open to Light: Charles F. Lummis, Author and Explorer, Sees After Fifteen Months," *San Francisco Call,* October 20, 1912, 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85066387/1912-10-20/ed-1/seq-36/#date1=1912&index=0&rows=20&words=Lummis+Sees&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1912&proxtext=Lummis+sees&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[142] Jason E. Pierce, "Indians not Immigrants: Charles Fletcher Lummis, Frank Bird Linderman, and the Complexities of Race and Ethnicity in America." *Making the White Man's West: Whiteness and the Creation of the American West*, University Press of Colorado, 2016, 95.

with Lummis's view of the superior Spanish conquistadores in the Southwest. Referring to Lummis as,

> A writer, reporter, editor, and self-taught combination of ethnologist, archaeologist, and historian, Lummis's varied career became the consummate example of the active intellectual, the uniquely American type of thinker and doer. Eventually, his opinions and reputation would carry weight far beyond Southern California. His fiery zeal for the Southwest, rather than any intellectual achievements, made him well-known in his era. He was certainly a popularizer, but in being so, he left a legacy.[143]

While this assessment certainly conforms to what Lummis thought of himself, as well as the legacy that he wished to leave behind, it lacked a more critical observation into Lummis's work and his omission of facts in his written works that did not match his own narrative, excluding his role as a legitimate ethnologist and historian.

In analyzing Lummis's work preserving native cultures, Pierce utilized a number of instances of Lummis's work, including his contention with the Indian education system in the United States. Pierce analyzed Lummis's series, "My Brother's Keeper" where Lummis educated his readers about the evils inherent in the American Indian education system, as well as his recommendations about how to resolve the shortcomings present within the system. This area of Pierce's evaluation of Lummis's work was the most critical of the man, with his acknowledgement of Lummis's overwhelming bias when it came to certain American Indian tribes.

> He liked the Pueblo peoples the best, harbored some suspicion of the Navajo, and believed the Hualapais of the Mojave stood out as a 'race of filthy and unpleasant Indians, who were in world-wide contrast with the admirable Pueblos of New Mexico…They manufacture nothing characteristic, as do nearly all other aborigines, and they are of very little interest.[144]

[143] Pierce, "Indians," 98.
[144] Pierce, "Indians," 101.

Pierce also acknowledged Lummis's tendency towards believing that he knew what was best for the tribal people, condescended to the very people that he was claiming to help. However, even in this critique, Pierce was much more forgiving of Lummis, in his comparison between the writer and Richard Henry Pratt, the founder of the Carlisle Indian School, "Needless to say, his paternalism sounded little different than Pratt's, but Lummis at least respected Indian cultures."[145] However, Pierce's previous quote negated this statement, as Lummis respected only certain Indian cultures.

Pierce's final analysis of Lummis's work was his contribution to the concept of a Spanish fantasy past, acknowledging that Lummis white-washed the Hispanic history of California. This selective recounting of the Spanish history of the Southwest was intended to present the region in a romanticized way, enticing white Easterners to relocate to what Lummis believed was the ideal location. Pierce's assertion of Lummis's white-washing of the Spanish past was due to the fact that Lummis celebrated the Southwest's Hispanic history, but did not support the expansion of rights for Hispanic people, politically and economically.[146] While mildly critical of Lummis, Pierce could have explored more of Lummis's contradictions and the impact of his preference for the Spanish over all other cultures, including his acceptance of those actions that the Spanish took, while criticizing comparable actions taken by the United States.

There have also been masters and doctoral dissertations that have recently focused on Charles Lummis, mostly centered on his impact on cultural preservation and the development of a Southwestern culture. The first of such dissertations was Zita Ingham's "Reading and Writing a Landscape: A Rhetoric of Southwest Desert Literature" written

[145] Pierce, "Indians," 101.
[146] Pierce, "Indians," 106.

in 1991. Written for the fulfilment of a Ph.D. in rhetoric, composition, teaching English from the University of Arizona, Ingham analyzed Lummis's impact on the Southwest not from a historical perspective, but as a part of the evolution of a new literary style. While only a small section of the paper was dedicated to Lummis, Ingham made the statement that, "Lummis slights the physical not in favor of the aesthetic or emotional response, but in order to encourage tourism."[147] This same sentiment had been shared by others in the past that had acknowledged Lummis's marketing of the American Southwest in his writings and in the *Land of Sunshine* and *Out West*.

In 2004, Joseph Perry Staples completed his doctoral dissertation, also for a Ph.D. in English from the University of Arizona, titled, "Constructing the *Land of Sunshine*: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Marketing of a Post-Frontier West." In the paper, Staples argued that Lummis played a significant role in the development of the literature and culture of the American West. As a New Englander that had migrated west, "Lummis enacted on his body and in his personal spaces a cultural myth of Anglo masculinity and familiar fantasy shared by many of his time: that the West was to be the site of cultural and personal revitalization."[148] Lummis sold the West as a place in which to reinvent oneself, thus increasing his desire to sell the West to the Anglo audiences of the East. Staples presented an objective viewpoint of Lummis, his work, and his personal failings. Speaking of his personal failings, "I am no Lummis apologist; he unquestionably appropriated and took advantage of Indians and Mexicans as he has been charged. He was difficult to live around and hurt those who loved him, and he was sometimes a self-

[147] Zita Ingham, "Reading and Writing a Landscape: A Rhetoric of Southwest Desert Literature," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, 1991, 79.
[148] Joseph Perry Staples, "Constructing the *Land of Sunshine*: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Marketing of a Post-Frontier West," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, 2004, 10.

absorbed braggart."[149] In contrast, Staples also presented Lummis's qualities as well. "For instance, he wrote often to denounce U.S. imperialism in Cuba, the Philippines, and Hawaii, and publicly praised feminist writings by Charlotte Perkins Stetson and others. These political writings show that he was indeed reflective and could think well about complex problems."[150] Ultimately admitting that while it was difficult to separate Lummis's work from his personal life, his writings and editorial contributions were an important aspect of the development of the American West as a literary region.

In his Master's thesis for Library and Information Science, Daniel Blitz analyzed the impact that Charles Lummis had as the librarian for the city of Los Angeles. Beginning his paper with an admission of Lummis's strengths and weaknesses, Blitz established the tone of the paper as an objective evaluation of Lummis's work as librarian. He made the argument that Lummis had a massive effect on the Los Angeles Library during his tenure. His positive impact was that of his work ethic, community outreach, development of an adequate reference collection, and his willingness to learn from others in his field with more experience and knowledge.[151] However, Blitz also recognized that Lummis had some serious character flaws that needed to be considered.

> To the contrary, he was a deeply flawed individual whose marital infidelities were downright excessive. The manner in which he landed his job as librarian in the first place was certainly most unfortunate. His predecessor, Mary Jones, was outrageously fired simply because of her gender. Throughout his librarianship, one scandal after another seemed to plague the institution.[152]

---

[149] Staples, "Constructing the *Land of Sunshine*," 209.
[150] Staples, "Constructing the *Land of Sunshine*," 209.
[151] Daniel Frederick Blitz, "Charles Fletcher Lummis: Los Angeles City Librarian," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Los Angeles, 2013, 85-86.
[152] Blitz, "Charles Fletcher Lummis," 86.

This lamentation over the firing of Mary Jones was previously presented by Margaret F. Maxwell in an article for American Libraries in 1978.[153] Despite his personal failings, Blitz concluded that Lummis's vision for a grand library and his work to develop such an ideal were vital aspects to growing the library in Los Angeles.

In her doctoral thesis for the University of California Riverside in history, Michelle Lorimer explored how writers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reimagined the Spanish past of the Southwest, revised the historical record, and promoted an idyllic version of the Spanish conquest and occupation. In the paper, Lorimer utilized Lummis's very first article following his acceptance of the editorship of the *Land of Sunshine*, "The Spanish-American Face," stating that Lummis's initial article in the new magazine was an argument supporting the Spanish conquest of the natives as just and achieved far more than the English explorers did in the original Eastern colonies.[154] She connected this to his support of the Spanish missions and his failure to understand the negative impact that the Spanish and the entire mission system had on the California Indians. Lorimer acknowledged Lummis's contradictory fight for Indian rights, while promoting the Spanish conquest, denying that the Spanish ever engaged in any actions detrimental to the American Indians.

Continuing the analysis of Charles Lummis's life and works through the lens of English and cultural studies, Elizabeth Lloyd Oliphant's "Inventing the Southwest: How Modernists Shaped an American Regional Experience" explored how Charles Lummis worked to shape tourism in the Southwest. Oliphant argued that Lummis's legacy was

---

[153] Margaret F. Maxwell, "The Lion and the Lady: The Firing of Miss Mary Jones," *American Libraries* 9, no. 5 (May, 1978): 268-72.

[154] Michelle Marie Lorimer, "Reconstructing the Past: Historical Interpretations and Native Experiences at Contemporary California Missions," Ph. D. Dissertation, University of California Riverside, 2013, 52.

that of popularizing the American Southwest as a unique desirable region.[155] She also made the statement that Lummis's *The Spanish Pioneers* failed to connect the Spanish treatment of the American Indian with U.S. Indian policy and the English conquest. However, Lummis made numerous statements about the benefits of the Spanish treatment of the Indians in *The Spanish Pioneers*. In this work, he contrasted the success of the Spanish in the subjugation of the natives, and utilized the work to justify harsh treatment levied against the natives by the invading Spanish. Many of his other works contrasted the Spanish success with the Indians where the English had not, including his article, "The Indian Who is not Poor." [156] She also explored how Lummis's partnership with the Harvey Company for tours across the Southwest increased tourism and increased Anglo exposure to the region. Oliphant concluded that Lummis "shaped the infrastructure of tourism in the Southwest, both indirectly, through his writing, and directly, in his partnership with the Harvey Company."[157] However, this increase in tourism worked to close off the frontier that he loved and officially ended a desirable period of the American Southwest.

Not being limited to the United States, Christopher Gonzalez-Crane completed his thesis titled, "California and the Emergence of Lifestyle: Self-Help, Tourism, and Los Angeles 1800-1915" for the University of London. Gonzalez-Crane's purpose was to examine how the development of lifestyle occurred in California in the nineteenth and

---

[155] Elizabeth Lloyd Oliphant, "Inventing the Southwest: How Modernists Shaped an American Regional Experience," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2017, 44.

[156] Charles Lummis contrasted the Spanish conquest of the New World with that of the English conquest in his article, "The Indian Who is Not Poor" and his book, *The Spanish Pioneers*. This contrast is important understanding how Lummis perceived Spain's ability to subdue the natives as opposed to England's, and by extension, the United States' conquest over the natives and their subjugation of the people's lifestyle, language, and religion.

[157] Oliphant, "Inventing the Southwest," 79.

early twentieth centuries. Chapter Three of his paper was dedicated to Lummis's contribution to the development of a sense of the West and Southwest as a separate cultural region. While there were factual errors in Gonzalez-Crane's biographical introduction of Lummis, such as dating his birth a decade after its actual occurrence, and his statement that Lummis's tramp was to escape a failed marriage, Gonzalez-Crane provided an objective analysis of Lummis's work. Acknowledging Lummis's faults, Gonzalez-Crane noted that, "His writing is often racist, inconsistent, and eccentric to the point of being self-contradictory. Lummis's effort at preserving dying cultural forms seems desperately at odds with his boosterism of the very forces hastening its decline."[158] Lummis's desire to sell the West to Anglo people of the East was instrumental in the quickening of the decline for the very groups, such as the American Indians and Mexicans, that he had been seeking to protect. Gonzalez-Crane argued that despite this seeming contradiction, Lummis had set the foundation of what it meant to be a Southwesterner.

[158] Christopher Gonzalez-Crane, "California and the Emergence of Lifestyle: Self-Help, Tourism, and Los Angeles," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of London, 2020, 130.

Chapter 3 A TRAMP ACROSS THE CONTINENT

Charles Lummis's life was by all accounts complicated. He embroiled himself in issues of American Indian rights, cultural preservation, and recognition of the Spanish impact on the American Southwest. Knowing what Charles Lummis did in his lifetime is not a difficult task. He documented almost everything that he did in his diary, his journals, his magazine, and his books. The difficult task for historians is understanding who Charles Lummis actually was. This question is not merely one of lineage and personal history, but how these events, as well as his own personal beliefs and personality shaped the direction of his life, his works, and his legacy. Since his death in 1928, scholars have worked diligently to answer this very question. However, much like the people that he wrote about within his lifetime, the answer to that question is complicated and not easily understood. This explains the different perspectives on his life and why the scholarship on Lummis has generally been focused on merely one aspect of his life. How can this question be properly answered in a suitable manner? It would take an analysis of multiple aspects of Lummis's life, actions, and written works.

Although Charles Lummis was the son of a professor, he did not have the alacrity, nor the dedication to his school work that would have made him a great student. He never had the drive to be a college man, but did so because his father was a college man and it was expected of him from his youth.[159] On the contrary, Lummis used his time in college to rebel against authority, choosing a multitude of activities in lieu of attending his classes, including hunting eels, playing poker, and engaging in a series of pranks with

[159] Charles Lummis, *As I Remember*, (unpublished manuscript), Box 2, Folder 3, Papers of Charles Fletcher Lummis, University of Arizona Archives, typescript.

Boise Penrose, who would later serve as a senator from Pennsylvania.[160] In hindsight, this could have been expected based on his tumultuous childhood.

Born in 1859 to Harriet Fowler Lummis and Reverend Henry Lummis, a Methodist minister and professor, Charles seemed destined to have a life that would present him with a great amount of possibilities. Henry Lummis was regarded as one of the most prominent linguists in the United States, with a specialty in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew.[161] Unfortunately, in 1861, young Charles's life was forever altered by the death of his mother. Following Harriet's death, Henry sent the two-year-old along with his newborn baby sister, Louise, to live with their maternal grandparents. Their grandfather, Judge Oscar Fitzallen Fowler was the village probate judge in Bristol, New Hampshire. He was also the village saddle and harness maker.[162] This influence of a hard-working man that wore many hats would one day be clearly seen in Charles Lummis after his eventual arrival in the Southwest. It was during this time that Charles developed a love for trout fishing that stayed with him through adulthood. He would even spend a great deal of the recounting of his walk speaking of the trout fishing that he was able to do along the way.[163]

When he was eight, his formal education began under the teaching of Jennie B. Brewster. Henry was the principal of the New Hampshire Seminary and Female College at Sanbornton Bridge, New Hampshire. There was a school there for the village school-aged children where Charles attended. Although a gifted child, his time at the school was

---

[160] Lummis, *As I Remember.*
[161] Charles Lummis, "A Successful Life," *Out West* 22, no. 5 (May, 1905): 318-9.
[162] Turbesé Lummis Fiske and Keith Lummis, *Charles Lummis: The Man and His West*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.
[163] Charles F. Lummis, *A Tramp Across the Continent*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982.

not a positive one, having hidden under a desk when the teacher left the room. Unable to get the boy out from under the table despite the threat of corporal punishment, Ms. Brewster resorted to contacting his father, who was able to coerce his son back out. Realizing that a formal school was not the best learning environment for Charles, Henry agreed to teach his son himself.[164]

Within the next few years, Charles became a learned student, adept at Latin, Hebrew, and Greek like his father. He enjoyed reading a great deal, especially the tales of American Indians told by Captain Mayne Reid. His knowledge and intelligence were good enough to get him into Harvard, despite a lack of formal school experience. However, unlike his father, Charles did not have the same desire for higher education, instead choosing this time to experience a lifestyle that he could not have experienced as the son of a Methodist minister. Activities such as drinking, playing poker, and masquerading as a vagabond, making his way up the East Coast were not what would have been expected for the son of such a prestigious educator and minister.[165] His extracurricular activities aside, one thing came out of his time at Harvard that had a major impact on his life and work. At that time at Harvard, freshmen were expected to have their hair cut short. When Lummis refused to cut his long hair, the sophomore class made it a point to threaten the freshman that if he refused to cut his hair, they would gladly do it for him. When he returned the threat with a challenge to the entire sophomore class, a certain sophomore admired Charles's resolve to not be bullied by the older class. This sophomore was a young Theodore Roosevelt, and although the two would not become

[164] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[165] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

close friends by any means, Roosevelt's respect for Lummis's tenacity and refusal to acquiesce to the demands of other people outlived their time at Harvard.[166] This relationship later allowed Lummis to serve in a federal capacity during Roosevelt's presidency.

One aspect of Harvard life upon which Lummis did spend significant time was building up his physical strength. Though not a large man at a mere 5'6, Lummis spent his youth building up his strength, including wrestling and boxing while at Harvard. This training as an athlete was vital when Lummis worked to build a national name for himself. Nevertheless, his lack of attention to his schoolwork eventually had its consequences. While at Harvard, just as in the years prior, Lummis showed that he was exceptionally intelligent, even claiming that he had been able to memorize an entire German-English dictionary enough to translate German poetry into English. Unfortunately, intelligence alone does not guarantee success, and Lummis failed to graduate after being unable to pass trigonometry and analytic geometry. Although he left Harvard without a degree, his time in college was not entirely a waste. It was during the summer between his freshman and sophomore years that he began his publishing career while working as a printer at the Profile House in New Hampshire. This is where Lummis created his first book of poems. As unorthodox as himself, the book was titled, *Birch Bark Poems,* and was made from sections of birch bark that Lummis had shaved thin and created an ink that would easily be printed upon the thin sheets. He began to sell copies of the book in the Profile House, and sent copies to many high-profile poets around the nation such as Walt Whitman, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry W. Longfellow, and one of

[166] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

his literary idols, Captain Mayne Reid. Lummis claimed to have sold thousands of copies of this book, and it inspired his life of journalism and writing. [167] It was during his time at Harvard that Lummis also met a young medical student, Dorothea Rhodes. The two had a brief relationship before marrying in secret after Lummis had gotten himself entangled with another woman. While he denied this initially, he later recanted his denial when he accepted the daughter, Bertha, that he had with this other woman whom he rejected to marry Dorothea.[168] His marriage to Dorothea also strongly influenced the direction of his entire life.

Lummis eventually acknowledged the daughter that was conceived during this scandalous romantic tryst. After the turn of the twentieth century, Lummis received a letter from a woman who claimed to be his daughter. Despite Lummis's initial desire to escape the consequences of his romantic encounter, his abandonment of the woman with whom he became entangled, and his lack of involvement in the life of the child born out of wedlock, his daughter, Bertha, had grown to be a highly educated and successful woman. In 1906, Lummis had gained enough fame within the nation that word of his daughter was reported as far away as the territory of Hawaii.

> The life secret of Charles F. Lummis, the California author and traveler, leaked out today when it became known that he had claimed a beautiful girl of 20, known here as Bertha Belle Page, as his daughter, and had taken her back to California with him…Her birth was shrouded in mystery, but her appearance indicated good parentage. She was named Bertha Belle Page for her foster parents, who gave the little one the best of care until she grew old enough for education. Displaying musical ability at an early age, she studied with some of the best teachers in

[167] Lummis, *As I Remember*. It is important to note that Lummis's recollection at the end of his life may not have been as reliable as one would hope. However, since there are no existing objective records of how many copies Lummis created and sold, as he did all of this himself, it is the only data available as to the popularity of his work.
[168] Mary Austin, *Earth Horizon*, Santa Fe, New Mexico, Sunstone Press, 1932, 292.

> Boston and graduated with highest honors from the Moody Institute at Northfield, Mass.[169]

Lummis considered Bertha as one of his children, despite the initial scandal that he attempted to avoid by leaving her mother in exchange for Dorothea. In the article, however, Lummis claimed that Bertha was the result of his first marriage, prior to his marriage to Dorothea. This is a curious statement, as Lummis's marriage to Dorothea was regarded as his first and was, itself, undertaken in secret.

Following his departure from Harvard, Lummis took some time to discover himself, something that he had claimed was his goal through college.[170] According to an early account by his daughter, Turbesé, one of the jobs that Lummis attempted after leaving college was that of a surgeon. Dr. Henry Orlando Marcy, the first surgeon to aspirate the knee joint, worked to train Lummis in surgery. Though Dr. Marcy was one of the foremost surgeons in New England at the time, Lummis failed to thrive in the position, as there was no travel involved. "But a surgeon, Charley saw, 'has to sit still'. He can't go adventuring over the four sides of the earth. And freedom was even more to a Birch Bark Boy than the wisdom of the scalpel or of husbandry."[171]

It was clear that a career that required Lummis to stay in one place would not bring him the excitement that he so craved. After leaving New England, Lummis was offered a position with his father-in-law managing his very profitable farm in Ohio. At

---

[169] "Life Secret is Revealed: C.F. Lummis, Author, Acknowledges His Daughter," *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* (Honolulu), January 13, 1906. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85047084/1906-01-13/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1906&index=0&rows=20&words=LIFE+REVEALED+SECRET&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1906&proxtext=Life+Secret+is+Revealed&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[170] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

[171] Turbesé Lummis Fiske, *Charles F. Lummis, A Brief Biography*, 1937.

that point in his life, Lummis had never worked a farm, let alone managed one. With no working experience, it would be unexpected that an intellectual like Lummis would enjoy or be successful at this new endeavor. However, acknowledging that he had neither the experience, nor the knowledge of the job, it was the precise reason that he believed that this was exactly the challenge that he needed in his life.[172] No records exist about how successful Lummis was at his position, save for his own recollection of efficaciously working with the "suspicious" Pennsylvania Dutch farmers, as well as having the farm's cattle shadow him around the grounds.

However, Lummis was only employed on the farm for one summer before vacating the position to become the city editor for the *Chillicothe Leader*, formerly the *Scioto Gazette,* "the oldest newspaper west of the Alleghenies." in nearby Chillicothe. [173] This position gave Lummis an opportunity to travel occasionally and he became involved in multiple aspects of journalism, including politics. The job also gave the restless writer the opportunity to explore, hunt, fish, and expand his own personal horizons, with travel being an aspect of the job itself. Lummis was able, through this position, to establish a connection to another newspaper man that was able to elevate him to national fame and set the trajectory for the rest of his life, Harrison Gray Otis. Colonel Harrison Gray Otis, a Civil War veteran, was the co-owner and editor of the *Los Angeles Times.* Following his recovery from a bout of malaria, Lummis made the decision to move west, and in typical Lummis fashion, he did not plan on traversing the western United States in a traditional manner. Instead, he had negotiated an arrangement with both the *Los Angeles*

[172] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[173] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

Times and the *Chillicothe Leader* to provide letters documenting his journey, the payment of which would help cover expenses. The arrangement was also made that upon arriving in Los Angeles, Lummis would take on the position of city editor for the *Times*.[174] Though this trip was a start at a whole new life, the question remained as to why Lummis decided that walking was the only option for crossing the western states. Thankfully, he answered this question in his retelling of the journey.

> But why tramp? Are there not railroads and Pullmans enough, that you must walk? That is what a great many of my friends said when they learned of my determination to travel from Ohio to California on foot; and very likely it is the question that will first come to your mind in reading of the longest walk for pure pleasure that is on record. But railroads and Pullmans were invented to help us hurry through life and miss most of the pleasure of it… I was after neither time nor money, but life – not life in the pathetic meaning of the poor health-seeker, for I was perfectly well and a trained athlete. I am an American and felt ashamed to know so little of my own country as I did, and as most Americans do.[175]

Lummis's desire to walk no longer appeared quite as foolish. Though he claimed that his walk was not for fame, it is clear that he capitalized on the fame that he had garnered from this national stunt. By the time that he entered Los Angeles in February, 1885, "Lum" as he was known, was already famous, and brought that reputation to the West Coast. However, it was the events that he reported upon his tramp that made him the renowned traveling journalist that he became.

As he prepared to leave Chillicothe, Ohio on his way to California, Lummis needed to take care to ensure that he was prepared for the grueling journey. He had to travel 3,507 miles, and though he followed the railroad tracks the majority of the way, he needed to be prepared for rough wilderness, as much of the area he traveled through was

[174] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[175] Lummis, *Tramp*, 1-2.

not populated. Despite the wisdom of the time that recommended long pants and thick boots, Lummis instead chose a knickerbocker suit with light walking shoes. That equated to shorts, high socks, and a thin pair of shoes that gave him blisters within the first week of his journey. Instead of stopping to nurse his wounds, he continued walking in hopes that his foot would heal itself. [176] Because of the potential dangers that he faced along the way, he also planned ahead, packing a small pistol that he later traded for a .44 caliber, tobacco, fishing tackle, matches, writing materials, a hunting knife, and $300 worth of $2.50 coins, wanting to avoid the damage that sweat would have on paper money. His knapsack and rifle had been shipped by train to Wa Keeny, Kansas ahead of him.[177] Many of Lummis's tales of his journey were exceptionally harrowing, and many scholars are convinced that much of it was fiction. Lummis was a writer, first and foremost, and in order to ensure the sale of his letters and the reputation that they would bring, his adventure needed to be one of excitement, danger, and intrigue, as it made a much better story for readers. Early on in his journey, he recounted coming across a vicious dog that attacked him as he crossed the state of Missouri. As Lummis wrote,

> A few miles west of Warrensburg, that morning, I had my first real, all-wool adventure. As I passed a comfortable little house near the track, a huge black dog of the mastiff-hound persuasion, leaped the hedge and came at me in a way that meant business only. You can generally tell when a dog is monkeying just to hear himself bark. He was not on that track, but after gore with a ten-line G. He was large and genial looking as Mr. Dufeu's familiar pet, but with more appetite for live meat. I trust it is no disgrace that my heart turned three or four back summersaults when he dashed at me… As he jumped at my throat I put out my stick, which he caught in his big jaws, and then with a desperate image I drove my big hunting knife to the hilt up through his throat and brain.[178]

---

[176] Lummis, *Tramp*, 7.
[177] Lummis, *Tramp*, 5.
[178] Charles Lummis, *Letters from the Southwest*, Ed. James W. Byrkit, University of Arizona Press, 1989, 16.

In the same letter, he also recounted being held up by two other tramps and beating them down with his boxing prowess. It is very clear from this account that the purpose was to make it as dramatic as possible, as both of these events happened on the same section of his journey. True to his word, Lummis faithfully wrote extensive letters to the *Chillicothe Leader* and the *Los Angeles Times*, enlightening his readers about the wonders of the United States west of the Mississippi River. In his later telling of his walk, Lummis made it clear that the eastern section of his trek was the least interesting, instead choosing to focus on the area west of Kansas City. It is also in this portion of his journey where he embroiled himself in the issue of the education, rights, and history of the Native Americans of the American Southwest. Since Lummis referred to the native peoples as either Indians or by their tribal name, this paper will utilize the term American Indian so as to be as clear and concise as possible.

Lummis considered Missouri to be the true start of his tramp, as it left the civilized eastern United States behind him, and the rugged frontier ahead.[179] As he documented his travels, Lummis did not send a letter from Illinois. Following his departure from Indiana, Lummis did not write another letter until he arrived in St. Louis, Missouri. His only words concerning Illinois at all were focused on political matters, analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the Republican and Democratic parties and their respective strongholds across the middle of the country, and the lack of interest that Illinois held for him. Combining the two issues, Lummis compared the flatness of Illinois to the national platform of the Democratic party. He regaled at the boring nature of the

[179] Lummis, *Tramp*, 9.

state, comparing it to biscuit dough being flattened by the Almighty Himself.[180] He later recanted this harsh criticism of the state of Illinois to the readers of the *Leader*, when he compared the flatness of Kansas to Illinois, making the statement that the former is far more unexceptional.[181]

Lummis's longing to be further west was met when he was finally able to reach the city of St. Louis. Along the journey, Lummis lived as frugally as possible, often asking to stay in a spare room at homes along the way. In his letter to Chillicothe from St. Louis, Lummis complained that the beds in Illinois were exceptionally hard, and the food was limited to milk and bread, having spent most of his nights in farmhouses. He also acknowledged politically that the Land of Lincoln had remained a Republican stronghold, with the Democrats unable to make any headway in the state, unlike the success that the Republicans had in Indiana.[182] This is also the point at which his recounting of his tramp is inconsistent with his documentation. In his later book in which he published his account of his journey, Lummis included aspects of the trip that were not mentioned in his letters, showing the initial signs of self-contradiction. One such omission in his letters that he mentioned in his book was a meeting with the notable outlaw, Frank James. In the fall of 1884, meeting Frank James would have been very newsworthy, as that previous April he was acquitted in the Huntsville Trial from an alleged robbery of a payroll in Muscle Shoals in 1881.[183] Frank's younger, more famous brother, Jesse had been shot a mere two and a half years prior. The readers of the *Chillicothe Leader* would have been exceptionally interested in their very own "Lum" having the opportunity to meet the

[180] Lummis, *Letters*, 13.
[181] Lummis, *Letters*, 23.
[182] Lummis, *Letters*, 13.
[183] Alvis Howard, "The Huntsville Trial of Frank James."

retired outlaw. His omission of this supposed meeting in 1884, but the inclusion of it in a recounting eight years later could be an instance of Lummis taking poetic license with facts to fit a narrative that he wished to push. That narrative being his complete immersion within the American West, including an interaction with one of the most famous western outlaws. This accusation of exaggeration cannot be conclusively proven either way, however, as there is no documented contradictions of the meeting by Frank James.

Writing to the *Leader* October 10, 1884 from Bavaria, Kansas, Lummis described his visit to a school for American Indians modeled after the Carlisle School in Pennsylvania. The Carlisle School, founded by Captain Richard Henry Pratt, a Civil War veteran was intended to assimilate the American Indian to white American culture. Pratt's intention was not to merely assimilate what he considered savage natives to civilized culture, but to completely eradicate all aspects of native life. In his own words, "Kill the Indian in him, and save the man."[184] This is why Pratt's policy has been so controversial over time. However, even many Indian rights advocates at the time supported Pratt's policy as they considered it a better option than the previous policy of annihilation. The Indian Rights Association was one such group that fully supported the strategy of forced assimilation.[185] The issue that Pratt saw with the way that the United States government had dealt with what he called the Indian problem, was that despite the fact that there had been policies in place since George Washington's presidency, Pratt saw no benefit for the American Indian. To him, the Indian was still savage and

[184] Richard Henry Pratt, "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*, Ed. Elizabeth C. Barrows, Boston, 1892, 46.
[185] Benay Blend, "The Indian Rights Association, the Allotment Policy, and the Five Civilized Tribes, 1923-1936," *American Indian Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (1983): 67.

primitive, and as such, they were a perpetual target for the United States Army for eradication as they were too much of a hinderance on the expansion and success of the United States as a whole.[186] In Pratt's mind, the government had failed in their attempts to develop a working coexistence with the American Indian, and it was up to him to correct this issue by bringing the Indian into the same world as the rest of American society. He also believed that engulfing the American Indian in a white environment would be the penultimate way to Americanize them.[187]

Contrary to his argument, the education policy for the American Indian was not as black and white an issue as Pratt would have his reader believe. Widespread reports of abuse were rampant within the entirety of the Indian education system, and it was a fight in which Lummis one day embroiled himself. However, during his visit to the Indian school in Bavaria, Kansas, Lummis's assessment of the school was glowingly positive. As he wrote about his visit,

> It is a most instructive place… It is a model school-house, inside and out, and there are not too many Caucasian children who get their knowledge boxes filled in so attractive a place. We visited some of the rooms, and I was astonished at the intent attention of these children of the forest. I never saw such orderly schoolrooms. The pupils range from 8 to 23 years, and are of both sexes. Many are stolid and dull-looking, but there are plenty of really bright faces, and the average is perhaps as good as in the ordinary white school… [H]ere lies the true solution of the vexed and vexing "Indian Question."[188]

During this same visit, Lummis also acknowledged his presuppositions about the American Indian, as well as the overwhelmingly common misconceptions. "It is

[186] Pratt, "Advantages," 43-47.
[187] Trennert, Robert A. "From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930." *Pacific Historical Review* 52, no. 3 (August 1983): 267.
[188] Lummis, *Letters*, 19.

wonderful how anxious these children are to learn. The Indian is generally accredited with endless laziness and stupidity in matters of school education, but after this visit, I find it hard to believe the slander."[189] This was not his last observation of racial prejudice during his walk across the American Southwest.

Lummis's words from Colorado, apart from the assessment of Kansas as an exceptionally unprepossessing state, focused on the natural world around him. He spoke of the wildlife of the state, having an opportunity to engage in antelope hunting with his rifle that had been sent by rail to Kansas. He wrote of the jack-rabbits, prairie dogs, and lamented about the absence of the bison that once inhabited the land. He spoke of the overhunting of the bison by white hunters, killing for the sport, not as a means of sustenance as the American Indian had.[190]

As he continued his walk through Colorado, he dedicated the majority of his letter from Denver to his experience antelope hunting in Colorado. Painting a very clear picture, Lummis described spotting a group of grey antelope and his disappointment in missing an opportunity for a kill when he believed that the animals caught the glare off of his rifle. Finding another group, he was able to make a kill and cut off enough food to fill his stomach.[191] Following his hunting experience, and cooking his kill, Lummis went walking and was attacked by a rattlesnake. After a brief scuffle with the serpent, he was able to get the butt of his rifle on the neck of the snake and cut off its head. Once he

[189] Lummis, *Letters*, 20.
[190] Lummis, *Letters*, 33-35.
[191] Lummis, *Letters*, 37-40.

killed the creature, he took time to admire the mechanics of the rattlesnake's jaws and fangs, marveling at the way that they had adapted into perfect killing machines.[192]

Lummis closed his letter from Denver with the news that his wife was to meet him there in Denver for a one-day reunion. It is important to note that when Charles moved to Ohio to work on his father-in-law's farm, his wife, Dorothea remained in Boston to complete medical school. From their wedding date until they were reunited in Denver, they had spent a significant amount of their marriage apart, putting strain on their relationship. Lummis's desire to engage in a five-month walk to Los Angeles put further strain on their already tenuous marriage. At only one month into his voyage, it was the responsibility of Dorothea to locate a home in Los Angeles, and establish a medical practice for herself.

The next letter that Lummis sent from Colorado came from the town of Platte, and recounted his reunion with his wife. He described the happiness of seeing his wife, but lamented at the cost of their brief time together. He did not write about the events of the brief family meeting, just that it was good to see Dorothea and the rest of the family traveling with her and then he put her on a train headed for California. While in Denver, Lummis also traded his .28 caliber small pistol for a .44 caliber so his rifle and handgun would use the same rounds. Lummis spent far more of his letter on his experience fishing for trout in the Platte Canyon than he did on the personal matter of seeing his wife once more.[193] Following his letter from Platte, Lummis next wrote from Pike's Peak near Colorado Springs. Along his journey from Denver to Pike's Peak, Lummis marveled at

[192] Lummis, *Letters*, 41-42.
[193] Lummis, *Letters*, 52-55.

the Garden of the Gods near the foot of the mountain. He was astonished at the beauty of the rock formations. In his letter from Pueblo, Colorado, Lummis referred to his time in Colorado as the best time that he had on his walk up to that point. One such moment of excitement that he experienced on his trek from Pike's Peak to Pueblo was when he walked too close to a penitentiary with his .44 revolver in its holster on his hip. Unaware of his surroundings and the potential cost of his folly, it was one of the guards that drew the traveling journalist's attention back to his surroundings. Lummis had mindlessly been walking on the sidewalk right alongside a chain gang in front of the prison with his gun in plain sight. It was not until the shotgun-toting prison guard bellowed at him that he realized that there were nineteen men in the chain gang at that moment with life sentences that would have gladly killed the twenty-five-year-old for his weapon and run for the hills, never to be seen again. The prison was home to 350 convicts, made up primarily of horse thieves, cattle rustlers, and murderers. In this one experience, Lummis had enough excitement to know that he had no desire to ever be a prison guard in Colorado.[194]

Although he loved the natural landscapes and wildlife in Colorado, it was his time in southern Colorado and New Mexico that truly set the trajectory for the rest of his life. There was also no way for Lummis at the time to have any notion of how impactful his time in these areas would be to his career, his personal life, and his legacy. It was also another instance where he had to confront his preconceived notions of racial prejudice and realize how wrong he was in his assumptions. In his letter from Alamosa, Lummis expelled an extremely racist description of his first contact with Mexicans.

[194] Lummis, *Letters*, 86-87.

> Two miles out from little Cucharas, and on the willowy banks of Cucharas creek, I ran across a big plaza of Mexicans – Greasers, as they are called out here. A westerner would no more think of calling a "Greaser" a Mexican, than a Kentucky Colonel would of calling a negro anything but a "nigger"…In it, in lousy laziness, exist 200 Greasers of all sexes, ages and sizes, but all equally dirty…The Mexicans themselves are a snide-looking set, twice as dark as an Indian, with heavy lips and noses, long, straight, black hair, sleepy eyes, and a general expression of ineffable laziness…They may be poor specimens along here. I hope so. Not even a coyote will touch a dead Greaser, the flesh is so seasoned with the red pepper they ram into their food in howling profusion.[195]

This scathing assessment of an entire ethnicity was very telling about his prejudices prior to his journey into the Southwest. It was not until his letter from Santa Fe that he began to acknowledge the inherent bias in his previous valuation of the Mexican people.

Whereas his previous statements were based on prejudicial racial stereotypes, his accounts from Santa Fe were based on first-hand experience.

> But I find the "Greasers" not half bad people. In fact, they rather discount the whites, who are all on the make. There is only one sociable thing about the white folks all along the D. & R.G. – they will share your last dollar with you. A Mexican, on the other hand, will "divvy" his only tortilla and his one blanket with any stranger, and never take a cent.[196]

Lummis, did not, however, refrain from using the term, "Greaser" throughout his letter, though he had personally witnessed the error in his previous assessment of the group. This was the beginning of Lummis's fascination with the Spanish language that would be a major influence on his life. He eventually adopted the Spanish language as his own, composing his personal diary in a broken dialect of Spanish and English.

As he continued to interact with the people of the Southwest, his prejudices began to fade, until he became an advocate for the very people that he had denigrated in his

[195] Lummis, *Letters*, 96-97.
[196] Lummis, *Letters*, 112-113.

original documentation of his walk. Lummis eventually advocated for the American Indian, the Spanish, and even the Mexican, who he had once referred to as "Greasers." This advocacy was clear to the American people, and there was a positive response to it, even among people that may not have typically been aware of the subjects of which Lummis wrote, nor had any proclivity towards the advocacy that Lummis wished to encourage. One such group was the New Century Club in the Indian Territory, which would eventually become the state of Oklahoma. The group had held a meeting where the focus had been Lummis's book, *The Awakening of a Nation* that promoted Mexican culture and the progress of the people, describing the book as "delightful."[197]

When Charles Lummis reached New Mexico there could not have been a premonition in his mind at how impactful this state would eventually be throughout his entire life. Within just a decade following his journey across the Southwest, Lummis had a permanent attachment to the state, and it served as a draw to him from California until his death. It was the land that turned the eastern greenhorn into a true Southwesterner. Though his meeting with the Mexicans of southern Colorado and New Mexico were an introduction to this new direction in his life, it was the meeting of the Pueblo people that truly created a national name for Lummis, long after his walk was merely a memory. While visiting the Pueblo of San Ildefonso, Lummis first encountered a group of American Indians that built their own permanent adobe homes, some even two stories tall. These multi-story Pueblos were the quintessential architecture of the American

[197] "A Pleasant Meeting: New Century Club Enjoys Mexican Study and Hears Fine Papers," *Chickasaw Daily Express* (Chickasaw Indian Territory), May 20, 1903, 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn86090528/1903-05-20/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1903&index=4&rows=20&words=Awakening+Nation&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1903&proxtext=Awakening+of+a+Nation&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Southwest, dating back centuries.[198] He was not only taken aback by the structures that these people had built, but also by the people themselves, noting that they are "[T]he best looking Indians I ever saw."[199] It was in this pueblo that Lummis also began to develop a more personal relationship with people outside of his racial background. Growing up in New England, Lummis had very limited contact with the people that eventually became a family to him once he arrived in the Southwest. This is also where his racial prejudice began to be etched away by his many positive encounters and relationships with the Pueblo people. While visiting the different pueblos of New Mexico, Lummis also got a lesson in the history of the Pueblo people and the area known as New Mexico as a whole.

It was while he visited with the Pueblos that the issue of Indian education was revisited. Lummis commented that the area was once home to 50,000 of the Pueblo people, but by the time he visited, the number had been reduced to 8,000. Lummis also learned that approximately 800 of those attended an Indian school, some at Carlisle, others at the Albuquerque Indian School. Lummis had the opportunity to read letters written from the students, and once again, he marveled at the high education of the Indian students.[200] Little did Lummis realize that his perception of the Albuquerque Indian School would change drastically within six years. This also served as a contentious issue within Lummis's life. While he was on his journey, Lummis was overwhelmingly supportive of the Indian schools, and the Carlisle model. While he was in New Mexico, he was amazed at how well the Indian students were doing at the three-year-old Albuquerque school, citing that many white students around the nation would be

[198] John B. Jackson, "The Spanish Pueblo Fallacy," *Southwest Review* 35, no. 1 (1950): 21.
[199] Lummis, *Letters*, 120.
[200] Lummis, *Letters*, 132.

fortunate to be as learned as those students from the Pueblo tribes. It proved to be a contradictory issue for Lummis, as was illustrated by future written works by Lummis himself. It is also an aspect of Lummis's life that has been a part of his legacy, but has recently come under more criticism based on his contradictory words and actions.

While there is significant contradictory evidence in his advocacy for American Indian rights, until his death he held a place in his heart for the Pueblo people. More than one time he engaged in some manner to assist the various Pueblo tribes in their struggles against the United States government. It was also his experiences with these groups of people that inspired Lummis's *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*, which in turn assisted in the formation and passing of the Antiquities Act of 1906.[201] This trip through the American Southwest, though merely intended to be a way for Lummis to relocate to Los Angeles with the two newspapers paying for his travel and time; and to have an opportunity to explore the nation that he called home; became the key transformative event in his life.

While his visit with the Pueblos was a metamorphosis of sorts for Lummis, it was his meeting with Amado Chaves that established the greatest love in his life. Lummis mentioned his introduction to Amado Chaves briefly in his Christmas letter from Santa Fe, though he simply mentioned him as "A.C."[202] When he wrote his letter from San Mateo a week later on New Year's Day, Lummis vividly described the beginning of his love affair with the Spanish people, culture, and hospitality. After arriving at the Chaves home, Lummis was treated to a warm meal, wine, a roaring fireplace, and a comfortable

[201] Raymond Harris Thompson, "The Antiquities Act of 1906 by Ronald Freeman Lee," *Journal of the Southwest* 42, no. 2 (2000): 212.
[202] Lummis, *Letters*, 122.

bed, enjoying one of the most agreeable nights that he had experienced in the four months since he began his journey. In the morning, he woke up to a hot breakfast and it is at the table that he met who he described as, "[T]he most beautiful girl I ever saw, and two others who would be extremely handsome if she were out of sight."[203] That solidified Lummis's infatuation not merely with the Spanish people, but even more specifically the Chaves family and the old Spanish way of life. The Chaves family was an aristocratic Spanish family that had a lineage in the New World dating back to one of the conquistadors that accompanied Juan de Oñate in his conquest of New Mexico. His father, Colonel Manuel Antonio had served in the Mexican army and had established himself as a rancher and businessman, becoming Don Manuel in the process.[204] Amado eventually continued the tradition, becoming a successful lawyer, serving as an attorney in the supreme court until he returned home. He also served as a representative in the territorial legislature, the first superintendent of public instruction, mayor of the city of Santa Fe, and even a state senator.[205]

Though he could not have known how New Mexico would forever change his life, Lummis did understand the power of the Chaves family and the importance of remaining close with the family. During his visit, Amado led Lummis to an ongoing excavation of ancient ruins, allowing him to reignite his love for archeology. Lummis wrote to the *Leader* asking them to contact the Smithsonian Institute, seeking an official excavation of the site.[206] He had no idea at the time, but that same desire for excavating

---

[203] Lummis, *Letters*, 207.
[204] Marc Simmons, *The Little Lion of the Southwest: a life of Manuel Antonio Chaves*, Chicago, The Swallow Press, 1973.
[205] "Necrology: Amado Chaves," *New Mexico Historical Review,* Albuquerque, Vol. 6, Iss. 1, (Jan 1, 1931): 100.
[206] Lummis, *Letters*, 208-213.

ancient ruins eventually led him to develop a friendship and partnership with Adolph Bandelier, the noted Swiss-American anthropologist and namesake for the Bandelier National Monument near Los Alamos in New Mexico. Lummis and Bandelier maintained a lifelong friendship, with Bandelier providing the forward to Lummis's *The Spanish Pioneers,* and Lummis providing the introduction to Bandelier's *The Delight Makers*.[207] Lummis gained another experience that became a part of his legacy while staying with the Chaves family. Gaining a day to spend with the family, they began playing traditional Spanish music, and immediately Lummis was fascinated with the songs, and the way that the singers managed to utilize so many more words than himself in the same measure.[208] This fascination eventually led Lummis to record wax cylinders of these same songs in the fear that they would not be passed on and would fade into oblivion.

It was also during this visit that the seeds for Lummis's contradictions between his love for the American Indian and the Spanish were planted. In a discussion with Don Manuel, Lummis learned of the "[C]ountless bloody encounters with the savage Apaches, Navajos, and Utes."[209] In his later work, *The Man Who Married the Moon, and other Pueblo Indian Folk Stories*, Lummis's introduction also refers to the tribes surrounding the Pueblos as savages.[210] This battle between his love for the American Indian and his love for the Spanish only got stronger throughout Lummis's life. His apologetics for the Spanish conquest of the New World stemmed from the relationship that he had built

---

[207] Bandelier, Adolph and Charles F. Lummis. *The Delight Makers*. Carlisle, Mass. Applewood Books. 1890, xiii-xvii.
[208] Lummis, *Letters*, 214.
[209] Lummis, *Letters*, 217.
[210] Charles F. Lummis, *The Man Who Married the Moon, and other Pueblo Indian Folk Stories*, New York, The Century Company, 1891, 3. This work was later changed to *Pueblo Indian Folk Stories* after the turn of the twentieth century, when more stories were included by Lummis. It also presented an opportunity to recycle older work as a new book. (Lummis, Charles F. *Pueblo Indian Folk Stories*. University of Nebraska Press. 1910.)

during his visit with the Chaves family. It also put into question his understanding of actual history, and his desire for a fantastical story. That experience in New Mexico also established an initial home for Lummis as he recovered from a series of strokes. New Mexico and the Chaves family became his second home, as he regularly visited, spending various amounts of time. During his time in New Mexico and Arizona, Lummis encountered the Navajo tribe, with whom he did not establish the same convivial relationship as he had with the Pueblos. Lummis described the Navajos as "dirty, thievish, treacherous, and revoltingly licentious."[211] Lummis was clearly not a fan of the people that he referred to as savage, and yet he spent years profiting from the many blankets and trinkets from the Navajo that he sold to tourists and white collectors. Since it is unlikely that he would have had enough personal experience with the Navajo tribe, he once again relied on opinions of others, this time Don Manuel.

On January 28, 1885, four and a half months after setting out on his walk from Ohio, Lummis finally reached California. In his letter to the *Leader*, Lummis referred to the Mojave Desert, his current location, as the most desolate piece of land that he had ever experienced.[212] When Lummis had made it through the desert and into San Gabriel, he was greeted by Colonel Harrison Gray Otis, the co-owner and publisher of the *Los Angeles Times*, and his new boss. Not wanting to complete the journey any way but on foot, Lummis and Otis walked the remaining eleven miles in the moonlight on February 1. Nine days shy of five full months of walking had led Charles Lummis to his new home, his new life, and became the beginning of his legacy. Though he had traversed

[211] Lummis, *Letters*, 232.
[212] Lummis, *Letters*, 260.

3,507 miles, and taken approximately 6,513,541 steps to make it to Los Angeles, little did Charles Lummis realize at the time that his journey had just begun and the job for which he had walked across the country would eventually be the reason that he needed to return to New Mexico.

Chapter 4 RECOVERY IN NEW MEXICO

One would think that after a 3,500-mile walk across the American Southwest, Charles Lummis would have taken some time to rest and relax. However, this was not the case, as his desire to work far outweighed his desire to rest. If Lummis had lived in modern times, he would be labeled a workaholic. It was nothing for Lummis to work twenty-plus hours per day, go home, sleep for an hour or two, then wake up to start another long day. Serving as the city editor of the *Los Angeles Times*, Lummis not only built a name for himself, but also witnessed Los Angeles transform from a small frontier city to the beginnings of a metropolis. It was not Harrison Gray Otis, the co-owner and publisher of the *Times* that demanded the exorbitant amount of work from Lummis. Instead, it was Lummis's personal preference to complete much of the work of the newspaper himself, working well into the night long after the last staffers had concluded their work day. However, despite the fact that Lummis had a stable job that he loved, a comfortable home, and he lived in an area that he considered heaven, he was unhappy.[213]

Understanding Lummis's propensity for rambling, one could have certainly anticipated this dilemma. His walk across the Southwest had certainly not settled his desire to wander, but intensified it. Thankfully his work was not limited to merely the goings on in Los Angeles. In 1886 news was reported that Geronimo and a band of Apaches were back at war against the United States army. When Otis sent his city editor to Arizona to cover the wars, Lummis was more than happy to accept the assignment. While in Arizona, Lummis was able to see and hear firsthand from General George

[213] Charles Lummis, *As I Remember*, (unpublished manuscript), Box 2, Folder 3, Papers of Charles Fletcher Lummis, University of Arizona Archives, typescript.

Crook what the conditions were in his constant struggles against different groups of American Indians. Lummis was also there when General Crook was replaced amid criticism of his failure to capture and subdue the elusive Geronimo.[214] Following Lummis's return to Los Angeles after the final surrender of Geronimo in the summer of 1886, he was asked to join Captain Henry W. Lawton as his chief of scouts, however, Otis would not let his city editor go.[215] Lummis then went back to his twenty-hour workdays.

When he returned to Los Angeles, Lummis once again reinstated his normal work schedule. Despite his absence, his routine returned with him and Lummis set about working his twenty-plus hour days. Lummis clearly documented his extreme work habits, as well as the demands that it placed upon his wife, Dorothea.

> I worked without a thought of late hours or of health. Having long before sent off my reporter, or reporters (in the growing days when I acquired any) I would put the paper to bed myself. At 6 a.m. I would get home. At 7 my wife – not daring to disobey my orders, for the smell of blood was in my nostrils – was shaking me violently and weeping. In my three years at the Times I never got more than two hours of sleep in the 24 and for the final newspaper year not over one.[216]

While this continued to put incredible strain upon his marriage, it was even harder on his own body. For months towards the end of 1887, Lummis started experiencing numbness in his extremities and what can be described as heart issues. Then on December 5, he laid down to rest and was unable to get back up. When he was finally able to rise, he discovered that the entire left side of his body was paralyzed.[217] Despite his completely

---

[214] Charles Lummis, *Dateline Fort Bowie: Charles Lummis Reports on the Apache War*, Ed. Dan L. Thrapp, University of Oklahoma Press, 1979. This same information is also contained in another compilation, (Charles F. Lummis, *General Crook and the Apache Wars*, Northland Press, 1966.)
[215] Turbesé Lummis Fiske and Keith Lummis, *Charles F. Lummis: A Man and His West*, University of Oklahoma Press, 1975, 38.
[216] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[217] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

debilitating ailment, Lummis refused to stop working. He limped to work against the medical wishes of his wife. Finally, in February, 1888, Lummis was convinced to leave Los Angeles to convalesce.[218] Having received an invitation from Don Manuel Chaves, Lummis accepted the offer and returned to San Mateo, New Mexico to rest and heal. This gave Lummis a chance to be back in the place that he loved, and with the people that he loved. However, Lummis had no intention to recuperate as though he were an invalid. Lummis used this time to build his strength, meet new people, and insert himself into the history of the Spanish in America and the national issue of Indian education.

When Lummis arrived in New Mexico, he was unable to move a great deal. His left arm hung useless at his side, and he had limited mobility in his left leg. While he started to improve shortly after arriving in New Mexico, his progress was halted when he received disappointing news. When he left Los Angeles, Charles was under the impression that following a three-month sabbatical, he could remain on the staff of the *Los Angeles Times* as a remote correspondent in New Mexico. However, while Dorothea had attempted to delay relaying the truth, at the end of February, she informed her husband that was not the case. When he discovered that he had gotten his last paycheck from the *Times*, he had a second attack of paralysis. Dorothea then made a journey to San Mateo to be with her husband and assist in nursing him to a point that he could once again be mobile.[219] With this setback, his traveling was limited to merely a few steps outside of the Chaves home where he could hobble. However, not being a man to enjoy a sedentary lifestyle, Lummis quickly built up his strength to ride a horse on his own and taught himself to hunt jack rabbits, holding his rifle like a pistol. As a man that refused to

[218] Turbesé Lummis Fiske, *Charles Lummis*, 39.
[219] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

give up things that he loved, he also taught himself to roll cigarettes with one hand, believing that if he could not roll it himself, he did not deserve it. Lummis did not consider living with the Chaves family as a way for him to remain home-bound, and he began working on the Chaves's sheep ranches. He also came to the realization that his release from the *Times* was an opportunity for him to reconnect with his passion for freelance writing. When Lummis left for New Mexico, he brought his camera with him and following a brief depression after his relapse, he began writing stories about the people that he saw, the events that he experienced, and sold them nationwide to the largest periodicals in the United States. He was also able to sell letters to the *Times* and the *Chillicothe Leader*.[220] Lummis eventually published these same stories in *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*.

While exploring the area around San Mateo, Lummis learned a great deal about the Spanish history of New Mexico. Settled initially by Spanish conquistadors, many of whom became aristocratic landowners, San Mateo had been the sheepherding center of New Mexico and the Chaves family had been one of the primary landowning families. Most of the population, however, had been peons, a poor, working-class group that worked the land, and paid much of their wages back to the landowner for rent, food, and necessities.[221] It was a form of legal slavery that in the American South was akin to the sharecropping system.

Among these peons in town, Lummis discovered a group of witches. Having been born in Massachusetts, the American history of witches and witchcraft was an intriguing and familiar aspect of New England history for Lummis. When he encountered the

[220] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[221] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

witches of San Mateo, as well as hearing the stories of their witchcraft, the journalist in him had to know everything. Just like the sharecropper, the peons of New Mexico were uneducated, and according to Lummis were prone to superstition.

> Of course the Americans have no faith in witches, nor do educated Mexicans; but all the Indians and probably ninety per cent of the brave but ignorant Mexicans are firm believers in the astounding superstition…Among the uneducated mass of Mexicans – who are the vast majority of their people here – the belief in *hechiseria* or *brujeria* (witchcraft) is as strong as among the Indians, though their witches are less numerous. It is a remnant of the far past…In the year 1887, to my knowledge, a poor old Mexican woman was beaten to death in a remote town by two men who believed they had been bewitched by her; and no attempt was ever made to punish her slayers! A few months later I had the remarkable privilege of photographing three "witches" and some of the people they had "bewitched."[222]

Through his investigation of these witches, Lummis reported on one man that was allegedly bewitched, where the witch in question permanently crippled the man through a twisted leg. Lummis concluded that the ailment was more likely due to rheumatism than otherworldly magic. Another man that he encountered, this one more intelligent per Lummis, claimed to have been transformed into a woman by a witch there in San Mateo. He also claimed to have had to pay another witch to transform him back into a man. Lummis made it a point to write that the man in question truly believed that he had suffered this ailment, and acknowledged that the man's intelligence in other matters was unquestionable.[223] Personally, Lummis considered these stories to be ridiculous, and attributed them to an uneducated superstition, and was not able to understand how an intelligent person could possibly believe them.

---

[222] Charles Lummis, *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*, Century Co, New York, 1898, 67-70. Towards the end of his life, Lummis republished the manuscript with added stories under the new name, *Mesa, Cañon and Pueblo*. (Charles F. Lummis, *Mesa, Cañon and Pueblo*, The Century Company, 1925.)

[223] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 70-71.

What is interesting to note is that Lummis included the American Indians in his assessment of those that held tight to the superstitious belief of the witches. By making the argument that it was ignorant to believe in such, Lummis made his point as to the intelligence of the American Indians of the area. He especially made this clear in a story that he wrote about a group of magicians in New Mexico. "Superstition is the corner-stone of all the strange aboriginal religions. Everything which the Indian does not absolutely understand he attributes to a supernatural cause…"[224] This is an interesting valuation on the intellectual aptitude of American Indians and poses interesting questions. Through his writings, Lummis did not speak of the Pueblo people as being ignorant, but promoted their industriousness and their ability to build full towns in the desert as they had been for centuries. Was Lummis speaking of American Indian tribes that are not the Pueblos? It is important to note that Lummis clearly documented the fact that the Pueblos' religion is that of a combination of Catholicism and aboriginal beliefs. Was it their Catholicism and thereby relationship with the Spanish that kept them from being labeled as ignorant? It is not the only time that Lummis wrote about the ignorance of the Indians, especially in relation to the Spanish. It is also important to note that he did not refer to the people that believed in witchcraft as Spanish, but as Mexican. While this can be explained away in the fact that the people that had occupied that land were, in fact, Mexican, Lummis referred to his hosts as Spanish, due to their history, and not Mexican, despite the fact the Don Manuel fought in the Mexican army and was Mexican by birth.

Through listening to the many stories, Lummis's attention was drawn to how the witches of the area operated. The superstitions of the area were not relegated to simply

[224] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 76.

the means in which the witches could punish those that had wronged them, but even the methods that they would utilize to facilitate their magic. It is also important to note that the witches that Lummis encountered and those of whom he shared stories, were not exclusively female. Though the specific tales of witch encounters and curses differed greatly, there were a specific set of superstitions regarding how the witches' magic worked. They would not harm animals, but would only focus their powers on other humans that had made an enemy of the witch enacting the curse.[225] While this gave no solace to the people of the area, it showed that the witches were not merely random evil, but calculating people exacting revenge for perceived wrongs.

Like the other American and European witch stories, the witches of New Mexico could fly. However, unlike the other stories, they did not utilize brooms to accomplish flight, but simply flew under their own power without the aid of a vehicle of sorts. "When the witches wish to fly, they generally retain their human form, but assume the legs and eyes of a coyote or other animal, leaving their own at home. Then saying (in Spanish, of course), "Without God and without the Virgin Mary," they rise into the air and sail away."[226] This unfortunately could be detrimental to the witch in question, as happened to one witch that Lummis claimed to have known.

> A sad accident once befell a male witch named Juan Perea, whom I knew in San Mateo, but who had died a couple of years ago. It was asserted that one night he went flying off with the eyes and legs of a cat, leaving his own on the kitchen table. His poor starved shepherd-dog overturned the table and ate the eyes, and Juan had to go through the rest of his life wearing the green eyes of a cat![227]

[225] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 71.
[226] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 72
[227] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 73

Since this account was written ten years following Lummis's time in San Mateo, the man in question was very much alive during the time, and Lummis made it clear that he not only knew of the man, but knew him personally. Lummis's account of the events of his time in San Mateo were used to inspire other people around the nation to visit the American Southwest. Real world witches would have been the most extreme group of people that many Americans could ever encounter within their lifetimes, however, it was not the most extreme group that Lummis encountered during his time in San Mateo.

While he was exploring the area around San Mateo, Lummis encountered a peculiar group of people that engaged in a very unique ritual during Lent every year. This was a very secretive group of Catholic men that recreated a ritual of self-flagellation and crucifixion every year for Easter. Throughout the forty days of Lent, the members of this brotherhood practiced flogging themselves, lying on cacti, carrying crosses, and it culminated with one member being crucified by the group in the desert.[228] Though Lummis was warned that the group was extremely private and protective of their secrets, he made the decision to not only witness the ritual and tell the story of the events, but also to get the first photographic proof of the group, an act that would force Lummis to relocate. Like those that believed in the witchcraft that Lummis reported on, he considered the Penitentes, or Penitent Brothers as ignorant and fanatic.

Lummis had first come upon the group following a hunting trip when he heard a wailing come across the desert. When he returned to the Chaves home, he inquired as to the origin of the screams that he heard. It was the beginning of Holy Week in San Mateo, and Lummis was informed that the sounds were the members of the brotherhood

[228] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 91.

engaging in their nightly pilgrimages, but they would be out in the daytime on Thursday and Good Friday. It was at this point that Lummis asked his hosts about the possibility of photographing this group and was told in no uncertain terms that such an action could lead to his death. [229] Not willing to heed the warnings of potential danger, Lummis took his camera and was able to get twenty-five pictures of the ritual, the first such photographs known and they are among the pictures of which he was the most proud. However, his published photographs, combined with his next battle in San Mateo forced Lummis to relocate in order to preserve his life. Lummis later included this experience with the Penitentes in his book, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*.[230]

The Chaves family's roots in New Mexico went back to one of the conquistadors that had accompanied Juan de Oñate in his conquest of the region. Through the years, the family had benefited greatly from being aristocrats under the peonage system. They had been wealthy landowners that had profited from the peons working their land and taking care of their sheep. However, when Amado became involved in local politics, he had made it very clear that he was adamantly against the peonage system. Lummis, being supportive of his host and friend, made it a point to publicly support Amado in this endeavor to end the peonage system. In New Mexico at the time, the landowners could loan out needy workers for forty or fifty dollars, and with wages being two dollars and fifty cents per month, that would make the worker beholden for sixteen to twenty years, controlling an entire population.[231] On the opposing side of the argument, stood an exceptionally powerful man, Don Roman Baca and his son, Liberato. In a December 2,

[229] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 92.
[230] Charles Lummis, *The Land of Poco Tiempo*, Scribners & Sons, 1893, 77-108.
[231] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

1888 article for the *Los Angeles Times*, Lummis reported on the story using the real names of the individuals involved. As he recalled these events of his life towards the end, he was more diplomatic, changing Don Roman's name to Don Adán and his son to Tiburcio.[232] Lummis's son Keith later postulated that his father had become close to members of both families, and had changed the names so as not to offend.[233] In 1888, Don Roman was a very powerful individual and landowner in the area of Valencia County, and Lummis was intrigued by the deaths of five individuals during the time that had opposed Don Roman.

Though the Penitentes had been a diminishing group for decades, Don Roman believed that there was influence to be had by not merely allowing the rituals to continue to take place, but to associate himself with them. His son, Liberato, like Amado Chaves, had studied law in college, and in order to gain votes, had joined the Penitentes, the same group that Lummis had photographed against their will. After being initiated into the brotherhood, Liberato gave a speech in Spanish against Amado Chaves and the "one-armed Gringo who had dared to photograph the rites."[234] Not one to back down from a threat, Lummis refused to reverse his stance against the peonage system and the Bacas. This is when Lummis ran the December 2, 1888, story in the *Los Angeles Times* against the Baca family as well as their despotic hold on Valencia County. Unfortunately for Lummis, publishing the story made his need to leave San Mateo a necessity. On December 5, Lummis left San Mateo, choosing to relocate to the nearby Pueblo of Isleta where his legacy as an Indian rights activist began.

---

[232] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[233] Lummis Fiske, *Charles Lummis*, 53.
[234] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

Lummis's reports on the Penitentes certainly had an impact on readers who learned about the curious group that crucified themselves during Holy Week. It was also a story that did not fade from the public's mind for over a decade. In 1900, long after Lummis had initially published his reports about the Penitent Brotherhood, the *San Francisco Call* reported on the group, as though it were a new story. The newspaper dedicated the majority of an entire page to an exposé on the history and actions of the group.

> These fanatics number some 700. They are known throughout New Mexico as the Penitentes – the full name being Los Hermanos Penitentes (the penitent brotherhood). Charles F. Lummis, a litterateur of California, secretly photographed from a distance a party of Penitentes at San Mateo, in 1888, while they are hanging a brother on a cross, and later Mr. Lummis was shot by an assassin in the locality. It had become known to the brotherhood that the former had made the pictures and that he had purposed using them in a book.[235]

Twelve years following Lummis's discovery and exposure of the Penitentes, it was still news in California, as was the connection between the threat on his life and his photographs.

In 1888, Lummis had made regular trips into Isleta to study the history of the people that had intrigued him on his walk. During one of these trips, he met a trader named Archibald Rea while researching the sheep industry. This meeting would turn out to be a life-changing event, though Lummis was not aware of it at the time. His relationship with Rea led to an introduction to one of the most influential tribal leaders, Juan Rey Abeita. When Lummis initially relocated from San Mateo, he was not welcome in Isleta. The people of Isleta had been wary of outsiders, especially a man like Charles

[235] "Penitent Brotherhood: American Citizens Who Are Hanged Upon Crosses," *San Francisco Call*, April 8, 1900, 10. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85066387/1900-04-08/ed-1/seq-10/#date1=1900&index=0&rows=20&words=Penitente+Penitentes&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=California&date2=1900&proxtext=Penitentes&y=15&x=15&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Lummis that brought trouble with him following his public feud with the Bacas. However, because of his relationship with Abeita, Lummis had a way to remain in Isleta, and he rented a room from Abeita himself. However, simply relocating his residence to Isleta did not ensure his safety.

The threat that had been made by Liberato Baca eventually came to fruition on February 4, 1889. Around midnight, as Lummis stepped outside of his small cottage that he was renting from Abeita, a tall silhouetted man approached, roughly twenty yards away and with both barrels of a shotgun, fired buckshot directly at Lummis. He survived the attack and had the opportunity to confront the Bacas in Albuquerque.

> Twelve days after the shooting I was on my way to Albuquerque. When I climbed up the steps of the train I came face to face with Tiburcio Coran (Liberato Baca) and his father. You never saw faces turn so many colors ending in a deathly pallor. Curious how the old conventions are usually with us. They said, "We were so shocked and sorry to hear of your accident."
> I said, "No doubt! Next time send a better marksman. Or come yourself."[236]

This confrontation and a visit to Valencia County to show that he was not afraid had earned him a new nickname, El Cabezudo, "The Headstrong" because he refused to back down to the Valencia County bosses.[237]

Following Lummis's attempted assassination, he was able to stagger to the Rea's home, about a block away and Archibald's wife, Alice attended to his wounds. Alice also took it upon herself to send a telegram to Dorothea, to inform her of her husband's attack. With Dorothea being a successful medical doctor, she was exactly what Lummis needed to ensure his successful healing. Lummis had taken a few shots in the attack, one to the finger as well as one that went through his corduroy coat and was slowed by a copy of his

[236] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[237] Lummis, *As I Remember*.

Birch Bark Poems that he kept in a pocket. However, the worst of the injuries was a shot that entered his cheek and lodged in the back of his throat, where he had suffered significant blood loss.[238] The wound had also caused Lummis to lose the power of speech for a time, and Dorothea was there to help him recover. When Lummis was released from the hospital and Dorothea returned to Los Angeles, her departure was the beginning of the end of their marriage.[239] All of the time apart, combined with his demanding nature and need for freedom had made Dorothea realize that her marriage was over. Lummis made the decision to live permanently in Isleta, giving up his home in Los Angeles. This decision was a key life-changing one, as it opened the next chapter in Lummis's life.

Though the people of Isleta were not initially welcoming of Lummis when he arrived, he had quickly ingratiated himself with the tribe. Lummis had a policy of sharing everything that he had with members of the pueblo. He shared his candy and tobacco with the people of Isleta, and they began referring to him as Por Todos, or "For Everyone." He would also not have to wait long for his heartache to end over the dissolution of his marriage to Dorothea. Living with Archibald and Alice Rea when Lummis was attacked was Alice's sister Eve Douglas and she had assisted Alice in treating Lummis's wounds the night he was shot. Eve was a former teacher at the Catholic day-school in Isleta and was fluent in Spanish and Tigua, the local language of the Pueblos. She was also engaged to the local Indian agent in Isleta. Lummis initially did not hold romantic feelings for Eve, nor expect anything to come from their relationship. It was not until a random game of croquet that Lummis realized that he had feelings for her. During the match, Eve's fiancé had been mocking Lummis about the fact that his arm

[238] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[239] Lummis Fiske, *Charles Lummis*, 65.

hung uselessly at his side. This inspired Lummis to play a highly competitive game and when he won, Eve's fiancé went into a ferocious tirade and Eve broke off the engagement.[240] Charles and Eve began a romantic relationship and were married in 1891.

While the situation between Lummis, Eve, and Dorothea was mildly scandalous at the time, Dorothea made it clear that their divorce was not due to Lummis's relationship with Eve. The news of the Lummis divorce was reported in California where Lummis had served as the city editor of the *Los Angeles Times* and Dorothea had established herself as a physician. The *Los Angeles Herald* reported on what they considered the surprise divorce and remarriage of Charles Lummis. Though the article began as a marriage announcement, it was the surprise of the divorce that stood out in the article.

> Everybody supposed that Mr. and Mrs. Dr. Lummis were still united by the bonds that are supposed to bind. But a reporter interviewed Mrs. Dr. Lummis yesterday with the following result: "Miss Douglas," she said, "is a young woman of estimable character, so young, in fact, that I feel sure Mr. Lummis would agree with me that it would be much better for the Los Angeles Papers to make no mention of the fact. Yes, I knew the marriage was to take place…As the marriage has been published, it might be well to state that a legal separation had been effected…No, Miss Douglas was not the cause of the divorce."[241]

In order to secure a divorce from Dorothea, Lummis agreed to bring Eve to California and spend time with Dorothea. Even after the divorce, Lummis considered Dorothea to be a good friend and an intellectual advisor.

Lummis considered his time in Isleta to be some of the happiest and most productive years of his life. He also began writing about the people that he had been living with and his writings became an important and influential aspect of his time living

---

[240] Lummis, *As I Remember*.
[241] "C.F. Lummis: He is Divorced from Dr. Lummis and Marries Miss Douglas," *Los Angeles Herald*, March 31, 1891, 3.

in New Mexico. This is especially true of the work that he completed about the Pueblo people of Isleta. It is also an aspect of his work that showed his contradictory nature. In his work, "The Indian Who is Not Poor," Lummis presented the Pueblo people as unique among the rest of the aboriginal people of the Americas. "[H]e even affords luxuries to which the superior race has not yet risen…He is the sole aborigine on earth who inhabits many-storied buildings, and the only man who ever achieved, in our land, such architecture of unburnt clay."[242]

However, despite his glowing assessment of the Pueblos, there are a number of problematic statements within the text itself. Lummis, in an attempt to show how great the Pueblos are, compared them to the "superior race," meaning Eurocentric whites. He also ignored key aspects of Pueblo history in order to promote the altruism of the Spanish that simply did not exist. Lummis began the article by making blatantly false claims about the Spanish treatment of the Pueblos throughout their control of the American Southwest. He also minimized the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 that was the culmination of the abuses that the Pueblos had been suffering at the hands of the Spanish. While scholars have analyzed this work as a positive piece affirming the humanity and exceptionalism of the Pueblos, what they fail to see is that the piece is more of a supporting document for the Spanish than it is for the Pueblo. Lummis utilized the piece as a way to educate the masses on what he considered the proper history of the Pueblos, focusing on the history of their control by the Spanish.

> Both in justice to history, and for the comprehension of the present, it is proper to reiterate here that the Spanish never enslaved the Pueblos; never made them work in mines; found no mines in New Mexico and made none; never forced the

[242] Charles Lummis, "The Indian Who is Not Poor," *Scribner's Magazine*, Sept. 1892, 361.

> Indians to abandon their old religion and adopt the new. Spain's was the most comprehensive, humane, and effective "Indian policy" ever framed.[243]

The unfortunate truth is that the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was a response to those very things that Lummis denied ever happened. This was one of the many instances where Lummis completely ignored aspects of history that disproved his assertions in order to make his argument appear valid. This shows that Lummis was more interested in promoting the Spanish than telling an accurate history of the Spanish conquest of the Southwest. It also shows that his love for the Spanish far outweighed his love and appreciation for the American Indian, even the Pueblos that he considered as his people.

Though his writings were an important way to educate the rest of the country about the American Indians of the Southwest, it was his activism with the Pueblos that established his reputation as an Indian rights activist. It was also his first time getting entangled in a struggle that involved the federal government, though it was not his last. Following his marriage to Eve Douglas, Lummis's welcome in Isleta was assured. Eve was exceptionally popular as a former schoolteacher, and the couple were able to subside on his payments for stories, as well as royalties for his books, *My Friend Will* and *A New Mexico David*. The success of the two books also allowed Lummis to gain the clout to have his next two books published, *Some Strange Corners of Our Country* and *A Tramp Across the Continent*. *Some Strange Corners of Our Country* was Lummis's way of educating the masses of the United States, and the world as a whole about the unique peoples of the American Southwest. He included many of the people that he had

[243] Lummis, "Indian," 363.

encountered on his tramp and his recuperation in New Mexico, such as the witches of San Mateo as well as the Moqui and their rattlesnake dance.

Doubling down on part of the reason that he was attacked, Lummis even included a section on the Penitentes, adding that he was the only man that had ever been able to photograph their ritual. While the book did provide a view into the American Southwest and the people that reside therein, it made the people in question appear more of a sideshow act than people worthy of equality with the white Americans of the eastern United States. A *Tramp Across the Continent* was Lummis's novelization of his walk from Ohio to California. It consolidated the tales from his letters to the *Chillicothe Leader* and the *Los Angeles Times*, though it was not always consistent with his letters, and it was clearly dramatized. Modern scholars have accepted that many aspects of the book are fiction, as many parts of his timeline are not possible based on walking. The publishing of these books not only provided Charles and Eve with some needed income, but it also provided Lummis with moderate national fame.

In 1891, Lummis became embroiled in a battle between the parents of Isleta children and the Albuquerque Indian School (AIS). The school had been open for ten years at that point, and had been a major aspect of the assimilation of northern New Mexico natives. The United States government hoped that the school would succeed where they felt that the Spanish had failed in truly assimilating the Pueblo people.[244] In 1886, the school participated in a Decoration Day parade, and their floats contained banners that accurately expressed the school's goals of assimilation. Statements such as, "Anglo-Saxon civilization rules the world, we submit," "Wise statesmanship demands a

[244] John R. Gram, *Education at the Edge of Empire: Negotiating Pueblo Identity in New Mexico's Indian Boarding Schools*, University of Washington Press, 2015, 3.

homogenous population," "Patriotism precludes allegiance to civil powers, independent of the United States," and, "We are free born; education confers knowledge and power to assert and maintain our freedom."[245] Lummis's landlord, Juan Rey Abeita believed that the best opportunity for his sons would be to attend the school and prepare for a white man's world. His two oldest sons were attending AIS, the same school whose praises Lummis had sung in the winter of 1884 on his journey. While these two sons had been on a break, their four-year-old brother had requested to return to the school with his brothers. William Creager, the superintendent of the school had promised to return the boy a week later since he was too young to begin attending the school. Three years later, the youngest son of the Abeitas had not been returned, and their other boys had not been able to leave because of a policy that Creager had put into place, preventing students from returning home on extended breaks. Creager's belief was that a return to their homes would allow the students to continue using their native language, return to their native religion, and continue the traditions that the school was attempting to train out of them. When his son was not returned, Abeita had traveled to Albuquerque to retrieve his son, where he was beaten by school employees and thrown out.[246]

Knowing Lummis's history and his understanding of the United States legal system, Juan Rey Abeita and the Pueblo council asked Lummis for assistance in getting his three sons back, along with thirty-three other children that had been held at the school, fifteen directly from the Pueblo of Isleta. When Lummis became involved, he initiated correspondence with Creager, but no resolution was worked out between the

[245] John R. Gram. "Acting Out Assimilation: Playing Indian and Becoming American in the Federal Indian Boarding Schools," *American Indian Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (2016): 251.
[246] Charles F. Lummis, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos: Part III," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1893.

two. Lummis then filed a writ of habeas corpus. The case concerning the students was to be held the day following Lummis's filing. Instead of allowing the case to go into court, superintendent Creager sent men to attack Abeita, but Lummis recognized that an attack was coming, and escorted his landlord to safety. Not wanting the events that had taken place to be released in court, Bureau of Indian Affairs Commissioner T.M. Morgan had the Abeita boys released immediately. Unfortunately, the youngest Abeita boy had forgotten his native language, only being able to speak English. Since his mother could only speak Tigua, she was not able to speak to her son that had been gone for three years. Lummis's wife Eve, who spoke Tigua, had to interpret the interaction between mother and son.[247] Lummis then led the parents of the other children to Albuquerque and all of them were released.[248] This event is still commemorated today among the Pueblo people in Isleta, and Lummis is still hailed as a hero in the Pueblo.[249] While the events of removing the children from the AIS were a key part of Lummis's legacy, it was the battle with Daniel Dorchester after the students had been liberated that truly made the events a national story.

Daniel Dorchester was the Superintendent of Indian Schools for the United States government. Following the release of the children from AIS, Dorchester and Lummis engaged in a national battle, utilizing open letters to newspapers, criminal charges, and personal attacks. While not all of the charges that Lummis levied against Dorchester can be confirmed, he made it very clear to the American public what he felt about them.

---

[247] Charles F. Lummis, Plain Talk from the Pueblos: Part II," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1892.
[248] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part III," 1893.
[249] While speaking to a direct descendent of Juan Rey Abeita, it was revealed that the tribe still shares stories about Lummis, holding him as one of their national heroes. Though the oral tradition changes the specifics of the events in question, the general theme is still that the Isleta children were freed by the actions of Lummis.

Desiring to get the information about the incident in Albuquerque to the national public, Lummis wrote a series of articles titles, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos" that illuminated the nation to the virtues of the Pueblos. He began the first of three parts by assessing the importance of seeing past color, noting that the nation did not need another Civil War before it realized that men with brown skin were still men.[250] He also included a scathing analysis of the role of government in the dealings with the American Indian and its failures.

> Unfortunately, the whole theory of the Government – if we may predicate anything so substantial as 'theory' of the ignorant and grotesque doddering which we dignify by the name of 'Indian policy' – is that the racial child can and must be made a wise adult in a generation. That is, that the Indian should and shall learn the lessons of civilization some ten-fold faster than our forefathers did.[251]

This scathing review was only the first in his attacks on not only the Indian education system, but the government as a whole.

When Lummis submitted the second part of his admonition of the government over the issues with the AIS, he got more personal, as opposed to the more general information that he had included in the first part. One such personal story he also shared was a lesson that he had learned in Isleta from a man named Henry Kendall. Kendall was a student of the Carlisle Indian School, and when he graduated, he returned to Isleta. Unfortunately for Kendall, he was not accepted into white America since he was clearly an American Indian. However, he was also not fully accepted back home since he had renounced the traditions of his people, and adopted the language, culture, and skepticism

[250] Charles F. Lummis, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos: Part I," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1892.
[251] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part I," 1892.

of the white teachers that had taught him. As such, he was caught in between two worlds, and a member of neither.[252]

It was in the second part of the article that Lummis shared the touching story of his wife Eve having to interpret for the Abeita family so that the youngest son was able to communicate with his mother. Arguably the most poignant part of the letter, his intention was to make the rest of the nation understand the issues that faced the American Indian. He succeeded in this with a colorful analogy of Martians coming to Earth and taking charge of humankind. They not only instilled in the people the need to accept their superior ways, but also to let go of and forget their traditions, religion, and culture. Lummis also confronted Dorchester directly and answered to a specific charge allegedly made by Dorchester against Lummis, that he was a Catholic. "I am not a Catholic and never shall be. I grew up with a not uncommon horror and fear of Catholics, and am no nearer conversion now, though I trust I am less of an uninspired idiot. But an honest man with real acquaintance with the Southwest must give up some prejudices." [253]

However, Lummis also convoluted his words in this part of the article, showing his complicated concept of race and racial equality. He made the argument that, "Nothing but race prejudice – that innate ignorance from which we have emerged little more than has the – Indian – stands between us and realization of the truth." However, in a later section he stated that, "The Pueblos have a status absolutely different from that of any other Indians. They cannot be coerced, as may the savage tribes."[254] While he was intending on ending racial prejudice against the American Indians, he engaged in that

[252] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part II," 1892.
[253] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part II," 1892.
[254] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part II," 1892.

very same prejudice by judging certain tribes as being savage, and others, like the Pueblos as being civilized, and therefore unequal.

In part three, Lummis shared more of the specific aspects of his battle with the AIS, allowing the people of the nation to understand the lengths that the school had been willing to go to keep students from leaving and reverting back to their traditional ways. He also shared his opinion of the purpose of the Indian schools and the concept of an "Indian problem."

> There is no Indian Problem. It is like speaking of the Problem of Decency, the Problem of Fair Play, the Problem of the Golden Rule. To those who find these things problems, there is an Indian Problem; but it is inside and not without. The Indian is a man, but a child; sometimes a bad one, partly an inheritance we share, but chiefly by contact with our dregs. But we do not sweat nationally over the Children Problem. Good and wise parents usually rear good children; a good and wise Government would as habitually rear good Indians.[255]

It is clear through Lummis's writings here that though he sought for more rights for the American Indians, he in no way considered them equal to whites. His comparison of them with children was something that stayed with him throughout his activism as well as his recommendations on changes to federal Indian policy.

Lummis also wrote about the crimes perpetrated by the AIS, including sexual abuse, kidnapping children from Mexico, and religious freedom infringement. Additionally, this served as another opportunity for Lummis to extole the virtues of the Spanish occupation of the Southwest before the United States took control. Though once again, his assessment of the Spanish occupation was factually inaccurate, it showed that Lummis's love and patriotism was overwhelmingly aimed at Spain. The other aspect of that statement that was suspect was the idea that the Indians were children, and needed to

[255] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part III," 1893.

be reared by a good government. Lummis referred to the adult American Indians as children, stating that it was necessary for the government to become involved, so that the Indians could mature properly. However, if he was truly against racial prejudice, then his assertion that the Anglo-centered government was needed to rear the childlike Indian would not only have been unnecessary, but would never have been a thought.

In another open letter to Dorchester, Lummis wrote an article for the *Sacred Heart Review* in Boston. This letter was not only exceptionally personal, but was especially vicious as well. In this article, Lummis openly leveled accusations against Dorchester, Indian Commissioner Thomas Morgan, and the entire Indian education system. Lummis's accusations against Dorchester include gross incompetency, ignorance, cruelty, and a multitude of illegal activities that had been perpetrated in the Indian schools. While Lummis acknowledged that Dorchester was not directly committing the illegal and abhorrent acts at the schools, his position as the head of the education system made him responsible for the goings on in the schools. He also included Morgan in the responsibility for the happenings at the schools across the nation. The issue arose, once again, about Lummis being a Catholic. This article, having been printed in a Catholic newspaper, certainly played upon the emotions and beliefs of the paper's readership.

> I have made these charges clearly and openly in leading Eastern newspapers...The only reply attempted by your tools has been: "Oh, he is a Catholic. "You and they know this to be false. You and they know that I am not a Catholic. But to the minds of a certain caliber this cowardly appeal to prejudice, no matter how false, seems sufficient answer to any charge. Your own reply comes in a fashion equally characteristic… By the way, too, I would like to see your next meeting with my father, who was for years your associate in the New England Methodist Conference. I would like to see you cower before that old man's honest eyes when you know that he knows what you have done. His way of serving God is somewhat different from yours. He never took his conscience for sale to the

> political junk-shops. He knows in detail my whole course with reference to the Indians and their oppressors, and I have his earnest God speed in the work.[256]

Lummis also accused the entire Indian education system of enslaving the American Indian children across the nation and inquired as to whether Dorchester openly supplied the schools with slave irons and other tools necessary to withhold their constitutional freedom, as they were citizens of the United States.[257] This ruthless attack on Dorchester and Morgan was a preview of how Lummis eventually used his literary prowess to enact change within the United States for both the American Indian, and the Spanish.

Lummis's time in New Mexico deepened an already abiding love that he held for the territory and it was his second home for the remainder of his life. He was politically involved in the state, not merely assisting Amado Chaves in his fight against the peon system and Roman Baca, but also in matters concerning the School of American Archaeology in Santa Fe and the territory's statehood. In 1904, almost twenty years following his first experience with New Mexico, Lummis was in the newspapers, presenting his opinion on the potential statehood of New Mexico and Arizona, specifically, the proposition of a joint statehood between the two. Lummis had believed that the two should remain independent of one another and that it would diminish the qualities of each if they were forcibly yoked in order to become states. He was quoted in the *Santa Fe New Mexican* with his strong opinions on the subject.

> "The merger of New Mexico and Arizona would be unjust and impracticable," said Charles Lummis. "Were those territories merged it would be a marriage at the point of a gun, neither party consenting…The fight against proper statehood is

[256] Charles Lummis, "A Christian and a Man of Honor," *Sacred Heart Review* 8, no. 22, Boston, Mass, (November 12, 1892).
[257] Lummis, "Christian." *Sacred Heart*, 1892.

> a discredit to the fair mindedness of our legislators. The territories had better wait for statehood until they are able to acquire it justly and honorably."[258]

Lummis had established himself an authority on the American Southwest, and as such, it was common for journalists to report on his opinion of the goings on in the area. This was especially true for New Mexico, as Lummis regularly visited the area, and though his residence was in Los Angeles, New Mexico was as much a home for Lummis as California.

Lummis's love for the New Mexico and Arizona territories was abundantly clear in his numerous works celebrating the areas, as well as the unique geography and people that inhabited them. This love for the Southwest was also present late in Lummis's life when he arranged a deal with the railroad to increase tourism to the area.[259] From the moment that Lummis had arrived in the Southwest during his walk across the nation, he had been promoting the region as an ideal location for eastern Americans to visit and even relocate. His book, *Some Strange Corners of Our Country* had specifically sought to pique the interest of Americans who had never experienced the West, and Lummis's love for the area never faltered.

Lummis had previously espoused his opinions on the territorial statehood, and had utilized his platform as a journalist to share this opinion to the rest of the United States. Understanding his limitations in political matters concerning the statehood of territories,

---

[258] "Lummis on Joint Statehood," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, January 27, 1904, 7. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020630/1904-01-27/ed-1/seq-7/#date1=1904&index=0&rows=20&words=LUMMIS+STATEHOOD&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1904&proxtext=Lummis+statehood&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[259] "The Cool Rockies of Arizona-New Mexico," *The Daily Gate City and Constitution-Democrat* (Keokuk, Iowa), July 15, 1919, 6. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn87057262/1919-07-15/ed-1/seq-6/#date1=1893&index=7&rows=20&words=Lummis+Pueblo&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1928&proxtext=Lummis+Pueblo&y=18&x=2&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Lummis had simply promoted aspects of New Mexico and Arizona, but had not specifically lobbied to make either territory a state. Even in his later quote, Lummis did not push for statehood, but merely advocated against a joint statehood, advising that the territories should wait to be brought in as independent states. In 1903, Lummis had written to *The Arizona Republican* about his beliefs on the territory's statehood status. "'The lion has never been fierce and forward for statehood to be given New Mexico and Arizona. It is a large question for a small mind: and after only half a life of study he doesn't feel he is quite there.'"[260] This was a rare instance in which Lummis publicly admitted his lack of knowledge in a subject, especially as it concerned the Southwest. However, it also spoke to how Lummis advocated for the Southwest, but not always in political matters that were outside of his purview or specialization.

[260] "The Lion on Arizona: Charles F. Lummis' Plain Talk on the Statehood Question," *The Arizona Republican* (Phoenix, Arizona), March 8, 1903, 6. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020558/1903-03-08/ed-1/seq-6/#date1=1892&index=1&rows=20&words=Lummis+Statehood&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1910&proxtext=Lummis+statehood&y=14&x=13&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Chapter 5 KNIGHT ERRANT FOR THE SPANISH FANTASY PAST

It has been well-documented that Charles Lummis was a definitive Hispanophile once he entered the American Southwest. The reason for this intense love could be traced back to his visit with the Chaves family on his walk to California in the winter of 1884/85. It could also have been due to his infatuation with teenage Susanita Del Valle from the same family represented by Helen Hunt Jackson in her novel, *Ramona*.[261] Lummis's passion for the Spanish history of the Southwest was apparent in his account of his walk from Chillicothe, Ohio to Los Angeles, California. What has not been acknowledged by biographers, historians, and critics is the depth of this fascination and the impact that it had on his reporting of historical events that affected both the Spanish and the American Indians. His assessment of the Spanish history of the New World diverted from the accepted understanding of the events of that time period because he believed that the documented Spanish history was incorrect. This explains Lummis's omission of key events in the history of Spanish rule in the Southwest such as the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. He believed that the accepted interpretation of Spanish history in the Americas was written by Anglos, and was errantly harsh on the role of the Spanish, especially towards the treatment of the natives in Central, South, and North America. It was this belief in the errancy of the historical record that led Lummis to make corrections that he felt were necessary.

Like other writers of the time, especially in California, Lummis clung to the idea of a Spanish fantasy past, a concept of an altruistic and wholly beneficial Spanish

[261] Helen Hunt Jackson, *Ramona*, Boston, Roberts Brothers, 1886.

heritage in the New World, especially the American Southwest. While this belief was not unique to Lummis, it did conflict with his concept of Indian rights, and his statements supporting the Spanish heritage of the Southwest contradicted his previous statements on the character of the Pueblo people. The promotion of the Spanish fantasy past is also key in a critical analysis of Lummis's reputation as a historian, as his acceptance of historical information was based upon its adherence to his predetermined narrative, promoting the Spanish.

Lummis's errors in the historical account notwithstanding, what he declared an intentional misrepresentation of Spanish history is in itself, an issue that he felt he was the one necessary to correct. His fascination with not only the Spanish history of the Southwest, but more specifically, the period of the wealthy, land-owning dons, led him to become a knight-errant for the Spanish crown.[262] Much like Don Quixote, who desired a return of chivalry and the romantic past, Lummis used the history of Spanish America as his quest to correct the wrongs that he perceived had been perpetrated against the Spanish. Lummis desired the romance of the past, and his writings about the Spanish celebrated this in abundance. Through his journeys across New Mexico and Arizona, as well as his time in California, Lummis became a roving knight in search of deeds that would earn him a knighthood and the honor of the king. These deeds equated to a correction of the historical record in Spain's favor and a restoration of the Spanish past. While his concept of a new interpretation of the Spanish past was factually inaccurate,

[262] Lummis's fascination with the period of the dons in Spanish colonial history is well-documented. His own home, El Alisal is made up of 13 lots, totaling roughly 3 acres that he purchased and built a 4,000 sq. ft home, is reminiscent of the Spanish colonial period in Central and North America.

Lummis did succeed in his attempt to gain the recognition of the king and earn the title of Don Carlos.

Lummis's knight-errant journey began in New Mexico while he was recovering from his series of strokes with the Chaves family in San Mateo. It then continued when Lummis relocated to the Pueblo of Isleta. Lummis's "The Indian Who is Not Poor," though intended as a celebration of the Pueblo people, was more of a celebration of the Spanish influence on the Pueblos, and was rife with inaccuracies that provided the Spanish a far more favorable analysis than history and the facts have. In his analysis of the historical record of the Pueblo people and the Spanish influence, Lummis came to his own verdict as to the cause of the errors in the reporting of Spanish history.

> The essential errors of research in our Southwest were two: first, the employment of students, or rather detectives, limited severely to recording details which were weighed and collected solely by men who never saw the field, and therefore without the necessary horizon. And second, entire disregard of all the documentary and geographical accessories without which such research is absolutely blind.[263]

Lummis, in this work, discovered a problem that no one else had considered an issue, then set about to correct that problem himself. In his assessment of the recording of Spanish history, Lummis also made an ironic claim that the student of history is afraid of "being biased by knowledge – by seeing the country and the races which have made that history, or by consulting the vast mass of reliable Spanish record."[264] The irony in this statement is also what applies to the criticism of Lummis's assessment in *The Spanish Pioneers*. Lummis extoled the virtues of the Spanish records of the time period, but he

[263] Charles Lummis, "The Indian Who is Not Poor," *Scribner's Magazine*, Sept. 1892, 362.
[264] Lummis, "The Indian," 1892, 363.

himself ignored the record of the events of that same period as told by the very Pueblos that he claimed to love and the very people that his article intended to celebrate.

The omission of the records of the Pueblos that had also been involved in the Spanish conquest of New Mexico is not merely unprofessional for a self-declared historian, but it was also put into question with Lummis's own words written four years after *The Spanish Pioneers* was published. In an article from the *San Francisco Call* in December 1897, there is a commentary on Lummis's contribution to Harper's Weekly from earlier that month. In the article, Lummis extolled the reliability of American Indian histories and that the stories and histories that had been passed down from generation to generation were highly reliable.

> Incidentally, he argues for the intrinsic reliability of Indian traditions, alluding to the extreme accuracy which they bestow, not only upon the circumstances recorded, but upon the actual words in which it is handed down, from which no deviation is permitted, and citing examples of the marvelous retentiveness and method of Indian memory.[265]

If Lummis believed in the intrinsic reliability of Indian history, then his omission of such history is all that more egregious, further proving that the reason that no Indian historical accounts were included in his book was due to the fact that it would inherently denigrate the Spanish, of who he had been exalting.

Perhaps the most deplorable error that Lummis made, or intentional misrepresentation, was a statement that was not only blatantly false, but violated the history of the very people that he lived with and assisted in his first fight in the Indian rights battle.

---

[265] "Our Notebook," *San Francisco Call*, December 12, 1897, 23. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85066387/1897-12-12/ed-1/seq-23/#date1=1897&index=0&rows=20&words=Hodges+Lummis&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1897&proxtext=Lummis+Hodges&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

> Both in justice to history, and for the comprehension of the present, it is proper here to reiterate that the Spanish never enslaved the Pueblos, never made them work in mines; found no mines in New Mexico and made none; never forced the Indians to abandon their old religion and adopt the new. Spain's was the most comprehensive, humane, and effective "Indian policy" ever framed.[266]

The most glaring error in this statement is that the only accuracy it contains is that the Spanish never forced Indian labor in the mines.

However, the rest of Lummis's account was factually inaccurate. The encomienda system placed the natives, including the Pueblos in a subservient role to the Spanish. For the purpose of this paper, slavery is defined as forced and unpaid servitude to another. This is an accurate representation of the Spanish relationship with the native peoples of the New World, including the Pueblo people about whom Lummis wrote. This is especially true for the Spanish in charge and the Franciscan friars that demanded food and textiles from the Pueblos that impaired their ability to maintain their own livelihood.[267] It was also Lummis's reliance on the Spanish documents that he considered wholly reliable that was the primary reason for his errancy in his assessment. Had Lummis followed the most basic rules of historical study, he would also have sought any information from the very Pueblos he had lived amongst.

Lummis was also completely wrong in his assertion that the Spanish never forced the Pueblos to abandon their own religion and adopt Christianity. This is a primary example of Lummis's belief that the accepted history of the Spanish conquest was incorrect, and it was his duty to correct the record. However, in his desire to portray the Spanish in a far more altruistic way than the events of history have shown, he sacrificed

---

[266] Lummis, "The Indian," 1892, 363.

[267] Thomas E. Sheridan and Stewart B. Koyiyumptewa, *New Mexico and the Pímeria Alta: The Colonial Period in the American Southwest*, Ed. John G. Douglas and William M. Graves, University of Colorado Press, 2017, 241.

the truth for his own need to complete the task that he had put before himself. It has been well-reported that the Spanish had been especially harsh in their conversion of the natives to Catholicism. It was this severe conversion strategy that was the leading cause of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680.

However, since that record was part of what Lummis considered the inaccurate recounting of Spanish colonial history, he ignored it in exchange for his more favorable assessment. There have been stories told by the Hopis about severe abuses perpetrated by the Franciscan friars towards the Pueblos, including severe floggings, and the use of turpentine on the wounds to the point where the beatings led to the death of the accused idolaters.[268] Similar stories would have been told by the people in Isleta at the time of Lummis's stay. Furthermore, research into the Spanish colonial period in North America had been completed by W.W.H. Davis in his *Spanish Conquest of New Mexico* in 1869. In it, he documented the abuse that the Spanish inflicted upon the Pueblos, which eventually led to the revolt in 1680. Punishments such as whipping and scourging were meted out against the Pueblos if they refused to forgo their religious beliefs in exchange for the Catholicism that the Spanish had brought.[269] Davis's work was based on the Spanish records of the time period, so why they would have been ignored or excluded by Lummis remains suspect. It is clear that his purpose was to promote the Spanish, not to educate the masses about the actual history of the Southwest. This was clear when Lummis's perspective was clearly with the Spanish, and his use of information derived from the Pueblos was woefully absent. Even so, works like Davis's show that there was

[268] Sheridan and Koyiyumptewa, *New Mexico*, 243-249.
[269] William Watts Hart Davis, *The Spanish Conquest of New Mexico*, Doylestown, Penn, 1896.

information in the Spanish records that presented the treatment of the Pueblos as far less benevolent as Lummis would have had his readers believe.

Another falsehood that Lummis perpetrated in his attempted promotion of the Pueblos was the idea that the population of the Pueblo tribes remained consistent before and after the Spanish conquest of New Mexico. "In the far greater American area covered by Spain for three centuries and a half, the aborigine is practically as numerous as at the Conquest, and much better off. When this unquestionable fact becomes more widely recognized, we shall hear less of 'Spanish atrocities' in the New World."[270] This statement was directly contradictory to his own words in his letters to the *Chillicothe Leader*, when he stated that the area was once home to 50,000 Pueblo people, but that population was down to approximately 8,000 when Lummis visited in late 1884.[271] Either Lummis's assertions in 1884 were significantly inaccurate, or his desire to embellish the facts in support of the Spanish had caused him to directly contradict his own words, nullifying his own reliability.

Once again, Lummis omitted two very important aspects of how the population changed in the Pueblos from the time before the first Spanish exploration and through the end of the 19th century. First, Lummis failed to account for the effect of the smallpox virus that the Spanish brought to New Mexico in their conquest. While precise records of population data do not exist, there are sources from the time that confirm the loss of Pueblo life to disease. According to Elinore M. Barrett, the greatest loss of the Pueblo population occurred in the 1630s and 1640s, where it was reduced by a third, following a

[270] Lummis, "The Indian," 1892, 364-5.
[271] Charles Lummis, Letters from the Southwest, Ed. James W. Byrkit, University of Arizona Press, 1989, 132.

severe outbreak of smallpox.[272] The basis of her assertion were records taken by Fray Juan de Prada in a message to the Council of the Indies from 1638. This shows that the records were available to Lummis in 1892 when he made the assertion, records that, being Spanish, were reliable by his own admission. Unfortunately, since these records did not coalesce with the message that Lummis attempted to deliver in his story, they were omitted. His propagation of the concept of the Spanish fantasy past was once again more important than recording an accurate history of the Spanish colonial period in the Southwest.

After returning from an unhappy expedition to Peru with Adolph Bandelier, the noted Swiss-American anthropologist that he met while recovering from his strokes in New Mexico, Lummis returned to Los Angeles.[273] On a previous sabbatical that he had taken during his expedition, he and his wife, Eve, had purchased a home, so when he returned he had a place to live that was his own. However, with money continuing to be an issue, Lummis once again began writing in order to earn enough to subside. One of the books that Lummis published during this time was *The Spanish Pioneers*. This book was not only Lummis's attempt at making a living as a writer, but also to correct what he believed was a criminal misrepresentation of Spanish history. Lummis had lamented that there were no English language textbooks that spoke of the Spanish as the hero of the New World.[274]

---

[272] Elinore M. Barrett, *Conquest and Catastrophe: Changing Rio Grande Pueblo Settlement Patterns in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 2002.

[273] Charles Lummis to Dorothea Lummis, March 20, 1894. While he had initially been excited about the excursion, Bandelier's medical ailments, the death of Bandelier's wife, and the fact that Lummis had largely remained away from the digging site, having been relegated to his room in Lima. Lummis acknowledged that his loneliness had been a major problem and Bandelier had done nothing to help matters.

[274] James A. Hijiya, "Why the West Is Lost," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (April 1994): 276.

The Spanish Pioneers analyzed the Spanish influence in the New World, including their explorations and conquest of the American Southwest. Before he was even able to begin his recounting of Spanish history, Lummis made the claim that the reason that the Saxon-Americans had not given the Spanish their due respect was because they had been misled. Lummis claimed that the history that was taught to the Anglo-Saxon Americans was a complete misrepresentation of the Spanish history of the Southwest, and ignored the many heroic actions of the Spanish, and even made the claim that "[T]he Spanish pioneering of the Americas was the largest and longest and most marvellous feat of manhood in all history." These two paragraphs in the preface of the book clearly established the goal that Lummis set for his book. His intent was to re-educate Americans about the Spanish contributions to the New World, using what he described as the "New School of American History." [275] He had determined that there was an issue with the historical record, and it was his responsibility to correct it.

Following his preface, Lummis dedicated the book to a woman that he truly admired. For those people that understand the history of American Indian rights and wars within the United States in the latter half of the nineteenth century, this name would appear to be a curious addition to a book written by an Indian rights activist. Charles Lummis dedicated *The Spanish Pioneers* to Elizabeth Bacon Custer, the widow of Lieutenant Colonel George Armstrong Custer, the commander of the 7th Cavalry during their failed campaign against the Lakota Sioux at the Battle of Little Bighorn. The reason

[275] Charles Lummis, *The Spanish Pioneers*, A.C. McClurg, 1936. In the preface of *The Spanish Pioneers*, Lummis mentioned what he called, the New School of American History that was intended to correct what Lummis considered an incorrect teaching of the Spanish conquest of the New World. Lummis believed that the stories of the Spanish mistreatment of the natives were fallacies created by Anglo-Saxon Americans to denigrate the Spanish and elevate the actions of the early English settlers.

that this dedication is so out of place for an Indian rights activist is that it was Elizabeth that had so strongly pressed the idea that her husband had been a martyr in the battle against the savage Lakota Sioux. This, however was far from the truth, as Custer himself had been the aggressor in the Battle of Little Bighorn. Custer had also been the invader that had violated the Treaty of Fort Laramie with his expedition into the Black Hills in search of gold. Lummis's inclusion of a dedication to her is exceptionally questionable, especially in light of his creation of the Sequoya Club. While it can be argued that this book was published before the creation of the Sequoya Club, when Lummis republished the title shortly before his death, adding a chapter on the Spanish missions, the dedication remained in the book.

The remainder of *The Spanish Pioneers* was written as a though it were a love letter to the Spanish Empire, not even feigning the disguise of authentic history. While the whole of Lummis's work is not a reliable source of authentic history, analyzing each aspect of the book would require more space in this paper than there is to give. For the purposes of this thesis, the focus will remain on those aspects of the book that involve the contact between the Spanish and the Pueblos, in chronological order as to when the events happened, not their placement within the text itself. With this book having been originally published in 1893, Lummis had already spent 3 years with the Pueblos. While he was living with the Pueblos, he married their former school teacher, and engaged in the rescue of thirty-six children from the Albuquerque Indian School (AIS). As previously mentioned, following the liberation of these students, Lummis then engaged in a national battle with Daniel Dorchester, the Superintendent of Indian Schools. In addition to the battle with Dorchester, Lummis wrote newspaper and magazine articles

celebrating the Pueblo people and extoling their virtues to the nation. Lummis claimed that he loved the people of the Pueblos, so his narrative in *The Spanish Pioneers* is a strange contradiction to much that he wrote and claimed to feel about the Pueblos in his goal to be recognized as the primary defender of the Spanish heritage of the New World.

Lummis first related the issues between the Spanish and Pueblos when he introduced Juan de Oñate's excursion into New Mexico in 1598. Lummis's perspective throughout the book was as though he were a Spaniard, having lived through the events that he wrote about. There was absolutely no objectivity, which was abundantly clear as he recounted the tale of the Pueblo revolts of 1598 and 1680. Lummis initially referred to the retaliation of the Pueblos against the invading Spanish as treachery.[276] Lummis described the fight between the two forces as unequal, portraying the Spanish soldiers as martyred heroes and the Pueblos as savage barbarians. This statement was a direct contradiction to his defense of the Pueblos following his battle with the AIS. In the *Boston Evening Transcript*, Lummis described the Pueblos in the following words, "These Indians are peaceful, industrious farmers, who dwell in permanent, substantial, and comfortable houses – both of which statements were true of them long before a Saxon foot was ever planted on America"[277] Within a year, not only had Lummis contradicted his own statements about his feelings for the Pueblos, but he had also contradicted his assessment of the character of the Pueblos themselves. His assessment of them as treacherous, savage, barbarians did not correspond to his assertion that they were peaceful farmers. If they were indeed peaceful farmers, then their attack on the Spanish must have been warranted. The question then becomes why would Lummis have

[276] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 1936, 128.
[277] Charles Lummis, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos: Part 1," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1892.

contradicted himself in both of these ways? It was not due to a momentary lapse in judgement, but a calculated decision to forgo not only his feeling for the Pueblos, but also his own words praising the Pueblos in the newspaper.

The word savage holds a significantly negative connotation, especially in reference to people of a different ethnic group than one's own. Its use in describing a person or group of people today would be interpreted as an insult. At the time that Lummis wrote this, there was a prevailing belief in the Social Darwinist understanding of ethnographic hierarchy, where the word described a specific evolutionary status among a group of people. This belief had also been utilized to study the anthropology of the Mexican people by Lummis's friend Adolph Bandelier and Lewis H. Morgan.[278] However, for Lummis to have applied this term to a people whom he had become close, claimed to love, and had personally defended nationwide was a contradiction. Its use repeatedly in a single chapter denoted a severe lack of respect for the very people that Lummis claimed to love. This was especially true when the narrative of the story supported the very people that invaded the home of the Pueblos that Lummis considered savages. As the invading force with weapons of war, the Spanish were the aggressors in the conflict between themselves and the Pueblos. In Lummis account of Oñate's conquest, he referred to the Spanish requiring the natives to make a pledge of allegiance

[278] Lewis H. Morgan and Adolph Bandelier, *México Antiguo*, Siglo XXI de España Editores, S.A., 2004. Morgan had been a major influence on Adolph Bandelier's understanding of American anthropology. David R. Wilcox and Don D. Fowler, "The Beginnings of Anthropological Archaeology in the North American Southwest: From Thomas Jefferson to the Pecos Conference," *Journal of the Southwest* 44, no. 2 (2002): 155.
This influence likely influenced Lummis's assessment of the natives, especially when compared with the far more advanced Spanish. However, his assertion in the preface admonishing his readers to abandon race prejudice, as well as his own comments on the Pueblos in "The Indian Who is Not Poor" and "Plain Talk from the Pueblos," exposed a contradictory nature in his beliefs in Social Darwinism and his purported love of the Pueblo people.

to the Spanish crown.[279] It was their violation of this pledge and their attempted expulsion of the Spanish that earned Lummis's judgement as treacherous savages.

This contradicted Lummis's previous statement, once again from his defense of the Pueblos when he said that, "Here is a people unharassed yet not indolent; a people doing harm neither to self, nor to others; a people that compares favorably with us in morals and is tenfold happier than we – and not with the blind content of brutes."[280] If the Pueblos compared favorably with the Anglo-Saxon Americans in morality, he was either stating that the Anglos were treacherous savages, or that the Pueblos were of good moral character. Since Lummis's audience was an Anglo-American one, it is clear that his purpose was to make a favorable assessment of the moral character of the Pueblos, which once again stood in direct contrast with his assessment in *The Spanish Pioneers*. It is also interesting to note that his message about the Pueblos in "Plain Talk from the Pueblos" was written two centuries after the Spanish reconquered the Pueblos, following the revolt of 1680. The Pueblos that Lummis had come to know and love had been subdued by the Spanish and had been forcibly assimilated to the Spanish culture. This was the reason why Lummis found them so appealing when he met them. They were exotic, yet unthreatening, and held characteristics that he found agreeable. This was also a great way for Lummis to appeal to the Easterners to whom he had been promoting the Southwest, which was a mysterious place to them, as though it were not even a part of the same nation.[281] It is also important to note that the article supporting the Pueblos would not have been read by those in power in Spain. Much of Lummis's words praising the

[279] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 189, 127.
[280] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part I," 1892.
[281] Flannery Burke, "Conclusion: Without Problems, We Wouldn't Have Any Stories," In *A Land Apart: The Southwest and the Nation in the Twentieth Century*, University of Arizona Press, 2017, 295.

American Indian, especially the Pueblo would also not have been readily available in Spain. This means that Lummis's words there would not have been viewed as a contradiction to the Spanish that he was so desperate to impress and fulfil his goal of becoming one of the dons that he so desired.[282]

One aspect of Lummis's narrative in *The Spanish Pioneers* was the colorful descriptions of the two opposing groups. As Lummis recounted the events of the Pueblo uprising of 1598, his words clearly denoted the perspective that he was taking, which was far from objective. Once again, playing to his Spanish audience, Lummis was clearly enthralled with the Spanish and considered their exploits in New Mexico nothing short of heroic. He described their struggle against what he considered the unfair attack on a harmless group of benefactors that existed in New Mexico simply to improve the lives of the poor, uneducated, and savage Pueblo people. What Lummis failed to portray in his narrative, and acknowledged only in a manner that whitewashed the actions of the Spanish, was that the Spanish were there not to give freely to the Pueblos, but had set out to conquer them. This fact is vital in understanding the actions of both the Spanish and the Pueblos.

This description of the Pueblos as savages not only contradicted his previous works praising the Pueblos as a model group of people, but it also contradicted Lummis's assertions about the American Indian that he made within just a few years of the

[282] From the moment that he met Amado Chaves and his family, Lummis had been infatuated with the Spanish people and culture. His meeting with Don Manuel opened his eyes to a world of chivalry, romance, and heroism. When he arrived in Los Angeles, he became close with the Del Valle family, whose home was the centerpiece in Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona*. Lummis even fell in love with the teenage Susan Del Valle, but her family would not allow their romance. Shortly after the publishing of *The Spanish Pioneers*, Lummis began work on his very own hacienda, El Alisal, where he threw elaborate parties he called Spanish Noises.

publishing of *The Spanish Pioneers*. At the end of the nineteenth century, and even again at the very beginning of the twentieth century, Lummis gave talks called "Some Aspects of Indian Education" to different groups. Following one of these talks to the Friday Morning Club in January 1896, *The Los Angeles Herald* reported on the speech, including their response to how Lummis referred to the American Indian.

> The entire attitude of the speaker was a defense against the coercive systems of education imposed by the government upon a race who are today not low grade savages, but advanced aborigines. From a study of the character and habits of the Pueblo Indians, among whom Mr. Lummis lived, he was enabled to do justice to the traits of the so-called red man, his patience and intelligence, concluding that God did not exhaust himself when he made us, but created the brown as honestly as the white.[283]

In the talk, Lummis mentioned that the Pueblos were no longer savages, implying that they were before the introduction of the Spanish. This shows that Lummis's positive assessment of the Pueblos was predicated upon their connection to the Spanish. However, the final statement placed increased scrutiny on the statement that the Indians were savages before the Spanish arrived, as he stated that God created the Indian as honestly as the white man. That one statement implied a sense of equality between races as far as the quality of the person from the time of creation, so his statement that the Pueblos were savages before the Spanish contradicted his own words.

The goal of the Spanish was the total subjugation of the natives and the full conversion to Roman Catholicism. This subjugation took the form of imposing civilization on the Pueblos in New Mexico. As stated by Edward Spicer and Hazel

---

[283] "He Stood by the Redskin: Mr. Charles F. Lummis Appears Before Friday Morning Club," *Los Angeles Herald*, Los Angeles, California, January 18, 1896, 4. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85042461/1896-01-18/ed-1/seq-4/#date1=1896&index=0&rows=20&words=Lummis+REDSKIN&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1896&proxtext=Lummis+redskin&y=11&x=7&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Fontana, the Spanish concept of civilization was very different from what modern people would understand. For the Spanish, civilization was a specific set of cultural ideals that represented the Spanish Empire and the Catholic Church. It was a conversion to a Spanish lifestyle that required the abandonment of their cultural identity.[284] While there was a syncretism to the Roman Catholic conversion of the Pueblos, wherein cultural aspects of Pueblo life were incorporated into the teaching of Catholicism in order to ease conversion, it was still an abandonment of their native lifestyle. This was shown in the 1675 imprisonment of Pueblo religious leaders on the charges of idolatry for practicing their native faith. This arrest was a result of these leaders' failure to assist the Spanish in their conversion of the natives to Christianity.[285] This imprisonment was the impetus for the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, in which the Spanish were driven away. When the Spanish were able to reconquer the Pueblos, the standard was established that the Pueblos would need to convert to Catholicism, or face death.[286] Although Lummis ignored this very important aspect of the Spanish conquest, it is nonetheless central to the understanding of the Pueblo's response to the Spanish overthrow. However, his opinion on forced assimilation was very different when he was working with the Pueblos against the AIS.

> We teach foreign languages in the public schools of some states, because the foreigner votes. But those who were Americans centuries before we were, must not, under penalty of severe punishment, use their native tongue even in their play. They must not only master a new language, but forget their own. A poor but womanly mother here, when her boy of seven years was finally released by me from his governmental captivity, could not talk to him. She had to come by my house, that my wife might interpret the lad's sole though broken English into

[284] Edward H. Spicer, and Hazel Fontana, *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533–1960*, University of Arizona Press, 1962, 5.
[285] Meldan Tanrisal, "Devising a Syncretistic Version of Catholicism Among the Pueblo," *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty Letters* 191, no. 21 (2002): 50.
[286] Margot Astrov, *The Winged Serpent*, New York, The John Day Company, 1946, 61.

Tigua.[287]

In his defense of the Pueblos to the American populace, Lummis was appalled that the school would not only kidnap children, but that they would make a child unable to communicate with his mother. This was a common practice within the Indian school system in the United States and was the reason that AIS Superintendent Creager refused to allow students to return home on their breaks. He was loath to allow his students to return to the origin of their religion, traditions, and language, believing that contact with their homes would impede their assimilation into American culture and the English language.

Unfortunately, this same practice was leveled against the Pueblo by the Spanish centuries earlier, but was not confined to merely the children. The Spanish had not merely inserted themselves into the daily lives of the Pueblos, but had subdued them, and imposed the Spanish concept of governance, land and labor requirements, and wealth forfeiture.[288] As previously stated, when writing about the concept of forced assimilation, Lummis compared it to an invasion by another race from Mars. "Let us suppose, having achieved transit, the people of Mars make bloody conquest of North America, with an army of seven billions and unheard of inventions, whereby they are richer and less happy, it is logically evident that they are the superior race and we must make room for 'civilization.'"[289] He went on to make the case that having another race of people invade Earth and claim to be superior would not make the people of Earth any more likely to

[287] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part II," 1892.
[288] Tracy L. Brown, *Pueblo Indians and Spanish Colonial Authority in Eighteenth-Century New Mexico*, University of Arizona Press, 2013, 29-30.
[289] Lummis, "Plain Talk: Part I," 1892.

renounce their faith, culture, and language. He made the same connection to the people of the Pueblos, and American Indians in general. Simply appearing and claiming to be superior and forcing people to conform to a new way of life was not an appropriate way to enact change.

Yet, Lummis celebrated and excused the Spanish for the very acts that he condemned the United States for practicing. The primary difference between the two was that the Spanish were far more punitive in their implementation. Instead of compassion for the people that he claimed to love, Lummis passed harsh judgement against the Pueblos, relegating them to simple barbarians and savages, guilty of treachery. He levied this accusation, while not only excusing the treatment by the Spanish, but acting as an apologist for them, omitting any mention of cruelty. Lummis, despite his relationship with the Pueblos and his supposed understanding of their cultural heritage and their character, perpetuated the idea that the Spanish conquest was a selfless act of altruism, despite numerous records, including that of the Spanish, to the contrary. One statement that Lummis made in *The Spanish Pioneers* is that "The whole policy of Spain toward the Indians of the New World was one of humanity, justice, education, and moral suasion; and though there were of course individual Spaniards who broke the strict laws of their country as to the treatment of the Indians, they were duly punished therefor."[290] The previous evidence shown dispels the idea that the Spanish conquest was altruistic.

However, what needs further dispelling is the idea that the crimes perpetrated against the natives were by a select minority and that those responsible were punished for

[290] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 1936, 92.

their crimes. Stories of the crimes perpetrated by the conquistadors as well as the Franciscan friars that oversaw the conversion of the natives to Catholicism are still told within Pueblo communities and historians. One of the most glaring instances of abuse by a Franciscan friar was that of Fray Salvador de Guerra. In 1655, Guerra was accused of exceptionally cruel abuse towards the natives in the Hopi village, especially against a man named Juan Cuna. Not much is known about the specific reason for the beating against Cuna, except that Guerra caught him in an act of idolatry. What followed was not only a severe whipping that left Cuna bleeding profusely, but the beating was followed by a scalding of boiling turpentine that eventually led to Cuna's death.[291] While this cruelty was hardly unique to this area or to the Spanish conquest as a whole, it was the consequences for Guerra that are the most telling about the situation and the Spanish legal response.

Following an investigation into this assault, as well as a separate incident of severe whipping and scalding with turpentine, Guerra was found guilty and ordered to be removed from the area and sent back to Mexico City for the official punishment by Franciscan leadership. However, Guerra never faced any lasting punishment for his crimes as he was stationed in Taos in 1659-60, and then in Isleta the following year, eventually becoming the right-hand man to Fray Alonso de Posada, the comisario of the Holy Office of the Inquisition.[292] Guerra not only faced no punishment for his exceedingly violent crimes, but even his reputation was not impacted. The idea that the harsh treatment of the natives, including the Pueblos was perpetrated by a select few and

[291] Sheridan and Koyiyumptewa, *New Mexico*. 2017, 243-244.
[292] Sheridan and Koyiyumptewa, *New Mexico*. 2017, 245.

that they were immediately made to face the consequences of their actions was not only false, but again was used by Lummis to not merely portray a Spanish colonial period that did not exist, but was another step in his attempt to fulfil his self-perceived duty to the Spanish crown.[293]

With regard to the religion of the Pueblos, Lummis was once again contradictory with his statements from one source to another. While he was engaged in the battle with the AIS and the United States Indian school system, Lummis's promotion of the Pueblos included an admiration of their religion. "The theology of the Pueblos is as democratic as their sociology, and as complex. Duality is an integral part of their elder religion as their government…There is no one God – the Sun-Father and the Moon-Mother were the equal First Causes."[294] Lummis described their original religion as a democratic one of equality. However, his narrative in *The Spanish Pioneers* was far different. "It is a ghastly thing to study these religions and to see what dark and revolting qualities ignorance can deify…The religions of our North American Indians had many astounding and dreadful features…"[295] While Lummis was speaking in generalities with this assessment, this section of the book was focused on the Pueblos, meaning that the intention of the statement would also be interpreted as relating to the Pueblos. It poses an interesting question to the readers of both sources. Why would his assessment of their religion be so varied between the two works? The only explanation is that his desire to

[293] Lummis's ultimate goal was to be a part of the Spanish aristocracy that he held in high regard. Lummis established a revisionist history of the Spanish conquest that either omitted harsh treatment of the natives, or provided a justification for similar policies for which he had criticized the federal government. In doing so, he believed that he could resurrect the romance that he perceived in the Spanish colonial period of the American Southwest. This reteaching of history was one of his quixotic duties to accomplish this very goal.
[294] Lummis, "The Indian," 1892, 368.
[295] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 1936, 151.

impress the Spanish government required that he take an adversarial viewpoint to the natives that the Spanish had to subdue. This is especially true with the Pueblos that had rebelled against the Spanish twice, and had caused death and hardship that most other tribes had not.

The most curious addition to *The Spanish Pioneers* by Lummis was his description of the success of the Spanish over the Pueblos following the uprising of 1598. "When his men had sufficiently recovered from their wounds Vincente de Zaldivar, the leader of probably the most wonderful capture in history, marched victorious back into San Gabriel de los Españoles, taking with him eighty young Acoma girls, whom he sent to be educated by the nuns of Old Mexico."[296] The reason that this statement is curious is twofold. First, Lummis recounted the triumph of the Spanish over the Pueblos by celebrating Zaldivar's kidnapping of eighty Pueblo girls that were taken against their will to a new area and forced into the same forced assimilation that had instigated the uprising to begin with. Second, for a man that had rescued thirty-six Pueblo children from the AIS in 1892, publishing a book merely a year later that celebrated the kidnapping of eighty girls was an odd contradiction.

When he engaged in his fight with the AIS, not only did Lummis file a writ of habeas corpus to free the students, but following their liberation, engaged in a national battle with the federal Superintendent of Indian Schools about the practice of forced assimilation and the need to kidnap children in order to educate them. However, when Lummis wrote about the Spanish committing the same act on a larger scale, there was no

[296] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 1936, 140.

outrage, simply an understanding that it was due recompense for the Pueblo's treachery against the Spanish. This contradiction is one of the more egregious because it negates his work with the Pueblos against the AIS. To condemn the same action committed by one and support it when committed by another was the ultimate act of apologetics in Lummis's journey to right the perceived wrongs that he claimed had been committed against the Spanish crown and its heritage in the Southwest.

The aforementioned abuses have been well-documented by historians and are still a matter of the oral traditions in the Pueblo tribes. They were also the impetus of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. Like the uprising of 1598, the Pueblos executed a violent revolt against their Spanish conquerors. However, the 1680 rebellion was far more successful, lasting over a decade before the Spanish were able to re-conquer New Mexico. While Lummis spoke of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, he did so briefly, and without an explanation of the causes of the revolt, as though it were a spontaneous act of treachery, of which there was no incendiary spark. To any student of history, the idea of a rebellion without cause is, in itself, a cause of questionable accuracy. This is not surprising considering his lack of information concerning any action taken by the Spanish that could be considered anything but altruistic. However, as a historical analysis, it is important to understand the underlying causes of the Pueblo revolt, so as to perform an analysis of Lummis's lack of information, thereby fully understanding his whitewashing of Spanish history in order to fulfil his knight-errant duties to the Spanish king.

Lummis's apologetics towards the Spanish have been well documented throughout this chapter. His avoidance of any issues that could possibly show the Spanish in a less flattering light has been duly noted. This trend continued in his assessment of the

Pueblo Revolt of 1680. Though an exceptionally minor aspect of his book, Lummis did mention the revolt, but once again, his perspective was that of the Spanish conquerors and not an objective historian relating the events of the past.

> Yet the mere presence of the strangers in their country was enough to stir the jealous nature of the Indians; and in 1680 a murderous and causeless plot broke out in the red Pueblo Rebellion…Thirty-four Pueblo towns were in the revolt, under the lead of a dangerous Tehua Indian named Popé…On that bitter 10th of August, 1680, over four hundred Spaniards were assassinated, – including twenty-one of the gentle missionaries who, unarmed and alone, had scattered over the wilderness that they might save the souls and teach the minds of the savages."[297]

Lummis laid out a striking accusation against the Pueblos, along with a strong charge of assassination without cause. This ignored the fact that the Spanish friars had been suppressing the Pueblo religion since Oñate's conquest in 1598-99. This suppression led to the Spanish reducing the number of pueblos to make the people easier to control, and a strict ban of any kind of practice of the Pueblo religion, which the Catholic friars considered devil-worship.[298]

However, later in the book, Lummis did, in fact, acknowledge one of the causes of the rebellion, even if he did not connect the actions of the Spanish missionaries to the rebellion of the Pueblos. "So at once the Spanish laws commanded from the Pueblos the same contribution to the church as Moses himself established. Each Indian family was required to give the tithe and the first fruits to the church, just as they had always given them to their pagan cacique."[299] When the missionaries arrived, forcing the conversion of the Pueblos to Catholicism and punishing the adherence to their pagan religion, they also

[297] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 1936, 92.
[298] Christopher Vecsey, "Pueblo Indian Catholicism: The Isleta Case," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 16, no. 2 (1998): 1–5.
[299] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 1936, 166-7.

demanded tribute from their new subjects. While the requirement of a tithe would not have been an issue to willing converts to the Christian faith, the demand of such from a people that had faced an extremely punitive forced submission into a wholly alien faith would have been considered theft or slavery. This is especially true with the requirements of the first fruits that needed to be offered to the missionaries.

Along with stories of treacherous Franciscan friars such as Salvador de Guerra, Lummis omitted another key piece of information from the years preceding the revolt. In the Spanish area of New Mexico during the 17th century, there was a debilitating drought that put a significant strain on many of the Pueblo tribes. This drought was exacerbated by the demands of the missionaries for textiles and foodstuffs to the point where Pueblo families began to suffer under a lack of food and being overworked by the Spanish that demanded so much from them. This also caused a drastic population drop, as it coincided with a series of severe bouts of smallpox outbreaks.[300] As the drought continued, the Pueblos made the realization that the new religion that they had been forced to accept had not helped them in their need for rain and successful crops, so they began reverting to their native religions, which incited the abuse of the Franciscan friars that Lummis described as gentle missionaries.

When Lummis charged that the revolt was without cause, he did not merely ignore one single cause, but a significant series of causes. Though he attempted to downplay the multiple causes of the rebellion, to any student of the history of the Southwest, his work was simply a tale of Spanish fantasy, and not a reliable work of

[300] Sheridan and Koyiyumptewa, *New Mexico*. 2017, 241-43.

historical scholarship. One aspect of the statement that Lummis made about the beginning of the rebellion that did hold truth was the mention of the man, Popé, that Lummis described as dangerous. In reality, Popé was dangerous, especially during the revolt. However, what Lummis neglected to mention was Popé's arrest for idolatry in 1675. Along with forty-six other medicine men, Popé had been arrested by Governor Juan Francisco Treviño. Treviño hanged three of them as a lesson to the others, and inflicted severe beatings on the remaining forty-four, including Popé. It took a group of seventy Tewa warriors that traveled to Santa Fé to free the remaining medicine men.[301] This arrest and abuse at the hands of the Spanish for the practicing of his native religion set Popé on a course of rebellion, and his commemoration as a hero to the state of New Mexico.[302]

As a self-proclaimed historian, Lummis should have examined all of the evidence of the early Spanish colonial period of the American Southwest and presented it in its entirety. However, his claims as a historian came into question with his omission of factual events and his reliance on materials and accounts that represented only one perspective of the period. To claim that there was no cause to the revolt itself was not merely uneducated, but was suspicious in a work that appeared to be one of historical record. Since the revolt was perpetrated as a joint effort by multiple Pueblo groups, it shows that the abuses were not limited to a specific group, but were universal in nature. This confederation of the different Pueblo groups could also be responsible for the

[301] Charles Wilson Hackett, "The Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1680," *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 15, no. 2, (Oct. 1911): 98-9.
[302] Elizabeth Archuleta, "History Carved in Stone: Memorializing Po'pay and Oñate, or Recasting Racialized Regimes of Representation?" *New Mexico Historical Review* 82, no. 3 (July 1, 2007): 317-342.

increase in Pueblo locations following the 1680 revolt.[303] It is clear through his assessment of the entire colonial period leading to the 1680 revolt that Lummis's purpose was not to educate the readers of his work as to the historical events of the time, but to alter the record in a way that would strongly favor the Spanish and their actions, while at the same time vilifying the Pueblos and their uprisings.

Unfortunately, Lummis betrayed his own work with words that he had written in support of the same Pueblo people that he had denigrated as treacherous, savage barbarians. His contradictory recounting of the history of the early contact between the Spanish and the American Indian exposed not only his preference for Spain, but a lack of true respect and honor for the very people among whom he lived and claimed to love.[304] These clear contradictions, paired with his omission of any negative actions taken by the Spanish in their conquest shows that Lummis was simply attempting to fulfil his duties as knight-errant for Spain. This was not an obligation that was placed upon him by any government structure, nor was he pressured into service by anyone attached to the Spanish crown. This was an undertaking of his own creation as a remedy to a problem that he himself had discovered. This was also not merely an aspect of Social Darwinism and his belief in white supremacy, but in the specific belief that the Spanish were the superior people, especially when contrasted with the American natives and even the

[303] Matthew Liebmann, T. J. Ferguson, and Robert W Preucel, "Pueblo Settlement, Architecture, and Social Change in the Pueblo Revolt Era, A.D. 1680 to 1696," *Journal of Field Archaeology* 30, no. 1 (2005): 47.

[304] Donald L. Fixico, "Ethics and Responsibilities in Writing American Indian History," *American Indian Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1996): 29. Fixico stated that it was the responsibility of the historian to look at more than merely a single-sided written account when writing about American Indian history. Since Lummis utilized only Spanish sources for his work, it would not be accepted as a historical narrative today. However, Lummis was not looking to be fair and unbiased, but use his work as a pedestal upon which to place the Spanish conquerors.

English settlers that settled the colonies on the East Coast. Much like the windmills to Don Quixote, Lummis used his works as a way to win favor with the crown and bring back a time of romance and chivalry.

Chapter 6 IN THE LION'S DEN

It was impossible for Charles Lummis to refrain from writing and sharing his opinion on essentially every topic that entered his head. From the moment that he entered the Southwest, his views on Spanish history were not only very clear, but well-documented in his many writings. His writings on the Pueblo people and his book, *The Spanish Pioneers* celebrated the history of the Spanish influence on the Southwest and the lasting legacy of the conquest. His battle with the Albuquerque Indian School in 1892 entered him in a national battle that had been waging long before his birth. The issue of Indian rights and education had been a contentious subject since before the war for independence, and by the time that Lummis entered the proverbial fray, there was much to be said on both sides of the issue.

After Lummis's return to California from Peru, he continued his writings on both the Spanish and American Indians and he became the editor of a magazine that had been created for the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the *Land of Sunshine.* While the magazine began as a promotional periodical for the Chamber of Commerce, Lummis quickly took the magazine in his own direction, and created a monthly editorial called, "In the Lion's Den." This monthly column was Lummis's opportunity to share his opinion with the masses in a raw, unedited manner where he was not restricted by an editorial body that required him to conform to an image that was not his own. It was in this column that Lummis was able to share both his popular and unpopular perspectives on issues that faced the United States, and he certainly took advantage of the opportunity.

Following his completion of *The Spanish Pioneers*, and the beginning of his time with the *Land of Sunshine*, Lummis decided to forgo utilizing only the pen in his next

step towards preserving the legacy of Spain in the New World, especially in California. To do this, he needed to save one of the most famous visual representations of the Spanish control over the state, and he used his magazine to assist him in accomplishing this goal. In December of 1895, along with other like-minded individuals, Lummis started the Landmarks Club which was responsible for the conservation and preservation of the Spanish missions in the state. These missions had been established by the Catholic Church between 1769 and 1824 by way of Junipero Serra along with other Franciscan friars.[305] The purpose of the missions was to convert the natives to Catholicism and utilize the natural resources of California to benefit the Church.

By the time that Lummis entered California, the missions had been dilapidated for years and sat in ruin, at the risk of disappearing when Lummis started the Landmarks Club. In the December, 1895 issue of the *Land of Sunshine*, Lummis made his initial remarks on the Landmarks Club that he had been building in his monthly column, "In the Lion's Den".

> The majority of the readers of this magazine, I believe – or I would not be editing it – will need no more appeal than the facts. Their minds and hearts are competent to take care of themselves. To another class it is enough to recall the material truth that the Missions are, next to our climate and its consequences, the best capital Southern California has."[306]

Lummis was convinced that the people of California, especially the readers of his magazine would be like-minded and want to see the California missions restored. He recommended beginning the restoration with San Juan Capistrano, and stated that if Spain had still been in control of the missions, they would have already begun the

[305] "California Missions," *The American Catholic Historical Researches* 2, no. 2 (1906): 152.
[306] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 4, no. 1 (December 1895): 43.

restoration and preservation. As the only ruins of California, Lummis felt that their preservation would be akin to holding onto a major piece of California's history and must be attended to at all costs. Beginning in January, the Landmarks Club became a regular column in the *Land of Sunshine*, where Lummis shared the goings on of the club each month, including donations made as well as the work that had been done.

Lummis's use of the *Land of Sunshine* was not merely for the work of side projects such as the Landmarks Club, but also to create in Americans the love for the Spanish that he held. From his first issue of the *Land of Sunshine*, Lummis wrote about the positive contributions that the Spanish had on the American Southwest, as well as the American lexicon itself. In the same issue of the magazine where he first solicited the assistance of his readers to restore and preserve the Spanish missions of California, Lummis also began a linguistic education on the Spanish origin of American words. One of the words that was especially telling for historians was his explanation of the word, "cannibal". "The missionary about to tempt the South Sea Islanders might perhaps be comforted to remember that 'cannibals' are nothing worse than a corruption of the Spanish *Caribes* (cah-rée-bes) or Caribs."[307]

To the casual reader, this is merely another word where Lummis attempted to educate the populace. However, understanding the origin behind this word exposes Lummis's obsession and apologetics for the Spanish, as the connection between the Carib people and cannibalism originated during Columbus's exploration of the Caribbean. When the Spanish were initially conquering the islands in the Caribbean, they made

[307] Charles Lummis, "Borrowed from the Enemy," *Land of Sunshine* 4, no. 1 (December 1895): 28.

extreme statements about the natives of these areas in order to increase the drama of their adventures and justify the actions that were taken against the natives of the various areas that they conquered. One such accusation was that of cannibalism against the Carib people that originated from Columbus's friend and lieutenant, Michele da Cuneo, who speculated about some members of their exploration that had gotten lost and were suspected to have been consumed by the cannibals in the area. However, modern evidence questions whether Columbus ever had contact with the Carib people at all during his explorations. It has also been discovered that the observations between the natives and cannibalism were completely invented or at the very least highly exaggerated.[308]

However, despite the lack of veracity in the Spanish statements, this connection between the Caribs and cannibalism had persisted in Spanish culture due to a sensational assessment of native people that the Spanish reported back to the Spanish people and crown. With this article, Lummis not only exposed his Hispanophilia in the desire to teach Americans about the Spanish origins of American words, but in his choice of this specific word, exposed the etymology of the word itself. Though he did not acknowledge it, Lummis connected the word to the Spanish's heavily dramatized exploits as well as their excuse for the harsh treatment that they levied upon those that they encountered and accused of acts such as cannibalism, idolatry, and sodomy.

Lummis also utilized his magazine to voice his opinion on international matters that concerned the United States. During the year in 1898, he espoused his opinions on

[308] John R. Pittenger, "What Good Can There Be in This Kind of Human? Spanish Justification for the Conquest of the Americas," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* 7, article 7 (January 2020): 63.

the annexation of Hawaii, as well as the build-up and execution of the Spanish American War, and utilized *The Land of Sunshine* as his vehicle to influence the American masses through a national periodical. Of all of the accusations that one could make against Charles Lummis, an outward imperialist could not be one of them. Throughout the year, Lummis repeatedly admonished the United States over what he perceived as imperialistic policies towards Hawaii, Cuba, and the Philippines. He was especially distraught over the annexation of Hawaii after what he considered the theft of the land from the natives.

> The Hawaiians have their faults, but they are generous and hospitable. They opened to the Heralds of the White Christ. The Christian payment of this heathen kindness is that in 50 years the Hawaiians have been robbed of their government, the sons of missionaries are fat with – er – acquired lands and wealth and power; the islands reek with vile civilized disease; and the nation above all the world builded in the name of freedom is preparing to steal what little the poor entertainers have been able to keep.[309]

The irony in this statement was that Lummis spoke out against not only the coup d'état but the potential annexation by the United States, but did not espouse this same sentiment when he wrote about the conquest of the New World by the Spanish. Despite the fact that the same aspects of the civilizing of the Hawaiians had happened to the American Indians of the Southwest, Lummis's disdain was reserved only for the United States. When the Spanish invaded the New World, they brought European diseases with them that the natives had never been exposed to, yet Lummis did not hold colonial Spain to the same standard as he had the United States. In the years preceding the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, there had been a drastic drop in the population of the Pueblo people when a severe bout of smallpox devastated the region. This epidemic resulted in a loss of one-

[309] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 8, no. 3 (February 1898): 133.

third of the total Pueblo population in the area directly under Spanish control.[310] The question then arises, as to why Lummis was not so critical of the Spanish as to their devastation of the native population with smallpox. The answer is that in order to support the Spanish conquest of the New World as well as the Spanish colonial period, the Spanish could not be held to the same standard as the United States. If the Spanish had faced the same admonition for the results of their imperialism, Lummis would not have been able to accomplish his duty as a knight-errant.

Another argument that Lummis utilized in his reproach of the United States' annexation of Hawaii was that a small group of foreigners should not be able to subjugate a much larger group of natives.

> The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce – an organization of the 1000 leading business men in an educated and progressive American population of 103,000 – opposes Hawaiian annexation for several sound business reasons and for the good American reason that this republic should not countenance the disenfranchisement of 97,000 natives by 3000 foreigners.[311]

Lummis's contention within this statement was that the fate of 97,000 Hawaiian people should not have been decided by 3,000 Americans. However, what Lummis failed to recognize and acknowledge was the fact that Cuba had been controlled by a small group of Spaniards, despite the much higher population of native Cubans. The Spanish had instituted suffrage laws that were intended to restrict the natives' ability to vote. In all of Cuba, despite a population of 1.6 million people, only 53,000 had the right to vote, the vast majority being Spanish, not Cuban. In the district of Guines, the population consisted of over twelve thousand native Cubans and five hundred Spanish.

---

[310] Elinore M. Barrett, *Conquest and Catastrophe: Changing Rio Grande Pueblo Settlement Patterns in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 2002.
[311] Lummis, "Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 8, no. 3 (February 1898): 133.

Despite this population disparity, the voting registry held thirty-two natives that were permitted to vote and four hundred Spaniards.[312] This information was available to Lummis when he wrote his editorial, as it had been a factor of Cuban insurgency before the United States entered the fray. This showed, once again, that Lummis held the United States to a standard to which he never held the Spanish. It is also interesting that Lummis mentioned the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, which also happened to be the origin of the very magazine that he edited, considering the representation of Cubans in the governing of their own island. The town councils on the island had been overwhelmingly governed by Spaniards, not native Cubans. Of the thirty-seven town councils within the province of Havana in 1891, thirty-one were dominated by the Spanish. There had been twenty governors over the province of Matanzas, but only two were native-born Cubans, and there had also only been one native-born governor of Havana, who had spent the majority of his life in Spain.[313]

Since Lummis was both against the annexation as well as the United States becoming involved in the Cuban fight for independence, his words concerning one can be used in response to the conditions of both. What Lummis also cleverly ignored within his own account of the Spanish conquest was that colonialism is, by default, the conquest of many by a few. Lummis clearly mentioned the population disparities between the Spanish and the natives, but did not affix the same judgement upon the Spanish conquest that he did upon the annexation of Hawaii by the United States. When Lummis described the conquest of the American Southwest by Francisco Vasquez de Coronado in *The*

[312] Mayo W. Hazeltine, "What Shall be Done about Cuba?," *The North American Review* 163, no. 481 (December 1896): 732.
[313] Hazeltine, "What Shall be Done about Cuba?," 732.

Spanish Pioneers, he made a point to clarify that Coronado took with him a group of 250 men in order to conquer the new land north of Mexico.[314]

Lummis's description of Juan de Oñate's conquest of New Mexico clearly showed that the Spanish were far outnumbered by the native Pueblos, with Oñate bringing along four hundred men in order to subdue the thousands of natives that they would encounter in the conquest.[315] Lummis clearly showed within his own work that each conquest that the Spanish had instigated consisted of a relatively small amount of men in order to surmount the much higher number of natives that they were expecting to confront. Not only did Lummis establish a separate set of standards for the Spanish and for the Americans, he contradicted his own words when he celebrated the Spanish conquest of the American Southwest. For Lummis, the American annexation of Hawaii was a crime, but the Spanish conquest of the Americas was not merely justifiable, but beneficial.

The year 1898 proved to be a busy year for the magazine editor, as his monthly "In the Lion's Den" editorials were replete with commentary about the annexation of Hawaii as well as the build-up and execution of the Spanish American War. These editorials once again exposed the double standard that Lummis held for the United States and Spain, as well as his continued work to ensure that he was promoting the Spanish in whatever way possible in order to fulfill his duty to the crown and earn his place among the other brave defenders of the empire. The primary issue with Lummis's rhetoric in relation to the United States' intervention in the Cuban fight for independence was that he not only argued against Cuban independence, but once again described the intervention

[314] Charles Lummis, *The Spanish Pioneers*, A.C. McClurg, 1936, 81.
[315] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 88.

by the United States as an imperialistic move. The stance that Lummis immediately took towards the accusations against the Spanish was that they were all fallacies.

> Suffering there is in all wars; but there are no more atrocities in this war than in our Great Rebellion. All the stories of Amazons and Cuban machete charges are lies pure and simple. There has not been one real battle. There has been no wanton starvation, no wholesale rape. Doubtless there are intelligent Americans who thoughtlessly swallow these lies; but they do small credit to their common sense. The Spaniards no more abuse women than we do – and, by the way, wife-beating and infanticide are unknown crimes in Spain and her colonies, while ravishment is rarer than in many parts of the United States.[316]

Lummis's assertion that there had not been one real battle was not only false for this specific conflict, but blatantly ignored the fact that this immediate fight for independence was not the first. Lummis in this statement ignored the Ten Years War and the fact that the current conflict that had been taking place since 1895. He also omitted the fact that the Protestant churches that had come to Cuba from the United States had been supportive of the rebellion against Spanish authority.[317]

By the time that the United States became militarily involved, the war had been raging for almost three years. Making the declaration that there had not been one battle also negated the reason that General Valeriano Weyler had instituted his reconcentration policy in Cuba, securing one-third of the Cuban population in concentration camps in 1896. This would have been a policy that Lummis would have been well aware of, and one that originated from the Spanish, thus not being merely a sensational story by the yellow journalists that Lummis regularly chided in his editorials. It also put into question his words from the very same article. "They (The Spanish) have not butchered hospitals.

---

[316] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 8, no. 2 (January 1898): 85.
[317] James A. Baer, "God and the Nation: Protestants, Patriotism and Pride in Cuba, 1890–1906." *International Journal of Cuban Studies* 8, no. 1 (2016): 75.

And they have found it as hard to get a fight out of the runaway insurgents as we did with a handful of Apaches who were also fighting for freedom."[318] If the Spanish had indeed been having trouble extracting a fight from the Cuban insurrectionists, then it would not have made sense to enact a blockade of the island, blocking all ports, and placing civilians in concentration camps to separate them from the combatants. Lummis intended to portray the Spanish as a stern parent simply attempting to keep the peace, and the Cuban revolutionaries as insolent children in the midst of a temper tantrum. This portrayal certainly made the Spanish appear less imperialistic and the Cubans as a savage group, akin to Lummis's own preconceived notions about the Apaches.

His contention that the Cuban revolutionaries were impudent children was further continued in his May editorial where he made the assertion that the rest of Cuba did not support the fight for independence. "Cuba? What have we to fight for there? The majority of Cubans are not running about the hills and away from the Spanish army. They are living under the government they prefer…They do not want to be 'liberated.'"[319] Weyler's intention with his concentration camps was to segregate the Cuban civilians so that they could not assist the rebels. If the majority of the population supported the Spanish control of Cuba, then the camps would not have been necessary. However, much like *The Spanish Pioneers*, factual information was less of a priority to Lummis than his celebration and promotion of Spain, as it would continue his path towards becoming a protector of the empire.

In that same quote, Lummis was adamant that not only were the accusations of crimes committed by the Spanish false, but he made the bold statement that they were

[318] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 8, no. 2 (January 1898): 85.
[319] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 8, no. 6 (May 1898): 278.

completely unknown to the Spanish at all. It is not clear through his editorial if this was intended as hyperbole, so the only explanation is that Lummis was being literal and sincere in his assessment. This evaluation is not only without any such supporting evidence, but the entire concept violated the Spanish history of New Mexico alone, and existed within the words of Lummis himself. When the Acoma Pueblo attacked the Spanish that had invaded along with Juan de Oñate, thirteen Spanish had been killed in what Lummis described as a massacre.[320]

However, the Spaniards' punishment for this attack was to kill five hundred of the Acoma, including women and children. Though the attack was not agreed upon by all Spanish soldiers present, it was swift and fierce.[321] When the Spanish attacked the Pueblo, they utilized numerous methods of firepower and munitions, destroying the Acoma houses, and the resulting fires killed those people that were untouched by bullets.[322] While Lummis made the case in his book that Vincente de Zaldivar, who had orchestrated this entire attack, had attempted to rescue the women and children of whom he had orchestrated the destruction, Lummis admitted that not only was the punishment a retribution of over thirty-eight people to one, but that among those killed in retaliation for the attack on the original thirteen, were women and children, thus contradicting his statement that the Spanish knew nothing of infanticide. It was during this same retaliation that Zaldivar kidnapped eighty young Acoma women whom he took to Mexico to be educated by the Catholic nuns.

---

[320] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 137.
[321] José Rabasa, "Aesthetics of Colonial Violence: The Massacre of Acoma in Gaspar de Villagrá's 'Historia de La Nueva México,'" *College Literature* 20, no. 3 (1993): 100.
[322] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 139.

Lummis's apologetics of the Spanish extended throughout the war. Before the official declaration of war, Lummis utilized his editorial to dissuade the American populace from war with the Spanish, extolling the virtues of the empire, and the corruption of what he described as the yellow journalists that had been sensationalizing the events in Cuba that had been preceding the United States' intervention in the ongoing conflict. Lummis, much in the style by which he wrote *The Spanish Pioneers*, painted the Spanish as a chivalrous entity. "Every serious traveler and student knows that the Spaniards are the kindest and most courteous of people; as fair, as brave, as chivalric as any. Of all outer nations, there is not one we have less ground for hating; not one to which we are more indebted."[323] Despite the fact that the area in which he was raised had been settled by the English, Lummis continued to be a supporter of the Spanish as though it were his native land. This devotion to the Spanish crown was intended by Lummis to continue to show his fealty to the king, despite the fact that his own nation was about to intervene in a conflict between the Spanish and one of its colonies.

Lummis continued to be against the war, even when the declaration had been made by the United States. He went so far as to blame the starvation in the concentration camps on the United States' blockade of Cuban ports. "Whether they (The American government) were well advised or not does not matter just now; nor whether the best way to relieve the reconcentrados was to starve them to death by a blockade, as we have done."[324] However, Clara Barton, the famous nurse, and founder of the American Red Cross had visited Cuba before this article was published. Her account of the conditions in Cuba as well as her philanthropic activities to relieve a portion of the strain that the

[323] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 8, no. 5 (April 1898): 234.
[324] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 9, no. 2 (July 1898): 80.

conflict had placed upon the population had been published in the *North American Review* in May of 1898, two months prior to Lummis editorial. The dates of these publications bear importance because it illustrates the fact that Lummis's claims of the United States being the cause of the starvation among the Cuban people were false. Barton had been made aware of the conditions in Cuba in November 1897, and made a trip to Cuba in early 1898, engaging in humanitarian efforts to assist the war-torn people of the island, delivering food and supplies to a struggling group of people. Barton and her team were in Cuba in February when the USS Maine exploded just off of the coast.

While on this visit, long before the United States enacted a blockade of any of the ports, Barton observed the starvation suffered by the populace of the nation, making the assertion that American supplies had not arrived on the island, and that this shipment was the first. Barton commented on the wretched state of the people on the island as they had faced severe starvation and a severe lack of medicine for some time.[325] Lummis placed the culpability for the starvation of the Cuban masses on the United States, as a result of the naval blockade of the island. However, the United States' blockade of the island did not take place until April 22, 1898, the very day that the Spanish government declared war against the United States. Since Barton's observations of the conditions of the starving Cuban people predated Lummis's assertion by months, it is clear that Lummis was attempting to shift the responsibility of the starvation of the Cuban people from the Spanish to the Americans, furthering his protection of the Spanish crown, proving his worthiness of a knighthood.

[325] Clara Barton, "Our Work and Observations in Cuba," *North American Review* 166, no. 498 (May 1898): 552-555.

After the United States declared war on Spain, Lummis continued to be against the war, but as an American magazine editor, Lummis needed to support the United States in the conflict. Lummis had already lost subscribers of the *Land of Sunshine* due to his espousing of Spanish sympathies and his anti-war sentiments. However, even in his written support of the United States, Lummis still employed his monthly editorial to support the Spanish people and the Hispanic heritage of the Southwest. As to the people of Spain, Lummis hailed them as a gallant race of brave men. "There is a certain reassurance in observing that the Spanish fight like men. Their army and navy are rotten with politics – as many Americans wish to make ours. But in personal courage there is no one has the best of them."[326]

Even when the Spanish were America's foes, Lummis continued to celebrate the gallantry of the Spaniards. He continued this support when addressing people within the state of California that desired a change in the Spanish names that permeated the entire state, including the state's name itself. Lummis replied to this request as would be expected of a Spanish knight.

> There are persons, permitted by God, who desire to change the names of California, San Francisco, Los Angeles and the like, 'because they are Spanish.' Of course these are people too cowardly to go out and fight Spanish soldiers – the Spanish dictionary is more to their liking. And every other dictionary. They should go out of America altogether; for it was discovered by the Spanish.[327]

Lummis's protection of the Spanish heritage of the Southwest was the number one goal of his professional life. This was his knightly duty to defend the Spanish and ensure the continued recognition of the Spanish legacy, especially in California. Lummis later

[326] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 9, no. 3 (August 1898): 140-141.
[327] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 9, no. 3 (August 1898): 140.

produced and distributed fliers in which he attempted to teach the masses about the proper pronunciation of Los Angeles. From the beginning of the United States' involvement in Cuba in 1898, through the end of the war, Lummis supported the empire of Spain and defended the Spanish people and their history in the American Southwest.

Lummis's opposition to the Spanish American War contrasted heavily with a powerful college acquaintance, and a man that Lummis eventually utilized to further his advocacy for the Southwest. Theodore Roosevelt had been a year ahead of Lummis at Harvard, and had protected the young Lummis when Roosevelt's class had wanted to forcibly cut Lummis's hair short. This chance acquaintance eventually had a major impact on both Lummis and Theodore Roosevelt. However, they were on opposite sides concerning the issue of the United States' involvement in the Spanish American War. During this time, Lummis was not indirect in his criticism of the United States government, the United States military, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Theodore Roosevelt. In an article that followed the Spanish American War by two years, Lummis's own friend, David Starr Jordan gave a speech that was recorded by the *Indianapolis Journal* and referred back to Lummis's words during the war as well as Jordan's own personal opinions on war itself. '"A late writer – one of many who are prone to 'think with their fists' as Lummis said of Roosevelt, declares that 'war is essential to the life of a nation, war strengthens a nation, morally, mentally and physically'…War can only waste and corrupt.'"[328] Though Lummis eventually promoted Roosevelt for president,

[328] "Blood of the Nation," *The Indianapolis Journal*, March 12, 1900, 8. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn82015679/1900-03-12/ed-1/seq-8/#date1=1900&index=1&rows=20&words=blood+Blood+BLOOD+nation+NATION+Nation&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=Indiana&date2=1900&proxtext=blood+of+the+nation&y=9&x=12&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

worked with Roosevelt following the death of President McKinley, and sung his praises until Roosevelt's death, the two differed strongly in relation to the United States' involvement in Cuba in 1898.

The year following the Spanish American War saw Lummis's return to American Indian rights issues, however, his contradictory nature followed him into each of the Indian battles in which he involved himself. In *the Land of Sunshine*, Lummis wrote a series of articles titled, "My Brother's Keeper," in which he shared his opinions on the current Indian education system as well as Indian rights surrounding the residential school system and what the students were being taught. Although this series was the beginning of Lummis's return to the issue of American Indian rights, it was not the sole outlet for Lummis's desire to impact national Indian policy. His return to the matter of Indian policy eventually included the development of the Sequoya League, a group whose purpose was the designed to "make Better Indians and better-treated ones."[329] The Sequoya League was the vehicle by which Lummis and other likeminded activists engaged the federal government through the issues of a group of Missions Indians that had been evicted from their land and a group of Moqui Indians in Keam's Canyon, Arizona that had been subject to an abusive schoolmaster and an Indian agent of questionable abilities.

In 1900, Lummis spoke before the Newman Club in Los Angeles on the issue of Indian education in the United States. Once again, Lummis used the opportunity when addressing issues that were pertaining to the American Indian to speak of the Spanish experience.

[329] Charles Lummis, "The Sequoya League," *Out West* 16, no. 2, (February 1902): 177.

> When we read in our histories how "unjustly" the Spanish crown treated Columbus, we sympathize with him. But the real chief reason why he fell into disgrace was because he was not a good Indian educator. From his first voyage he carried Indian slaves back; but the Catholic Queen, who had pawned her jewels to make a New World possible, did not enjoy seeing the natives made slaves, even in golden chains. In the second expedition, in 1493, she sent those first American exiles back…The instructions to the commander of the expedition were that he should always treat the Indians well and justly. That was the beginning of the Catholic Indian policy; and if I sometimes use the words Catholic and Spain, it must cause no resentment, because Spain was the backbone of Catholicism – and I sometimes wish there were more backbone now.[330]

Instead of immediately addressing the issues that Lummis perceived within the American Indian education system, he began with an explanation of how beneficial the Spanish crown was to the American natives. This explanation included Isabella sending missionaries along with Columbus to begin a policy of benevolent treatment towards the natives.

Lummis's references to the Spanish conquest were not limited to the beginning of the speech, but were predominant throughout. "That Indian system which the Catholic Church and the Spanish Government administered over two-thirds of America for three and a half centuries – the root of that system was the consideration that the Indian was a human being, born of woman and loved by his mother; that he had a father and tended to love him."[331] Like *The Spanish Pioneers* before it, Lummis chose to ignore those aspects of the Spanish conquest that did not coalesce with his representation of Spain as an altruistic nation, that existed for the benefit of the natives. Lummis ignored the abuses by the missionaries, the abuses and executions of natives for practicing their native religions, and the massive reduction of native populations through war and disease.

---

[330] Charles Lummis, "Some Aspects of Indian Education," The Newman Club, Los Angeles, California, November 28, 1900, 5-6.
[331] Lummis, "Some Aspects," 15.

> I would like to be Czar for one week – just long enough to compel every American and every bigot to read the Spanish laws formulated for the treatment of the Indians – "las Leyes de Indias." No other nation in the world – and I am willing to stake my reputation on the statement – has ever put into force laws so noble, so far-sighted, so humane, as those formulated by the Crown of Spain, with Church assistance and carried out by the official and clerical administrators.[332]

Lummis spent a significant amount of his speech lauding the benefits of the Spanish, and less proposing adequate changes in the modern American Indian education system. In this same section of his speech, the only mention of the current system was a hypothetical question that he posited asking whether the Indian Bureau had laws in place that were similar to those imposed by the Spanish.

As he had done in *The Spanish Pioneers*, Lummis also contradicted his own account of the remaining population of the natives.

> Where are our millions of Indians? There are but 250,000 left now in the United States, and the great majority of those are left because they happen to be in the areas that the Spanish Government and the Catholic Church controlled until 1848…On the other hand, Spanish America invariably protected the Indian in the tenure of his land. Furthermore, it is a proved fact that, take Spanish-America all together, the Indian is as numerous there now as in 1520.[333]

Lummis once again contended that the native population of the Americas was at the same number as it had been before the conquest. However, due to the wars, disease, and general mistreatment of natives, the only way that Lummis's account could have any validity would be to count the mestizos that had been the product of the relations between the natives and the Spanish. However, the way that Lummis worded this section in his speech, he implied to his listeners that the population of American Indians in those parts of the United States that had once been controlled by the Spanish had remained consistent

[332] Lummis, "Some Aspects," 15-16.
[333] Lummis, "Some Aspects," 16-17.

from the moment that the Spanish had arrived. This contradicted his own writings on the population numbers during his walk across the American West.

As he had done with "The Indian Who is Not Poor" and *The Spanish Pioneers*, Lummis focused not on the natives that he claimed to love, but of the Spanish superiority in the New World. When he became involved with the Albuquerque Indian School, Lummis realized that there were significant flaws within the United States Indian education system, and he openly presented these in his series of articles, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos" and his open letters to Daniel Dorchester. His involvement in the release of thirty-six students from the AIS began his reputation as an Indian rights advocate. With this speech, Lummis had the opportunity to focus on the current flaws within the Indian education system and propose ways in which to correct them. If the purpose of his talk was to address these issues and advocate for the American Indians within the education system and those that had been negatively affected by it, focusing upon how to correct those issues would have better served the American Indians. However, Lummis did not utilize this as an opportunity to actively assist in correcting the system, but to promote the superiority in his perception of how the Spanish treated the American natives. Like his other works that preceded this talk, his information was deeply flawed and omitted numerous aspects of that Spanish conquest that failed to coalesce to Lummis's claims of Spanish altruism.

The issues of Indian rights in which Lummis entangled himself brought significant change and notoriety to him, as well as opportunities to further his influence in Indian matters as well as reuniting him with a former Harvard schoolmate. The year 1900 concluded with the death of his first-born son, Amado Bandelier Lummis at the age

of just six years old from pneumonia. Thankfully for Lummis, the following year was one of hope and work to be done by the self-styled protector of the Southwest. When President William McKinley was assassinated by Leon Czolgosz in 1901, Lummis's life was unexpectedly complicated in ways that fed into his ego as well as his desire to be an active participant in the national battle over Indian rights. When Theodore Roosevelt was elevated to the presidency, Lummis was invited by his former Harvard colleague to Washington D.C. to discuss matters of the American Southwest and Indian rights. Lummis assisted the president whenever asked, and even submitted recommendations that were unsolicited.[334] The new president, an active participant and leader in the Spanish American War was well aware that Lummis had been adamantly against the war and understood Lummis's criticism of the American government preceding and during the conflict. It is important to note that during this time period in Lummis's career, his self-contradictions were not limited to his discourses supporting the Spanish, but also in his writings and actions concerning his Indian activism and Indian rights. His work concerning Indian education and rights was put into question by his very own writings while he embroiled himself in two issues that became national concerns for the tribal people involved.

In 1901, ten years after his being asked to assist the Isleta Pueblo people in their battle against the Albuquerque Indian School, Lummis became involved in another matter of Indian rights, and was instrumental in the creation of the Sequoya League.

[334] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, November 21, 1902. Though Roosevelt had sought the opinions of Lummis, along with other notable Indian rights activists during his presidency, Lummis wrote a great number of letters to the president with regards to current issues. In this letter, Lummis asked Roosevelt to add provisions to his Indian policy that would protect American Indians from unscrupulous land deals. Lummis's perspective here is telling as he asks for a provision to prevent American Indians from selling their land for a matter of 50 years, comparing them to children who can be cheated easily.

Named after the Cherokee leader that created an alphabet for the Cherokee language, the Sequoya League's purpose was to be a national entity that could influence Indian policy across the United States. It included distinguished members across the nation that could see to it that this mission came to fruition. The first issue with which the new group embroiled itself was that of a group of Mission Indians that had been fighting to remain on their home land in the United States courts for the previous year. Lummis's first mention of the Mission Indians' fight was in the January, 1901 issue of the *Land of Sunshine*. This issue included a small reference in the section, "In Western Letters," where author Constance Goddard DuBois was mentioned along with her work in the fight for the Mission Indians and their homes.[335]

Lummis next mentioned the Mission Indians in his "In the Lion's Den" editorial in October of the same year. It was minor mention, but Lummis hinted at the fact that more information was forthcoming.[336] It was in this same issue that Lummis announced that the name of the *Land of Sunshine* would be changed to *Out West* in January of 1902. In the November editorial, Lummis finally revealed the issues that were facing the Mission Indian group, who he referred to as the Warner's Ranch Indians. Lummis let his readers know that the Warner's Ranch Indians were being removed from their land after losing a battle in the Supreme Court.

> In this richest and happiest section of a rich and happy nation, we have several Original Americans to whom this December brings no joy. It is the stated month for evicting them – by the law of our half-read Supreme Court – from the home their fathers have lived in for centuries. I mean the Indians of Warner's Ranch, whose case has been set forth here.
> We are enjoying their country; they are about to be kicked out of it. Our assessment roll runs up into the hundred millions; they are a sight of starvation. We have such homes and such luxuries as our own fathers never dreamed of; they

[335] Charles Lummis, "In Western Letters," *Land of Sunshine* 14, no.1 (January 1901): 26-27.
[336] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 15, no. 4 (October 1901): 264.

> are about to lose the shabby huts they love, and to have no homes whatever. Are we "well enough off" – in heart or pocket to spare them a little Christmas? Or are we not?[337]

Lummis clearly desired to connect with the Christmas spirit of his readers, but Lummis failed to fully discuss the entire issue of the Warner's Ranch Indians, whose tribal name was the Cupeños.

However, Lummis utilized the brief story to garner donations to assist the tribal people in their fight against their forced removal and Lummis had a new group that could further assist in this endeavor. The Cupeños had been in the Agua Caliente area of California since before the Spanish arrived in 1795. Based on Lummis's own words during his assistance in this matter, he and the Sequoya League were committed to using this issue as an early success to help further the group's national standing and extend its platform.

The central concern surrounding the Sequoya League's involvement in the issue of the Cupeños was not to prevent the government from evicting them from their land, but to ensure that the tribe was moved to an area that was equivalent in value to the area that they were being forced to vacate. Following the Supreme Court case in which the Cupeños lost any claim to the land known as Aqua Caliente, the federal government had approved funds in order to purchase another tract of land for the tribe.[338] In the December 1901 issue of the *Land of Sunshine*, Lummis explained the situation as well as the Sequoya League's initial contact with the federal government, intervening on behalf of the Cupeños in an article titled, "A New Indian Policy." "It might seem, to one unfamiliar

[337] Charles Lummis, "In the Lion's Den," *Land of Sunshine* 15, no. 5 (November 1901): 370-317.
[338] Barker v. Harvey, 181 U.S. 481 (1901).

with the case, that this is a liberal provision of land for the 78 people who are left. But those familiar with the facts know the land (with the exception of a few inconsiderable parcels) to be of no use whatever to them."[339] What Lummis was referring to was the fact that though the tract was large, encompassing roughly 7,500 acres, the land was not of the same quality as the Cupeños had at Agua Caliente where they had resided for centuries. Seeing this primary issue of a new home for the tribe, Lummis and the Sequoya League sought an appointment on a federal commission to locate and procure a new plot of land to replace their home.

In January, 1902, the *Land of Sunshine* was renamed *Out West*, following Lummis's ideal of what the magazine needed to represent: the entirety of the American West, not merely the state of California. The February, 1902 issue of *Out West* introduced a new series to run in the magazine titled, "The Sequoya League." The inaugural article followed a historical piece on the club's namesake, and described for the first time in detail what the group would be doing to assist Indian tribes, and the current issue that was facing the Cupeños of Warner's Ranch. Lummis also explained in the article that the workings of the Sequoya League would be presented in *Out West* and that the magazine would be the vehicle for the league's work. In a letter to President Roosevelt in February, 1902, Lummis asked the president to appoint him to the Warner's Ranch Commission, that also included other members of the Sequoya League, David Starr Jordan, C. Hart Merriam, George Bird Grinnell, and Rev. H.B. Restarick.[340]

While Lummis's intentions appeared pure, his documentation of his work on the commission illustrated that his work was not solely for the betterment of the tribe. Based

[339] Charles Lummis, "A New Indian Policy," *Land of Sunshine* 15, no. 6 (December 1901): 459.
[340] Charles Lummis, Letter to Theodore Roosevelt, February 26, 1902.

on Lummis's own correspondence during his work on the Warner's Ranch Commission, he showed that the assistance of the Cupeños was to be used as a way to promote the Sequoya League and show that the League meant business. In a letter to fellow Sequoya League member, George Bird Grinnell in April, 1903, Lummis made it clear what the League's work with the tribe was to accomplish.

> Now when the League can stand up and say for the first time so far as we know in our history and as the first work of this League, 300 Indians, dispossessed by law of their ancient homes, have had procured for them by the Government, have been removed to and are settled upon incomparably better lands than those they lost, with better houses, which they are paid for building for themselves instead of being fed as paupers while American contractors erect buildings; with a valley all their own, hemmed in from American aggression yet easy access to all the advantages of civilization; with as good farming lands as there are in California allotted to them; with a model irrigating system created for those lands under the direction of the League in co-operation with the Indian Department; with a farming instructor, who holds his place not through politics but by the recommendation of the League for competency, and a trader who has his place for the same reason and is not only bond to the Government for the due observance of his duties as a trader but under bond to the League to use his best efforts in behalf of the Indians and particularly to keep out liquor from among them; that from a corner of a desert cattle ranch these dispossessed Indians have been removed solely through the efforts of the League to lands the richest farming community would be glad to own.[341]

Lummis made it very clear in this letter that the rehoming of the Cupeños was to serve as the first success for the Sequoya League, and show that the group could accomplish anything that it set out to do. [342] In order to get the renown and respect of a national audience, the Sequoya League needed to prove its value as well as its ability to effectively enact change within the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

---

[341] Charles Lummis to George Bird Grinnell, April 1, 1903.

[342] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, May 11, 1902, Autry Museum Library and Archives. MS.1.1.3386.
In his letter to President Roosevelt, Lummis once again requested that the Sequoya League be placed on the Warner's Ranch Commission, as it would be the first work for the league.

It is also telling that Lummis and the Sequoya League were not asked by the tribe to find a new plot of land for them, and throughout the entire time that the league was supposedly working for the betterment of the tribe, the Cupeños had been fighting to stay on their own land. This was not a small private matter, but a public issue that had numerous Indian rights activists involved, many of which were attempting to assist the Cupeños in their fight to remain on their own land. Lummis was incensed when he was made aware that others had become involved in the matter with the Cupeños.[343] When the Warner's Ranch Commission was officially recognized by the federal government, Lummis included two members from the tribe to accompany and assist the commission to find a new home for the Cupeños. These men, Salvador Nolasquez and Ambrosio Ortega explored each potential tract along with the commission and they were not satisfied with any of the alternatives to their home at Warner's Ranch. This fact is illustrated in a letter from the two members that was sent to William A. Jones, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in July, 1902. In the letter, the men stated that none of the lands were suitable for their tribe and the requested that they be allowed to remain on Warner's Ranch, or as it was known by the Cupeños, Agua Caliente. They also entreated the government to purchase their original home of Agua Caliente, or at least a portion of it to allow the tribe to continue to reside there.[344]

[343] Valerie Sherer Mathes and Phil Brigandi, "The Mischief Record of 'La Gobernadora': Amelia Stone Quinton, Charles Fletcher Lummis, and the Warner Ranch Indian Removal," *The Journal of San Diego History* 57 (2011): 69–96. Lummis was so upset by what he considered the intrusion of Quinton into the matter that he wrote a letter of caution to her following a scathing attack on her in the *Los Angeles Times*, the former employer of Lummis.

[344] Ambrosio Ortega and Salvador Nolasquez, Letter to W.A. Jones, July 31, 1902, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3386.

Unfortunately, the commission, the owners of Warner's Ranch, nor the government were willing to explore that option. Nolasquez and Ortega followed this letter by composing another, bypassing the Bureau of Indian Affairs by going straight to the president himself. In the letter to President Roosevelt, the men informed the president that they wished to remain on their native land and claimed that the commission did not regard their wishes when it was making its decision on a plot of land, and that they had already sought out Commissioner Jones, sharing the same information with him.[345] These letters show that despite Lummis's public writings in the *Land of Sunshine* and *Out West*, the goal of the Sequoya League and by extension, the Warner's Ranch Commission, was not to help the tribe, but replace the tribe's self-determination as representatives of the government that knew better than the members of the tribe what was best for the Cupeños.

Lummis knew that the tribe would not be satisfied by the decision of the Warner's Ranch Commission or the federal government and that their one true desire was to remain on their native land. Not only was Lummis aware that the tribe did not agree with the findings of the commission, but he knew that they would push back against their forced removal. This is telling by Lummis's letters to President Roosevelt trying to move the process along to get the Cupeños relocated to the land that the commission had acquired as quickly as possible. Lummis later advised the government that the removal of the tribe from their land may require armed soldiers. The Warner's Ranch Commission had completed its work in 1902, and Lummis had requested the president assist in pushing

[345] Ambrosio Ortega and Salvador Nolasquez, Letter to Theodore Roosevelt, undated, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3386.

along the matter through Congress so that the tribe could be relocated onto the newly approved land. [346] Lummis had already made an agreement with a landowner for a plot of land on the Pala Reservation, but needed Congress to approve the purchase, and release the funds.

However, Lummis understood that despite the pride that he had in his and the Warner's Ranch Commission's procurement of a new home for the Cupeños, they were not happy to be leaving their original home. Despite the tribe's desire to remain on their native land, and Lummis's own admonishment of the government removing natives from their homes, he knew that the government would need to be involved in the removal of the Cupeños from Warner's Ranch. Lummis explained this in a letter to Theodore Roosevelt in June, 1903, where he stated that ninety-eight of the 300 Cupeños had been removed on May 15. He also recommended that the only safe way to remove the remainder of the Indians was utilizing a detail of twenty soldiers. This was due to the fact that the tribe was adamant on remaining on their land. Lummis also acknowledged that the tribe themselves had asked other people help them remain on their land, a lawyer named John Brown, and a California reporter.

> What is serious is the fact that to coax the Indians, the Inspector employed (and I think I use this word correctly) two branded scoundrels who have been working steadily to stir the Indians up to revolt against the Government and against the Agent and all other officials. John Brown, a half-breed lawyer, of San Bernardino, notorious as a defender of "blind pigs" and as a petti-fogging strife maker among the Indians – and I guess Commissioner Jones and Senator Bard both understand him pretty thoroughly – was one. The other was a young reporter named Lawson, discharged from the Los Angeles papers as a liar and dead-beat and editorially branded by the Express as a mendacious and untrustworthy

[346] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt (2), August 5, 1902, Autry Museum Library and Archives., MS.1.1.3805C.

> correspondent who had imposed on it. He has been putting in his time for months at Warner's Ranch to stir the Indians to resist eviction in order to get for him a sensation.[347]

Both of these individuals had been invited by the tribe to assist them in their fight to remain on their own land and avoid eviction. Lummis and the Sequoya League, on the other hand, had involved themselves, and not only supported the removal of the Cupeños from Warner's Ranch, but advocated the use of armed soldiers to ensure compliance. In the June issue of *Out West*, Lummis blamed these individuals for the loss of trust in the Sequoya League by the local Indian tribes, ignoring that their own actions had largely been responsible for that, along with his recommendations that contradicted the sympathetic tone of the writings in his own magazine.

It is also telling in Lummis's handling of the Warner's Ranch case which plot of land that he and the commission recommended for the Cupeños. In January, 1902, Lummis wrote in his journal that he had completed the purchase of the Pala Mission on behalf of his organization, The Landmarks Club.[348] The Landmarks Club was an organization that Lummis started in 1895 with the purpose of restoring and preserving the Spanish Missions of California. The Landmarks Club had been a regular section in both the *Land of Sunshine*, as well as *Out West*, where Lummis used the magazine to publish the monthly workings of the club. This club was another way that Lummis could preserve the Spanish heritage of the Southwest, and played a significant part of the land search regarding the Cupeños. Lummis's purchase of the Pala Mission also provided an area in

[347] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, June 3, 1903, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C.

[348] Lummis, Charles F. "Journal Entry," January 1902, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.2.

which he and the Warner's Ranch Commission could search for land as a new home for the tribe.

The Pala Mission was initially established to convert these very same tribal people in 1813, and it was the reason that the Cupeños were referred to as Missions Indians. If the Warner's Ranch Commission was able procure a tract of land adjacent to the mission, then Lummis would be able to recreate the conditions that the Spanish Catholic Church would have had in the beginning of the 19th century. This was furthered by the fact that the Landmarks Club returned control of the mission to the Catholic Church in 1903, and the renovated church acted as the house of worship for the very Indians that had been removed from their original home at Agua Caliente.[349] Lummis had succeeded in recreating a piece of the Spanish California that he desperately desired to see return.

Before he had completed one task for Indian rights, Lummis had already embroiled himself and the Sequoya League into another issue that had been taking place in Arizona.[350] This conflict involved the Moqui tribe of Keam's Canyon, Arizona. The Moqui, also known as the Hopi, were a Pueblo people that had been separated by a significant amount of land from the rest of their tribal families. Lummis had been familiar with the Moqui for years, having written about them a decade prior. "The most remote civilization of all the Pueblos, the least affected by the Spanish influence which so wonderfully ruled over the enormous area of the Southwest and practically untouched by

[349] Charles Lummis, "The Landmarks Club," *Out West* 16, no. 4 (April 1903): 624.
[350] Charles Lummis to Clinton Hart Meriam, April 1, 1903. Despite the fact that the Cupeños had not yet been fully relocate to their new home, Lummis mentioned to Meriam that he had been investigating issues with the Moqui tribe in Arizona.

the later Saxon influence, the Indians of the Moqui towns retain almost entirely their wonderful customs before the conquest."[351]

Once again, Lummis struggled to speak of the native peoples of the American Southwest without promoting and celebrating the Spanish influence upon them. This was not the only time when Lummis utilized the Moqui issue to espouse the qualities of the Spanish. Unlike the case with the Cupeños, there was no true central issue of the Moqui investigation. Instead, there were a few issues that Charles Lummis and the Sequoya League were investigating. The issues included reports of an abusive schoolmaster named Kampmeyer, the incompetence of the Indian agent, and the enforcement of a haircutting order. The two primary aspects that the Sequoya League focused on were the haircut order and the incompetence of Indian Agent Burton.

Lummis consolidated these charges in a single letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in June, 1903. While listing out the abuses levied against the Moqui, Lummis curiously alluded to the Spanish rule. This list of abuses had previously been published in *Out West*, two months earlier.[352] While he was enumerating the perceived crimes that had been committed against the tribe, he mentioned that in reference to the haircutting order, the king of Spain had rebuked that same type of order in 1621.[353] The mention of the Spanish was not only completely out of place within the list of abuses, but was used by Lummis simply to celebrate his perception of the treatment of the Indians by the Spanish, and once again ignored every human rights violation, choosing to acknowledge only those positive aspects that fit his argument.

---

[351] Charles Lummis, "The Moqui Indians," *Farm Field & Fireside*, Feb 4, 1893.
[352] Lummis, Charles F. "The Sequoya League." *Out West* 18, no. 4 (April 1903): 479.
[353] Charles Lummis to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, June 12, 1903, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C.

The second aspect of the abuses that Lummis levied against Indian Agent Burton, and by extension, the Bureau of Indian Affairs was the ineptitude of the Indian agent himself.[354] This is also where Lummis contradicted himself, and expressed different opinions and statements to different people on the same subject. In that same letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Lummis levied numerous accusations against Agent Burton. Lummis accused Burton of being incompetent and an unsuitable person for his position. He also claimed that the 1,800 Moqui feared and detested Burton as a "despotic oppressor." Lummis also claimed that though Burton had been with the tribe for four years, he had not gained the tribes respect, confidence, or good-will, and was not even able to communicate with his wards, except through "incompetent interpreters."[355]

Every accusation against Burton decried his inability to do his job and his unfitness for his position. And yet, when the government refused to dismiss Burton, Lummis claimed to have never called for Burton's removal.[356] While the letter and charges do not specifically state that the Sequoya League requested the removal of Burton, the charges against him, as well as the labeling of him as incompetent was intended to inspire the government to remove him from his position in Indian Affairs. Lummis also strongly villainized the haircut order itself, which was not borne of Agent Burton, but of Indian Commissioner William A. Jones. However, in a letter to Theodore Roosevelt a year prior, Lummis began decrying the haircut order, knowing that it came

[354] Charles Lummis to William A. Jones, June 13, 1903, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C. This letter to Indian Commissioner Jones included a significant list of charges that Lummis and the Sequoya League had levied against Agent Burton in Keam's Canyon. These charges included harsh enforcement of a federal Indian haircut policy, abuses by the schoolteacher, and a general ineptitude of Agent Burton.

[355] Lummis to Commissioner, 1903.

[356] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, September 26, 1903, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C.

from Commissioner Jones. In the same letter, however, Lummis also stated that he still liked Jones in the position in which he held.[357]

When the investigation was nearly a year in, Lummis wrote to the president once again mentioning the haircutting order, but this time referring to it as "outrageous."[358] Lummis spent an entire investigation speaking about one agent's enforcement of a haircutting policy that Lummis himself felt was not only wrong, but outrageous. Yet, when it came time to acknowledge the origin of the order itself, Lummis referred to the creator as a man that he still liked. At the end of the investigation, when the Sequoya League did not obtain the results that it desired from the investigation, Lummis inquired as to whether the decision was in fact a delayed punishment for the Warner's Ranch Commission. Since the Sequoya League had interfered in the purchase of the Monserrate Ranch, instead locating another plot for the Cupeños, Lummis worried that this decision was recompense.[359] Lummis's focus on the potential reasons for the Sequoya League's failure in Keam's Canyon exposed his true motivation for intervention. The search for a new home for the Cupeños and the fight against the brutality facing the Moqui then became not altruistic assistance for people that needed the help, but simply a way for the Sequoya League to earn positive press with two successes. This duplicity and

---

[357] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, August 5, 1902, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C.

[358] Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, June 13, 1903, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C.

[359] Charles Lummis to Clinton Hart Meriam, September 25, 1903, Autry Museum Library and Archives, MS.1.1.3805C.
Lummis became incredibly defensive concerning the outcome of the investigation, putting into question whether or not the case was in support of the Moqui or to simply provide another success for the Sequoya League. This is clear in a letter that Lummis wrote to President Roosevelt, (Charles Lummis to Theodore Roosevelt, September 4, 1903.) where he defended the charges, but placed the blame of the league's failure on Indians that had been too frightened to testify.

contradiction of his own supposed ideals discounted the impact that Lummis's work has held in the time since his death.

Chapter 7 DON CARLOS

To best illustrate Lummis's preference for the Spanish, especially over the American Indian, one need only examine a single incident from 1907. On August 24, 1907, a fifty-one-year-old Spaniard, Francisco Amate shot and killed Procopio Montoya, a twenty-year-old from the Pueblo of Isleta. Lummis had met Montoya when the young man was a child and brought him to California to work at his home, El Alisal. Amate was a guitar player and singer that Lummis had employed as a groundskeeper at his home, "El Alisal." Montoya had also been employed by Lummis as a general worker and was responsible for irrigating the grounds. On the evening of August 24, an altercation broke out between Montoya and Amate over the use of a hose, and according to Lummis's statements, Montoya threw a rock at Amate that hit the elderly Spaniard in the knee. Amate then ran to his room, with Montoya in pursuit, attempting to get inside the locked door. Fearing for his life, Amate shot through the doorway, striking Montoya in the side, who retreated to his room.

Lummis claimed that they believed that the wound was superficial, having a physician look at the him and then had the young man rest. Within a few hours, Montoya was dead, and Amate was taken by Lummis to the police station to surrender himself.[360] With Lummis being the primary witness of the events, he claimed that Amate did everything that he could to avoid a threat to his life, but utilized his revolver as a last resort.

> Justifiable homicide was the verdict returned by the coroner's jury in the case of Francisco Amate, the aged Spaniard who shot and killed Procopio Montoya, an Indian boy, at the home of the City Librarian Charles F. Lummis Friday.

[360] "Murder in Lummis' Home," *Los Angeles Herald*, August 25, 1907, 1-2.

> Lummis was the principal witness at the inquest. He stated Amate had been attacked by the boy and had done all in his power to get away from Montoya. According to Lummis, Amate did not shoot until his life was threatened and there was no chance for escape.[361]

With Lummis being the primary witness of the attack, and the one that spoke on behalf of the incident, his testimony was the key to Amate's release. Despite the fact that an Indian young man that Lummis had known for eighteen years had been shot, it was the shooter, a Spanish troubadour, that Lummis sided with in the shooting. Lummis chose a Spaniard whom he had known for a mere two years over a young man that he had known since childhood and had taken from his home to be a servant for Lummis's household.[362] In a matter of life and death, Lummis sided with the Spanish over the American Indian.

Charles Lummis, by all accounts, both past and present, was a complicated man. However, what other historians have failed to focus on, was the fact that Lummis was a contradictory man that consistently held a different set of standards for the Spanish as opposed to everyone else. Lummis was also one to alter the historical record to match the purpose of his writing. This first became apparent in his recollection of his journey across the United States. Though Lummis had documented his walk across the western United States through letters that he sent to the *Chillicothe Leader* and the *Los Angeles Times*, Lummis later collected all of the stories from his trip into a book, *A Tramp Across the Continent*. In the book, Lummis regaled the people of the United States with a story of his famous walk and information about the Western US that Easterners had never experienced. The stories that Lummis had sent in the letters to the two newspapers

---

[361] "Slayer of Redskin Lad Exonerated at Inquest," *Los Angeles Herald*, August 27, 1907, 5.
[362] "Isleta Boy Shot by Spaniard in Los Angeles," *The Albuquerque Morning Journal*, August 28. 1907, 4. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84031081/1907-08-28/ed-1/seq-4/#date1=1893&index=18&rows=20&words=Lummis+Pueblo&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1915&proxtext=Lummis+Pueblo&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

included events that appear too fantastic to have happened to one man during one journey.

Curiously, his A *Tramp Across the Continent* not only included the same fantastic stories, but even included aspects that were not a part of any of the letters themselves, providing critical readers of both the question of why they were not included in the original letters that had been published. One such story was a supposed meeting of Lummis and the infamous outlaw Frank James. This story was a two-paragraph inclusion in Lummis recollection of his trip through Missouri, describing meeting the legendary bank robber in the post office, appearing almost as an afterthought, not a deliberate inclusion.[363]

Another curious aspect to Lummis's inclusion of this only in his book and not the letters that he wrote is that this one single story would have been major news in the United States in 1884, when Lummis engaged on his trip. Frank James and his more famous brother, Jesse had gained national notoriety for their bank-robbing escapades just years earlier. Jesse himself had recently been shot and killed by a member of his own gang, and earlier in 1884, Frank had famously been acquitted in a murder trial concerning one of his alleged robberies. Not including this meeting in the original letters is exceptionally suspicious in that there was very little of import in Lummis journey through Missouri and this would have been the highlight of this section of the trip. Even when Lummis included it in his book, it was minimized to the point where it appears as though it was intended to lend credence to his journey, but not draw so much attention that if it was a fictional meeting that Frank James would publicly renounce it. No matter

[363] Charles Lummis, *A Tramp Across the Continent*, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1982, 2.

what Lummis's true intention was as to why it was only included in his book and not his letters, his contradictory nature was apparent, and would be further exposed in his writings of the Southwest.

The issue of Lummis choosing the Spanish over the American Indian was not something new to the 20th century, but had been a significant part of Lummis's time in the American Southwest, beginning during his walk from Ohio to California between 1884 and 1885. It was during his trip that he became acquainted with the tribe that he eventually considered family, the Pueblos. However, it became apparent in his writings that his affection for the people of the Pueblos was tied closer to their connection with the Spanish, than their independent attributes as First Americans. His article, "The Indian Who is not Poor" clearly exposed Lummis's propensity to celebrate the Spanish attributes held by the Pueblos, as well as suppress any and all mention of negative treatment of the American Indian by the Spanish suzerains. Perhaps the most audacious of Lummis's claims in this work was his assessment of what the Spanish gave the Pueblos upon their arrival. Having previously mentioned the gift of livestock and crops to grow, Lummis followed that with what he considered was the greatest effect of the Spanish upon the natives.

> The most important ethnological effect of the coming of Spain, was to make the Pueblo from a sedentary to a *fixed* Indian. Instead of continuing to play chess with his cities across a three-hundred-mile board, he now was limited. To each of his communities was given a generous grant of land, and upon that grant he must stay. Thenceforth there were no town-migrations, and the living pueblos are essentially where they were when Plymouth Rock came into history.[364]

In this assessment, Lummis celebrated the fact that the Spanish invaded the Pueblo territory and limited the area upon which the Pueblo people were allowed to reside.

[364] Charles Lummis, "The Indian Who is Not Poor," *Scribner's Magazine*, September 1892, 361.

For a man that admonished the United States for its intervention in Cuba, and its acquisition of Hawaii, this admiration of the imperialistic control over the Pueblos by the Spanish showed the double standard that he held for Spain. Throughout his life, Lummis claimed to love the Pueblos more than any other tribal people within the United States, and yet when recounting the fact that the Spanish invaded the Pueblos land, limited the land they were allowed to settle upon, all while celebrating it as progress, illuminated where his true sympathies lied, and it was not with the First Americans as he referred to them, but always with Spain.

Lummis's contradictory writing was also apparent in *The Spanish Pioneers*. This contradiction to a statement that Lummis had already made in his letters during his walk was a direct result of his advocacy of the Spanish conquest. While on his journey across the Southwest, Lummis entered New Mexico and it was his first interaction with the Pueblo people, who eventually became a significant part of his life. However, it was when the people were strangers that Lummis was honest about their history. It also shows that Lummis's fealty to the Spanish crown began after his walk across the US, as there was nothing in his writing that specifically worked to protect the legacy of Spain and their conquest of the Americas. When he first encountered the Pueblos, Lummis acknowledged that the population of the people had once been as high as 50,000 before the Spanish arrival, but had dropped to 8,000 by the time that Lummis had arrived, 300 years following the initial conquest.[365] These numbers were contradicted in "The Indian Who is Not Poor", when Lummis claimed that the Pueblos were numerous in the last

[365] Charles Lummis, *Letters from the Southwest*, Ed. James W. Byrkit, University of Arizona Press, 1989, 132.

decade of the nineteenth century as they had been before the Spanish arrived in New Mexico in the sixteenth century.[366]

Though Charles Lummis considered himself an Indian rights advocate, his contradictions within his own written works showed that his fealty always lied with the Spanish. This love affair and dedication to the Spanish began on his walk across the nation and his visit with Amado Chaves and his family in New Mexico, and from that point forward, Lummis was a dedicated Hispanophile. His time with the Chaves family established his desire to be a part of the aristocratic history of the Spanish Southwest. It was also this time with Amado Chaves and his father, Don Manuel that entrenched certain biases into the mind of Lummis.

Even the way that Lummis referred to friends of his betrayed his inherent prejudice in favor of Spain. Though descended from one of Juan de Oñate's generals, the Chaves family had lived in Mexico ever since. Yet Lummis referred to the family as being Spanish, not Mexican because they were a treasured remnant from the aristocratic period of the Spanish New World and the time of the land-owning dons, of which Lummis desperately wished to be. From his time in the Mexican army, Don Manuel developed predisposed opinions of certain Indian tribes in the American Southwest and shared these opinions with Lummis, who held these same opinions throughout his career. "The Pueblos live chiefly by a very fair scheme of agriculture, are cleanly (for Indians), honest, hospitable, and chaste; the Navajos are hunters and stock-breeders rather than

[366] Lummis, "The Indian," 1892, 364-5.

farmers; dirty, thievish, treacherous and revoltingly licentious. In fact the one people are civilized beings, the others are still mere savages."[367]

This statement was made about a people that Lummis had not spent enough time around to adequately develop an opinion of them based on personal experiences. Yet Lummis referred to the Navajo just as Don Manuel had, using exceptionally defamatory descriptors for a people that had not personally committed any wrongs against Lummis. It also exposed a part of Lummis's lexicon that he continued to use to describe certain American Indians. Lummis referenced many different tribal people as savages. Although this term was typically utilized when describing people other than the Pueblos whom he claimed to love, he described the Pueblo people of the 16th and 17th century as savages when they stood opposed to the Spanish, showing that Lummis loved no group of people more than the Spanish.

When Lummis returned to New Mexico to recover from his series of strokes, he returned to the home of Don Manuel and Amado Chaves, where his previous prejudices were reinforced and despite his work with the Pueblos of the area, his predisposition for the Spanish and his sense of superiority over the American Indians was solidified and put into writing. It was during this time of recovery that Lummis began his freelance writing career celebrating the American Southwest. One of these compositions was an inspirational book, *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*. Although this work was intended to be a way for Lummis to expose the rest of the country to the wonders of the Southwest, his writing was more of a collection of natural wonders and descriptions of people that appeared to be more of a sideshow act than humans equal with the Eastern

[367] Charles Lummis, *Letters from the Southwest*, Ed. James W. Byrkit, University of Arizona Press, 1989, 232.

whites to whom Lummis was writing. Lummis dedicated an entire chapter of his book to the witchcraft that he observed in New Mexico. Using his book as an opportunity to show the ignorance of the American Indians and Mexicans, Lummis compared them to Americans. Exposing his personal belief in the ignorance of the people that he lived amongst and claimed to love.

> Of course the Americans have no faith in witches, nor do the educated Mexicans; but all the Indians and probably ninety per cent. of the brave but ignorant Mexicans are firm believers in this astounding superstition…In my own pueblo of Isleta, which numbers over eleven hundred souls, nearly half the people are believed to be witches, and the only thing which prevents a bloody war upon them by the "True Believers" is fear of the Americans, of whom there are several thousands only twelve miles away."[368]

Though Lummis had intended to spark interest in the Southwest, what he did in these words was express his own superiority over the American Indians, and portray them as a backwards people with their belief in the silly superstitions that white Americans had forgone long before.

Not satisfied to simply compare the American Indians in his book to white Americans, Lummis also utilized the exposition as a way to once again celebrate the Spanish despite supposedly using the book to expose Americans to the people of the Southwest, Lummis took the opportunity to extol the benefits that he believed the Spanish brought to the very people that he was writing about. When writing about the Moqui Snake Dance, Lummis, in his explanation of the location of the Moqui people, and their limited contact with the Spanish during their conquest of the Southwest, incongruously connected their location to what Lummis claimed that the Spanish provided to the American Indians during their occupation. "The most remote from

[368] Charles Lummis, *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1989, 67.

civilization of all the Pueblos, the least affected by the Spanish influence which so wonderfully ruled over the enormous area of the southwest, and practically untouched by the later Saxon influence, the Indians of the Moqui towns retain almost entirely their wonderful customs of before the conquest."[369] Why Lummis chose this as an opportunity to exalt the Spanish again would appear curious, except in the understanding that Lummis's overall goal in life was to bring notoriety to the Spanish and cleanse the historical record of any negativity attributed to their conquest of the New World. This was Lummis's self-imposed crusade and he used each opportunity that he was presented to accomplish this feat as a knight-errant.

An opportunity to further his research into the history of the Spanish conquest of the Americas presented itself to Lummis in the form of an expedition along with Swiss-American archaeologist and ethnologist, Adolph Bandelier. The pair had been working to raise funds while they were both living in New Mexico, and because of the developing fame of both men, particularly Lummis, word spread quickly and newspapers around the West began announcing the trip. By this point, Lummis had become so popular with his stories of the American Southwest, that journalists expected a great deal from him following his return.

> Mr. Lummis goes to Peru as a syndicate writer, whose papers will be eagerly sought by the foremost literary productions of the United States. He is an authority on everything that pertains to Aztec lore, and will undoubtedly in a very short time approve himself one on the Inca traditions. Many excellent bits from his fertile pen will be the consequence of his trip, and that these will be hailed with delight by his numerous admirers, may not be doubted.[370]

---

[369] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 45.

[370] "Charles F. Lummis: The Writer of Zuni Folk Lore Departs for the Land of the Incas," *Los Angeles Herald*, October 23, 1892, 3. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84025968/1892-10-23/ed-1/seq-3/#date1=1891&index=0&rows=20&words=Lummis+Peru&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1894&proxtext=Lummis+Peru&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

It is no surprise, based on this account of his upcoming journey, that his scholarship on native peoples and the Spanish influence upon the region was not heavily questioned.

Following his excavation trip to Peru, Lummis returned to Los Angeles and published his largest and most significant work in his desire to rewrite the history of the Spanish conquest of the New World, *The Spanish Pioneers*. In this book, Lummis not only dedicated the book in a way that can easily be viewed as an afront to the American Indian community, but also described the conquest of Mexico, Peru, and the American Southwest as something beneficial and altruistic. Following his dedication of the book to the widow of George Armstrong Custer, the invader of the Sioux Nation, Lummis's description of the conquest of New Mexico stood not only in direct contrast of his advocacy of the Pueblo people, but also portrayed the Spanish as the tragic heroes that struggled against the vicious savagery of the ungrateful natives.

Writing about the Acoma revolt against Juan de Oñate's incursion, Lummis sided with the Spanish invaders, referring to the natives as barbarians and savages.

> There was no coward blood among that doomed band. They sold their lives dearly; in front of every one lay a sprawling heap of dead. But one by one the howling wave of barbarians drowned each grim, silent fighter, and swept off to swell the murderous flood about the next…But their savage foes still pressed them; and being too faint to carve their way to one of their "ladders," in the wildness of desperation the five sprang over the beetling cliff.[371]

In his desire to present what he considered a new school of historical research into the Spanish conquest and occupation of the American Southwest, Lummis altered the historical record and depicted the natives as a treacherous race of people that resisted the philanthropic conquistadores.

[371] Charles Lummis, *The Spanish Pioneers*, A.C. McClurg, 1936, 130.

Even in his recounting of the retribution enacted by the Spanish against the Acoma Pueblo, Lummis spoke highly of the death of over 500 Acoma people, including women and children in response to the thirteen soldiers killed by the Acoma warriors, and the kidnapping of eighty Acoma girls that were sent to the be taught by the Spanish nuns. By this time, Lummis had already rescued thirty-six children that had been forcibly held by the Albuquerque Indian School and had written scathing remarks on the tactics of a school that needed to forcibly hold children as students. This put his desire to portray the capture of these Acoma girls in 1598 as not only an afront to the American Indians that he had supported, but a violation and contradiction of his own supposed ideals and principles, exposing that his only solid principle was the perpetuation of Spain as an altruistic force in the New World.

This perpetuation was even more apparent in Lummis's reference to the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, minimizing the events, and placing the entirety of the responsibility at the feet of the Pueblos themselves, not as a result of the treatment of the Spanish. This continued the narrative that he began with what he considered the Acoma betrayal of Spain, and the Spanish retaliation against the brutal attack. While the Spanish held control over the Pueblos for the next eighty years, the abuses against the Pueblos increased, both by the Spanish soldiers and the religious leaders tasked with the conversion of the heathens. Lummis described the Spanish treatment of the Pueblos as being wholly altruistic, however, this assessment as he presented it was historically inaccurate.

> He never robbed the brown first Americans of their homes, nor drove them on and on before them; on the contrary, he protected and secured them by special laws the undisturbed possession of their lands for all time. It is due to the generous and manly laws made by Spain three hundred years ago, that our most interesting and

> advanced Indians, the Pueblos, enjoy to-day full security in their lands; while nearly all others (who never came fully under Spanish dominion) have been time after time ousted from lands our government had solemnly given to them.[372]

The historical inaccuracies in this statement aside, Lummis's own words about the Moqui contradicted the assessment that those not fully under Spanish dominion had been removed from their lands. In his exaltation of the Spanish in *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*, Lummis spoke of the Moquis that were the least influenced by Spain because they were so far removed from Spanish rule. Yet, he explained that the Moqui had been able to retain the vast majority of their culture that existed before the Spanish conquest, and was least affected by Saxon influence.[373]

Lummis also utilized semantics in order to avoid the issue of the reality of Spanish rule over the Pueblos. By listing that the Spanish never took the Pueblo lands or drove them from their lands, Lummis ignored the fact that the Spanish ruled the Pueblos with an iron fist. They demanded tribute not only for the crown, but the Spanish friars that had come into New Mexico to convert the American Indians. In the years before the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, there had been a significant drought which had over-taxed the natives, yet the demands for tribute and taxes had not waned. There had also been harsh rule over the Pueblos and cruel punishments for continuing to exercise their religion and worship the Pueblo gods. This practice led to the arrest of Popé by the governor along with over forty others accused of idolatry, where the majority were tortured and some put to death. Popé himself used this experience as the incentive for his revolt against the harsh treatment that he and his people had faced at the hands of the Spanish. Yet in the book, Lummis blamed the mere presence of the Spanish as the primary cause of the

[372] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 149-150.
[373] Lummis, *Strange Corners*, 45.

revolt against them by the Pueblos, going so far as to say that it was a "murderous and causeless plot."[374]

Lummis presented the book as a historical record, correcting what he saw as the flawed record of the misrepresentation of Spanish atrocities that had been reported in the Southwest. However, he merely sought to protect the image of the Spanish heritage of the American Southwest. This was the foundation of Lummis's duty to the Spanish crown. His self-imposed duty was to present the Spanish control of the Americas as a beneficial aspect in the history of the New World. In order to prove that his new assessment of Spain was correct, he needed to adjust the conditions of which the Spanish ruled the Pueblos. He did this by avoiding all mention of any kind of Spanish maltreatment and portrayed the Pueblos as children that rebelled against their parental units, eventually submitting to the Spanish rule and realizing the error in their ways. In Lummis's own words, following the Pueblo rebellion, "[T]he Pueblos grew to lasting peace with the humane conquerors, and to merit the kindness that was steadily proffered them."[375] Lummis never considered the Spanish to be anything but kind and benevolent to the American Indians, and even when confronted with contrary information, as the majority of research had presented beforehand, Lummis accused historians of a bias against the Spanish and fashioned a role for himself in correcting the historical record to match what he believed.

Despite the glaring historical inaccuracies present in Lummis's work, some early reviews praised the book as a successful presentation of the history of the Spanish conquest of the New World. "Altogether it is a well-written book, and shows the reader

[374] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 92.
[375] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 143.

what a debt of gratitude the American people owe the brave colonizers, the Spanish Pioneers."[376] By this point in his life, Lummis had established himself as an authority on all things Spanish and relating to the Southwest, so it is easy to understand how those people who had not had the opportunity to research the history themselves would have trusted his account. With the vast majority of the population not having graduated high school, nor earning a college education, historical research would have been left to those that had accomplished those feats, including Lummis, though technically he never graduated from Harvard.

However, this praise was not universal, and there were educated voices that decried Lummis's representation of the Spanish conquistadors as altruistic settlers of a savage land. In a scathing review of Lummis's presentation of Francisco Pizarro, the *Los Angeles Herald*, the same newspaper that would eventually praise *The Spanish Pioneers*, blasted the author for his work.

> Columbus is to be canonized, and Mr. Charles Lummis, following the lead of the pope, and assuming in himself all the powers of the college of cardinals, proposes to preside at the apotheosis of Francisco Pizarro – perhaps the most inhuman wretch that ever slaughtered his fellow creatures for the greater glory of God.[377]

The reviewer did not stop merely at a critique of Lummis's promotion of Pizarro, but also in his denigration of the Peruvian natives as a "low, ignorant lot of savages, and their

---

[376] "Among the Authors," *Los Angeles Herald*, March 18, 1894, 8. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85042461/1894-03-18/ed-1/seq-11/#date1=1893&index=0&rows=20&words=pioneering+Pioneers+pioneers+Spanish&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=California&date2=1894&proxtext=Spanish+Pioneers&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[377] "Apotheosis of Saint Pizarro: A Reply to Charles F. Lummis's Theory," *Los Angeles Herald*, July 16, 1893, 9. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn85042461/1893-07-16/ed-1/seq-9/#date1=1893&index=1&rows=20&words=apotheosis+APOTHEOSIS&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=California&date2=1894&proxtext=Apotheosis&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

conquerors all that is good and great."[378] This is the same complaint of Lummis's treatment of the American natives, that he referred to as merely a group of ignorant, savage barbarians.

Lummis's life in the first half of the 1890s was as busy as one could expect of a man in his early thirties. In New Mexico alone, he had written a pivotal book on the American Southwest, survived an assassination attempt, rescued thirty-six American Indian children from the Albuquerque Indian School, and engaged in a national battle of words with the director of Indian education. He then traveled to Peru to excavate ancient ruins with Adolph Bandelier, the famed archeologist. Returning to California, he published the key work in his duty as a knight-errant, started the Landmarks Club to preserve and restore the Spanish missions, and became editor of the *Land of Sunshine* magazine, a periodical supported by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

It was this job as a magazine editor that provided Lummis with the first steady paycheck that he had received since he left the *Los Angeles Times* following his series of strokes. When he officially began his tenure as editor of the magazine, his opening issue began with an article that he penned himself, titled, "The Spanish-American Face." If there was any ambiguity as to where Lummis's preference lied, it would have been laid to rest with the words of this article. The article itself read as a love letter of sorts to the Spanish people and Spain's exceptional accomplishments in the New World. This was especially true when compared to the English conquest of the New World. Lummis claimed that the English failed to subdue the natives, choosing only to fill the new land with increasing numbers of settlers.

[378] Apotheosis of Saint Pizarro."

> The seal of Spain is upon all things that she has ever touched. To the thoughtful student few side-lights in history are more striking than this vital individuality of the Spaniard. Whatever page he opened in the New World, he wrote across it his racial autograph in a hand so virile and so characteristic that neither time nor change can efface it…How significant this is, we may better judge when we remember that the Saxon, masterful though he is, has never achieved any of these results. He has filled new lands with his speech and his faith (or his lack of it), but only by filling them with his own blood, never by changing the native. The United States, for instance, is of his speech; but what Indian tribe ever spoke English? In the vastly greater area of Spanish-America every Indian tribe speaks Spanish, and has done so for centuries. The Saxon has never impressed his language or his religion upon the peoples he has over-run. Something of his face goes into the half-breeds he begets but will not father; but even the physical impress is much less marked than in the case of his Latin predecessor.[379]

As with *The Spanish Pioneers*, Lummis's concern was not with historical accuracy, but in words which characterized the Spanish as benevolent and kind conquerors. This was evident by his ignorance or omission of the fact that when the Pilgrims first spoke to the surrounding tribal people, Samoset greeted them in English and they owed their lives to the natives that had already understood the English language.[380] He also omitted tribes such as the Cherokee that not only spoke English, but adopted American culture in order to assimilate with the Americans.

However, the key omission in Lummis's account of the Spanish conquest was the most telling about his devotion to Spain. Lummis contrasted Spain's success in altering the natives with the Saxon's inability to accomplish the same feat. However, what Lummis failed to detail was how the Spanish were able to accomplish such an achievement, such as the sexual exploitation of the natives. Numerous reports from the conquests of the New World by the Spanish painted the natives as cannibalistic sodomites, justifying the harsh treatment levied against them by the Spanish.

---

[379] Charles F. Lummis, "The Spanish-American Face," *Land of Sunshine* 2. no. 2 (January 1895): 21.
[380] Lincoln N. Kinnicutt, "Plymouth's Debt to the Indians," *The Harvard Theological Review* 13, no. 4 (1920): 351

In his article, "What Good Can There Be in This Kind of Human? Spanish Justification for the Conquest of the Americas," John Pittenger used primary documentation from the Spanish conquests to show that the Spanish embellished or outright lied in order to portray the Amerindians as barbarians in order to justify inhumane treatment. By accusing the natives of the New World of acts like cannibalism, sodomy, and idolatry, the conquering Spanish could justify their oppressive treatment of them and their eventual conquest. Understanding that the Spanish royalty and the Catholic Church would support this treatment if it was against a people that were morally and religiously reprehensible, Cortés and the other conquistadores were able to enact any retribution against the natives that they wished because it was justifiable.[381]

The Spanish philosopher of the time of the conquest, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, an apologist of the Spanish modes of conquest, stated that the difference between the Spaniards and the natives was essentially that of "apes and men."[382] Pittenger also recognized that following the return of the conquistadores to Spain, there was a severe outbreak of syphilis that was blamed on the natives with whom they had come into contact. Understanding how syphilis is spread, two things are clear. First, the conquistadores engaged in sexual relations with the natives in high numbers. This explained the fact that the return of syphilis became a massive outbreak, and not a limited illness. Second, Lummis's account that it was the Saxons that fathered children that they did not raise failed to acknowledge the Spanish tendency to do the same. In fact, Lummis's wording in his account mirror the same wording utilized by the conquistadores

[381] John R. Pittenger, "What Good Can There Be in This Kind of Human? Spanish Justification for the Conquest of the Americas," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* 7 article 7 (January 2020): 62-67.
[382] Pittenger, "What Good Can There Be," 71.

and apologists to justify the actions of the Spanish in the New World, showing that Lummis not only longed for that time period, but inserted himself into the Spanish legacy as a knight-errant on his own crusade for the positive interpretation of Spanish actions in the New World.

Lummis's questionable research and judgement of factual evidence was not limited to his presentation of events of the Spanish Conquest of the New World. Lummis also faced criticism of his judgement during his time, especially during times when he involved himself in issues that may not have required his engrossment. One such event was Lummis's promotion of Dr. Hewett to remain as the director of the School of American Archaeology in Ne Mexico. The criticism of Lummis's defense of Hewett was not merely in the defense itself, but the standard that Lummis utilized to determine the qualifications of a proper director.

> A striking feature of Mr. Lummis's letter is the new standard or test he establishes for determining who is a scientist. It is: Is he in Who's Who in America (a red book which contains over 18,700 names). He says: "You will find the name of Dr. Hewett and the members of the managing committee in these volumes."[383]

A separate article on the same page continued its criticism of Lummis, contrasting his opinion with those of professors that had critiqued Dr. Hewett's qualifications.

> Eminent professors of Harvard and Columbia universities back up the assertion that Dr. Edgar L. Hewett is discredited in scientific circles as an archaeologist or "scientist" – that he is merely a promoter and NOT the man to head the School of American Archaeology in Santa Fe.[384]

---

[383] "Lummis Flays Twitchell for Calling Santa Fe 'The Oldest City,'" *Santa Fe New Mexican*, October 23, 1913, 3. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020630/1913-10-23/ed-1/seq-3/#date1=1913&index=0&rows=20&words=LUMMIS+TWITCHELL&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1913&proxtext=Lummis+Twitchell&y=0&x=0&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

[384] "Great Professors Declare Hewett has no Standing," *Santa Fe New Mexican*, October 23, 1913, 1. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn84020630/1913-10-23/ed-1/seq-1/#date1=1913&index=0&rows=20&words=Lummis+Who+who&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1913&proxtext=Lummis+Who%27s+Who&y=11&x=12&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1

Though Lummis considered himself the penultimate authority on the history and culture of the American Southwest, these articles show that this personal belief was not necessarily shared with everyone. It also exposed potential issues in Lummis's judgement when it came to his beliefs. With the Spanish conquest, Lummis believed that the Spanish were altruistic and that was the message that he wanted to promote to the public. In doing so, Lummis ignored any evidence that contradicted his prejudicial perspective, and this article showed that this same evidentiary judgement was present in other aspects of Lummis's life and work.

At the same point in Lummis's life that he published his version of the Spanish conquest of the New World, Lummis founded a group in Southern California that was dedicated to preserving the remnants of the Spanish possession of California, the California Missions. Lummis believed that the California missions were one of California's greatest assets, and were a reminder of the romance of California's past.[385] This sentiment outlived Lummis, to which his work certainly contributed.[386] Lummis's Landmarks Club devoted themselves to rebuilding the crumbling missions, and included the monthly minutes in his magazine the *Land of Sunshine*, and continued it in *Out West* when he changed the name of the periodical in January 1902. This was a significant part of Lummis's duty to preserve and protect the Spanish heritage of California and allowed him to physically return the state to the time of the Spanish missions and the powerful land-owning dons, of which he desperately wished to be. This exposed a new aspect to Lummis's role as a knight-errant, as his duty had transformed from simply altering the

[385] Elizabeth Kryder-Reid, *California Mission Landscapes: Race, Memory, and the Politics of Heritage*, University of Minnesota Press, 2016, 72.
[386] Francis J. Weber, "The California Missions and Their Visitors," *The Americas* 24, no. 4 (1968): 336.

perception of the Spanish occupation of the Americas to recreating the California in which the Spanish had resided.

Lummis's focus on the Spanish missions and their effect on the California Indians became apparent in his creation of The Landmarks Club in December 1895. In the January, 1896 edition of the *Land of Sunshine*, Lummis began his publishing of the minutes of The Landmarks Club, and summed up its purpose succinctly. "The immediate and permanent preservation, from decay and vandalism, of the venerable Missions of Southern California; and a general promotion of proper care of all such matters. It will be a function of the club to secure a permanent fund to be applied exclusively to these objects."[387] The Landmarks Club initially sought enough funds to restore the missions at San Juan Capistrano and San Luis Rey, and published a monthly accounting of the club's workings throughout the life of the *Land of Sunshine*, and carried over into *Out West*. From the time that the California missions were secularized, between 1833 and 1834, they had fallen into disrepair and Lummis had desired to return them to their former glory.[388] In 1931, the Landmarks Club transformed into the Landmarks Program under the California Department of Historic Preservation, and continues to preserve the California Missions, continuing Lummis's legacy of retaining Spain's place in the history of California.

To a casual reader, one could conclude that Lummis had written all of these works at a certain point in his life, and perhaps had eventually seen the error of his ways and recanted his conclusions. However, even at the end of his life, Lummis made the

[387] Charles Lummis, "The Landmarks Club," *Land of Sunshine* 4 no. 2 (January 1896): 85.
[388] Joseph J. Hill, *The History of Warner's Ranch and Its Environs*, Los Angeles, 1927, 61.

decision to republish his seminal work, *The Spanish Pioneers*, but added a new chapter, altering the title to *The Spanish Pioneers and the California Missions*. This additional chapter focused on the specific impact of the Spanish missionaries in their work to convert the California Indians to Christianity. They did so by constructing missions throughout the state that not only worked to teach the natives the Christian faith, but also taught them how to make soap, as evidenced by the tallow vats at Mission San Gabriel Archangel. This chapter of the newly published version of his key work began much like the rest of the book, with a praise of the Spanish for their discovery of the New World. However, this chapter began with Lummis's claim that the United States owed a debt of gratitude to Spain for the United States' possession of California, professing that if it were not for Spain, California would simply be another territory of Canada, having been conquered by the British.

He claimed that the reason that the Spanish were able to accomplish the feat of subduing the natives of California was the construction and operation of twenty-one Franciscan missions covering 500 miles of California. Showing his continued intent, celebrating what he considered the romance of the Spanish past in California, Lummis wrote about the missions,

> [B]ut the twenty-one Mission establishments, strung five hundred miles up and down the coast – each Mission not "just a church" but an outpost of civilization in the wilderness, and industrial training school for as many as 2,800 Indians at a time at each – these set a record of Faith and Heroism and Romance never excelled, perhaps, even more mediaeval days of Spain's first American colonizations, and certainly unrivaled on any other historic page."[389]

In this one sentence, Lummis explained the purpose of the chapter, and his self-imposed mission for the Spanish empire.

[389] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 296.

This added chapter of Lummis's work also accurately exposed Lummis's allegiance when the issue of Indian rights intersected with the Spanish conquest. Lummis had involved himself in the Warner's Ranch issue where a group of Cupeños from Aqua Caliente had been evicted from the land upon which they had lived for generations, before the Spanish conquest. Despite their ability to remain on the land following the Spanish exploration and occupation and through the Mexican control following its emancipation from Spain, when the United States took control over California, ownership of the Cupeños' land was given to the heads of Warner's Ranch, and the tribe was forced to relocate. It was at this point that Lummis utilized his relationship with President Theodore Roosevelt, and formed the Warner's Ranch Commission, that sought to locate and purchase a new tract of land for the Cupeños.

Lummis believed that the federal government was doing a disservice to the tribe by seeking a new property that was inferior to their original home, and his goal was to provide the Cupeños with a superior piece of land, and as a founding member of the Sequoya Club, it was his duty as an Indian rights activist. However, Lummis presented a completely different perspective in this additional chapter to his book as it related to the California Indians. As he had in the previous chapters, Lummis referred to the natives as barbarians and savages, but it was his reference to the California Indians in particular that strongly contradicted his work with the Cupeños.

> Imagine any commonwealth of ours getting its Indians to build such great temples not only to Worship but to Art, as Serra and his lieutenants kindled the lazy, naked California Indians to do – the most primitive and unprogressive aborigines that the Spanish found in all their exhaustive exploration of the New World; and incomparably inferior to the Algonquins of Massachusetts, or the Six Nations, or any of the other tribes with whom our people have come in sharp contact.[390]

[390] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 306.

The same people that Lummis had allegedly assisted altruistically, he referred to as lazy and naked. Any time that Lummis's Indian activism intersected his portrayal of the Spanish legacy of the New World, the Spanish always won.

Lummis went further into his contradictions with his previous writings when he described the work that the Franciscan friars imposed upon the natives.

> The Franciscan foundation of California, on the contrary, was as clean a piece of devoted unselfishness as the annals of man can show. It was not for the missionaries, but for the heathen. It was to save their souls – and incidentally to teach them of a God of soap, and industry, and decency and art, as well as of catechism.[391]

Following his battle with the Albuquerque Indian School, Lummis wrote his opinions on Indian education in a three-part series of articles titled, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos." In these articles, Lummis expressed not only his feelings towards the Pueblo people that had been affected by the Albuquerque Indian School, but also the entire Indian education policy of the United States at the time.

> The end of education is not presumed to be the employment of the teacher, nor a gymnasium for the philanthropy of those who hire him, but for the practical benefit of the student. But a saddening proportion of the energy of our Indian schools goes to teaching Indians stuff which can by no possibility ever be of any remotest use to any present pupil, while what is needed is almost altogether neglected.[392]

According to Lummis, the purpose of Indian education was to help the Indians in their current lives, not to simply become like their white neighbors.

However, in this new chapter of T*he Spanish Pioneers and the California Missions*, Lummis celebrated the Spanish for educating the California Indians in

[391] Lummis, *Spanish Pioneers*, 304.
[392] Charles F. Lummis, "Plain Talk from the Pueblos: Part I," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 1892.

industries that benefitted the missions, and by extension, the Spanish government. Until 1769, when the Spanish colonized Alto California, the California Indians had no need for Spanish soap, industry, art, or Catholic catechism. These were all aspects of life that benefitted the Spanish, and worked to transform the California Indians into members of Spanish society, much in the way that the American Indian education system was intended to transform the Indian into a member of white American society. Lummis was opposed to this system when it was the United States in charge, but had no qualms about the Spanish engaging in the very same educational pattern for which he had vilified the United States.

The comparisons between Charles Lummis and Don Quixote have been abundant in this paper, as it exemplifies Lummis's role as a knight-errant for the Spanish crown. In Don Quixote, Miguel Cervantes intended to educate the reader that though their fantasies about life, heroism, courage, romance, and chivalry may help them in the short-term, living in a fantasy world of their own creation is unhealthy in the long run. Eventually reality catches up to the fantasy maker and their ideas of what the world should be do not match the world that actually exists. Like Don Quixote, Lummis held onto a fantasy about the past, wishing to become a sacred knight for the Spanish crown, returning the land to a time of romance, chivalry, and heroism. Lummis desired a return to what he considered the most romantic era of California, which was the time of the aristocratic, land-owning dons, of which he desperately wished to be. To this end, he purchased a large plot of land near Pasadena and spent over a decade constructing his own home, resembling an old Spanish hacienda. He threw extravagant parties for wealthy friends, as

well as up-and-coming literary, vocal, and visual artists, referred to as his Spanish Noises.

Lummis wrote articles and books that relentlessly praised the Spanish and corrected what he believed was the misrepresentation of the Spanish conquest of the New World. He believed that the accepted history was needlessly cruel to the legacy of the Spanish explorers, conquistadores, and Catholic missionaries that permanently conquered the Americas. In his desire to do so, Lummis altered facts, omitted key aspects of history, and relied solely on Spanish-written works that often presented a biased account of the Spanish conquest. Unlike Don Quixote, whose story provided an important lesson, Lummis's crusade brought him significant fame and he was rewarded for his actions. Journalists of his time had referred to him as "[A]n author, anthropologist, historian, editor, librarian and traveler."[393]

In 1915, Lummis was presented with the highest Spanish honor that could be presented to a foreigner, Knight Commander of the Royal Order of Isabel the Catholic by King Alfonso XIII for his duty to the Spanish crown.[394] The news of his success in this goal did not remain in California, but was also reported upon by news outlets in New Mexico, where he was also a pseudo celebrity.[395] Lummis had succeeded in his mission. Not only had he been personally recognized for his work by the king of Spain, but he had earned the title for which he had seemingly so long wished: Don Carlos. Lummis had become a part of the Spanish aristocracy, though it was certainly different that it had been

[393] "Lummis Made Spanish Knight," *Estancia News-Herald*, Aug. 26, 1915. https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov/lccn/sn94057017/1915-08-26/ed-1/seq-3/#date1=1915&index=0&rows=20&words=Knight+Lummis&searchType=basic&sequence=0&state=&date2=1915&proxtext=Lummis+Knight&y=20&x=19&dateFilterType=yearRange&page=1
[394] "Lummis Knighted by Alfonso XIII," *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 15, 1915, 3.
[395] "Lummis Made Knight"

in the late 18th century. With respect to the comparison between himself and Don Quixote, Lummis had succeeded where Don Quixote had failed. According to J. M. Sobré, "Don Quixote is a complete fool; his folly, however, is the most sublime of virtues in this rotten world."[396] Lummis, on the other hand, sacrificed people that he claimed to love in order to fulfil his self-imposed duty to promote the Spanish history of the American Southwest. Lummis was able to build a life and reputation on this work, and became the Spanish don that served as his heroic ideal from the moment that he met the Chaves family in San Mateo, New Mexico. However, Cervantes's lesson was one that came to fruition after the end of Lummis's life. Though he considered himself a historian during his lifetime, his work has faced criticism by historians that acknowledge his flawed research, as well as his bias towards the Spanish fantasy past, of which he was a key architect. His work as an Indian rights activist has also been put into question by his overwhelming preference towards the Spanish and the contradictions that exist in his work and his writings.

[396] J. M. Sobré, "Don Quixote, the Hero Upside-Down," *Hispanic Review* 44, no. 2 (1976): 129.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts/Archival Collections

Charles F. Lummis Papers. Huntington Library and Archives. Pasadena, California.

Charles Fletcher Lummis Papers [manuscript materials] 1850-1975, 1850-1929. Autry Museum of the American West Archives, Burbank, California.

Lummis Fiske, Turbesé. *Charles F. Lummis, A Brief Biography*. (unpublished). 1936. Autry Museum Library and Archives.

Miscellaneous Newspaper Clippings - Pueblos - 1892/1893. Autry Museum of the American West Archives. Burbank, California.

Papers of Charles Fletcher Lummis. University of Arizona Archives,

Newspapers

Chronicling America: Historic American Newspapers. Library of Congress. Washington D.C. www.chroniclingamerica.loc.gov. (accessed July 16, 2023 to January, 2024)

The Albuquerque Morning Journal (Albuquerque, New Mexico)

The Arizona Republican (Phoenix, Arizona)

Chickasaw Daily Express (Chickasaw, Indian Territory)

Daily Capital Journal (Salem, Oregon)

Daily Gate City and Constitution-Democrat (Keokuk, Iowa)

Estancia News-Herald (Torrance County, New Mexico)

The Evening Star (Washington, D.C.)

Indianapolis Journal (Indianapolis, Indiana)

Las Vegas Free Press (Las Vegas, New Mexico)

Los Angeles Herald (Los Angeles, California)

The Morning Call (San Francisco, California)

New York Tribune (New York, New York)

The Pacific Commercial Advertiser (Honolulu, Hawaii)

Sacred Heart Review (Boston, Massachusetts)
San Antonio Light and Gazette (San Antonio, Texas)

The San Francisco Call (San Francisco, California)

Santa Fe New Mexican (Santa Fe, New Mexico)

Howard, Alvis. "The Huntsville Trial of Frank James."

Lummis, Charles. "A Christian and a Man of Honor." *Sacred Heart Review* 8, no. 22 (November 12, 1892).

Lummis, Charles F. "Poor Pedro, the Fate of the Indian Who Was Educated." *Los Angeles Times*. April, 1890.

"Lummis Knighted by Alfonso XIII." *Los Angeles Times*. Aug. 15, 1915. 3.

Magazine Articles

Lummis, Charles. "Borrowed from the Enemy," *Land of Sunshine* 4 no. 1 (Dec 1895): 28.

Lummis, Charles. "The Indian Who is not Poor." *Scribner's Magazine*. September 1892.

Lummis, Charles F. "In the Lion's Den." *Land of Sunshine* 4, (Dec 1895-May 1896).

Lummis, Charles F. "In the Lion's Den." *Land of Sunshine* 8. (Dec. 1897-May 1898).

Lummis, Charles F. "In the Lion's Den." *Land of Sunshine* 9 (June 1898-Nov. 1898).

Lummis, Charles F. "In the Lion's Den." *Land of Sunshine* 15 (June 1901-Dec. 1901).

Lummis, Charles F. "In Western Letters." *Land of Sunshine* 14 no.1 (Jan., 1901). 26-27.

Lummis, Charles F. “The Landmarks Club.” *Land of Sunshine* 4 no. 2 (Jan. 1896). 85.

Lummis, Charles F. “The Landmarks Club.” *Out West* 16 no. 4 (Apr., 1903). 624.

Lummis, Charles. “The Moqui Indians”. *Farm Field and Fireside*. February 4, 1893.

Lummis, Charles F. “A New Indian Policy.” *Land of Sunshine* 15 no. 6 (Dec, 1901). 459.

Lummis, Charles. “A Successful Life.” *Out West* 22, no. 5 (May, 1905): 318-9.

Lummis, Charles F. “The Sequoya League.” *Out West* 16, no. 2. (Feb, 1902): 177.

Lummis, Charles F. “The Sequoya League.” *Out West* 18, no. 4 (April, 1903): 477-484.

Lummis, Charles F. “The Spanish-American Face.” *Land of Sunshine* 2 no. 2 (Jan, 1895): 21-22.

Speeches

Lummis, Charles. “Some Aspects of Indian Education.” The Newman Club. Los Angeles, California. November 28, 1900.

Dissertations

Blitz, Daniel Frederick. “Charles Fletcher Lummis: Los Angeles City Librarian.” Dissertation. University of California Los Angeles. 2013.

Gonzalez-Crane, Christopher. “California and the Emergence of Lifestyle: Self-Help, Tourism, and Los Angeles.” Dissertation. University of London. 2020.

Ingham, Zita. “Reading and Writing a Landscape: A Rhetoric of Southwest Desert Literature.” Dissertation. University of Arizona. 1991.

Lorimer, Michelle Marie. “Reconstructing the Past: Historical Interpretations and Native Experiences at Contemporary California Missions.” Dissertation. University of California Riverside. 2013.

Oliphant, Elizabeth Lloyd. “Inventing the Southwest: How Modernists Shaped an American Regional Experience.” Dissertation. University of Pittsburgh. 2017.

Books

Austin, Mary. *Earth Horizon*. Santa Fe: Sunstone Press. 1932.

Bandelier, Adolph and Charles F. Lummis. *The Delight Makers*. Carlisle, Mass. Applewood Books. 1890.

Barrett, Elinore M. *Conquest and Catastrophe: Changing Rio Grande Pueblo Settlement Patterns in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Albuquerque. University of New Mexico Press. 2002.

Bingham, Edwin R. *Charles Lummis: Editor of the Southwest*. San Marino. Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery. 1955.

Brown, Tracy L. *Pueblo Indians and Spanish Colonial Authority in Eighteenth-Century New Mexico*. University of Arizona Press. 2013.

Burke, Flannery. *A Land Apart: The Southwest and the Nation in the Twentieth Century*. University of Arizona Press, 2017. 294–306. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1m3p35b.17.

Churchill, Ward. *Kill the Indian, Save the Man*. City Lights Books. San Francisco, CA. 2004.

Davis, William Watts Hart. *The Spanish Conquest of New Mexico*. Doylestown, Penn. 1896.

Fleming, Robert E. *Charles F. Lummis*. Boise, ID. Boise State University. 1981.

Gordon, Dudley. *Charles F. Lummis: Crusader in Corduroy*. Los Angeles. Cultural Assets Press. 1972.

Gram, John Reynolds. *Education at the Edge of Empire: Negotiating Pueblo Identity in New Mexico's Indian Boarding Schools*. Seattle. University of Washington Press. 2015.

Hagan, William Thomas. *Theodore Roosevelt and Six Friends of the Indian*. University of Oklahoma Press. 2002.

Hill, Joseph J. *The History of Warner's Ranch and Its Environs*. 1927.

Houlihan, Patrick T and Betsy E. *Lummis in the Pueblos*. Minnesota. Northland Press. 1986.

Jackson, Helen Hunt. *A Century of Dishonor: A Sketch of the United States Government's Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes*. Harper & Brothers. New York. 1881.

Jackson, Helen Hunt. *Ramona*. Boston. Roberts Brothers. 1886.

Krech, Shepard, Barbara A Hail, and Smithsonian Institution. *Collecting Native America, 1870-1960*. Washington, D.C. Smithsonian Books. 2010.

Lummis, Charles. *Bullying the Moqui*. Prescott, AZ. Prescott College Press. 1968.

Lummis, Charles F. *Dateline Fort Bowie: Charles Lummis Reports on the Apache War*. Ed. Dan L. Thrapp. University of Oklahoma Press. 1979.

Lummis, Charles F. *General Crook and the Apache Wars*. Northland Press. 1966.

Lummis, Charles F. *The King of the Broncos and other Stories of New Mexico*. Kessinger. 1905.

Lummis, Charles F. *The Land of Poco Tiempo*. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913.

Lummis, Charles Fletcher and. *Letters from the Southwest, September 20, 1884 to March 14, 1885*. Ed. James W Byrkit. Tucson. University of Arizona Press. 1989.

Lummis, Charles F. *The Man Who Married the Moon, and other Pueblo Indian Folk Stories*. New York. The Century Company. 1891.

Lummis, Charles F. *Mesa, Cañon and Pueblo*. The Century Company. 1925.

Lummis, Charles F. *A New Mexico David and other Stories and Sketches of the Southwest*. Pasala Press. 2015.

Lummis, Charles F. *Pueblo Indian Folk Stories*. University of Nebraska Press. 1910.

Lummis, Charles F. *Some Strange Corners of Our Country*. Tucson. University of Arizona Press. 1891.

Lummis, Charles F. *The Spanish Pioneers*. A.C. McClurg & Co. 1893.

Lummis, Charles F. *The Spanish Pioneers and the California Missions*. A.C. McClurg & Co. 1936.

Lummis, Charles F. *A Tramp Across the Continent*. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1982.

Lummis Fiske, Turbesé and Keith Lummis. *Charles F. Lummis: The Man and His West*. University of Oklahoma Press. 1975.

Morgan, Lewis H. and Adolph Bandelier. *México Aniguo*. Siglo XXI de España Editores, S.A. 2004.

Pierce, Jason E. *Making the White Man's West: Whiteness and the Creation of the American West*. University Press of Colorado. 2016. 95–120. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt19jcg63.10.

Pratt, Richard Henry. "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites." *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*. Ed. Elizabeth C. Barrows, Boston. 1892.

Reid, Mayne. *The Scalp Hunters; Or, Romantic Adventures in Northern Mexico*. London and Glasgow. Collins' Clear Type Press. 1855.

Reid, Mayne. *The White Chief*. London. George Routledge and Sons. 1851.

Sheridan, Thomas E. and Stewart B. Koyiyumptewa. *New Mexico and the Pimeria Alta: The Colonial Period in the American Southwest*. Ed. John G. Douglas and William M. Graves. University Press of Colorado. 2017.

Simmons, Marc. *Charles F. Lummis: Author and Adventurer*. New Mexico. Sunstone Press. 2008.

Simmons, Marc. *The Little Lion of the Southwest: a life of Manuel Antonio Chaves*. Chicago. The Swallow Press. 1973.

Spicer, Edward H. and Hazel Fontana. *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533–1960*. University of Arizona Press. 1962.

Thompson, Mark. *American Character: The Curious Life of Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Rediscovery of the Southwest*. New York. Arcade. 2001.

Wenger, Tisa. *We Have a Religion: The 1920s Pueblo Indian Dance Controversy and American Religious Freedom*. Chapel Hill, NC. 2009.

Journal Articles

Ahern, Wilbert H. "An Experiment Aborted: Returned Indian Students in the Indian School Service, 1881-1908." *Ethnohistory* 44, no. 2 (1997): 263-304. https://doi.org/10.2307/483370.

Archuleta, Elizabeth. "History Carved in Stone: Memorializing Po'pay and Oñate, or Recasting Racialized Regimes of Representation?" *New Mexico Historical Review* 82 no. 3 (July 1, 2007): 317-342.

Baer, James A. "God and the Nation: Protestants, Patriotism and Pride in Cuba, 1890–1906." *International Journal of Cuban Studies* 8, no. 1 (2016): 74–96. https://doi.org/10.13169/intejcubastud.8.1.0074.

Barton, Clara. "Our Work and Observations in Cuba," *North American Review* 166 no. 498 (May 1898): 552-555.

Blend, Benay. "The Indian Rights Association, the Allotment Policy, and the Five Civilized Tribes, 1923-1936." *American Indian Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (1983): 67–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/1184687.

Brigandi, Phil. 2018. "In the Name of the Law: The Cupeño Removal of 1903." *The Journal of San Diego History* 64, no. 1.

"California Missions." *The American Catholic Historical Researches* 2, no. 2 (1906): 152. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44377753.

"Charles F. Lummis." *California Folklore Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (1942): 291–291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1495745.

Cutter, Martha J. "Sui Sin Far's Letters to Charles Lummis: Contextualizing Publication Practices for the Asian American Subject at the Turn of the Century." *American Literary Realism* 38, no. 3 (2006): 259–75. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27747220.

Earle, Henry Edmond. "An Old-Time Collector: Reminiscences of Charles F. Lummis." *California Folklore Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (1942): 179–83. https://doi.org/10.2307/1495483.

Fixico, Donald L. "Ethics and Responsibilities in Writing American Indian History." *American Indian Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (1996): 29. https://doi.org/10.2307/1184939.

Goodman, Audrey. "The Tasks of Southwestern Translation: Charles Lummis at Isleta Pueblo, 1888-1892." *Journal of the Southwest* 43, no. 3 (2001): 343–78. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40170224.

Gordon, Dudley. "California's First Half-Century of Statehood, 1850-1900." *Southern California Quarterly* 53, no. 2 (1971): 133–46. https://doi.org/10.2307/41170345.

Gordon, Dudley. "Charles F. Lummis and Jack London: An Evaluation." *Southern California Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1964): 83–88. https://doi.org/10.2307/41169831.

Gordon, Dudley. "Charles F. Lummis: Pioneer American Folklorist." *Western Folklore* 28, no. 3 (1969): 175–81. https://doi.org/10.2307/1499263.

Gordon, Dudley. "Charles Fletcher Lummis, Cultural Pioneer of the Southwest." *Arizona and the West* 1, no. 4 (1959): 305–16. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40166983.

Gordon, Dudley. "El Alisal: The House That Lummis Built." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (1953): 19–28. https://doi.org/10.2307/41168385.

Gram, John Reynolds. "Acting Out Assimilation: Playing Indian and Becoming American in the Federal Indian Boarding Schools." *American Indian Quarterly* 40, no. 3 (2016): 251–73. https://doi.org/10.5250/amerindiquar.40.3.0251.

Grinde, Donald A. Jr. "Taking the Indian out of the Indian: U.S. Policies of Ethnocide through Education." *Wicazo Sa Review* 19, no. 2 (2004): 25–32. https://doi.org/10.1353/wic.2004.0018.

Hackett, Charles Wilson. "The Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico in 1680," *The Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* 15, no. 2, (Oct. 1911): 98-9.

Hazeltine, Mayo W. "What Shall be Done about Cuba?" *The North American Review* 163. no. 481 (Dec., 1896): 731-742.

Hijiya, James A. "Why the West Is Lost." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (April 1994): 276–92.

Horsman, Reginald. "American Indian Policy in the Old Northwest, 1783-1812." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (January): 35-53. 1961. https://doi.org/10.2307/1922806.

Jackson, John B. "The Spanish Pueblo Fallacy." *Southwest Review* 35, no. 1 (1950): 19–26. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43466892.

Kinnicutt, Lincoln N. "Plymouth's Debt to the Indians." *The Harvard Theological Review* 13, no. 4 (1920): 345–61. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1507717.

Koegel, John. "Mexican-American Music in Nineteenth-Century California: The Lummis Wax Cylinder Collection at the Southwest Museum, Los Angeles." *Revista de Musicología* 16, no. 4 (1993): 2080–95. https://doi.org/10.2307/20796069.

Kryder-Reid, Elizabeth. In *California Mission Landscapes: Race, Memory, and the Politics of Heritage*. University of Minnesota Press. 2016. 71–134. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt1jktq29.7.

Liebmann, Matthew, T.J. Ferguson, and Robert W. Preucel. "Pueblo Settlement, Architecture, and Social Change in the Pueblo Revolt Era, A.D. 1680 to 1696." *Journal of Field Archaeology* 30, no. 1 (2005): 45-60. https://doi.org/10.1179/009346905791072459.

Margo Curtis E, Harman LE, Smith DB. "The Curious Blindness of Charles F. Lummis." *Arch Ophthalmology* 129 no. 5 (2011): 655–660. https://doi:10.1001/archophthalmol.2011.79.

Mathes, Valerie Sherer and Phil Brigandi. "The Mischief Record of 'La Gobernadora': Amelia Stone Quinton, Charles Fletcher Lummis, and the Warner Ranch Indian Removal." *The Journal of San Diego History* 57 (2011): 69–96.

Maxwell, Margaret F. "The Lion and the Lady: The Firing of Miss Mary Jones. *American Libraries* 9 no. 5 (May, 1978): 268-72. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25623320.

"Necrology: Amado Chaves." *New Mexico Historical Review* 6, Iss. 1 (Jan 1, 1931): 100.

Newmark, Marco. "Charles Fletcher Lummis." *The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (1950): 45–60. https://doi.org/10.2307/41168228.

"Notes and Queries: Charles F. Lummis." *California Folklore Quarterly* 1 no. 3 (July, 1942): 291.

Padget, Martin. "Travel, Exoticism, and the Writing of Region: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the 'Creation' of the Southwest." *Journal of the Southwest* 37, no. 3 (1995): 421–49. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40169930.

Pittenger, John R. "What Good Can There Be in This Kind of Human? Spanish Justification for the Conquest of the Americas." *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* 7 article 7 (Jan, 2020): 62-67.

Rabasa, José. "Aesthetics of Colonial Violence: The Massacre of Acoma in Gaspar de Villagrá's 'Historia de La Nueva México.'" *College Literature.* vol. 20, no. 3

(1993): 96–114. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25112061.

Righter, Robert W. "National Monuments to National Parks: The Use of the Antiquities Act of 1906." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (1989): 281–301. https://doi.org/10.2307/969536.

Riley, Michael J. "Constituting the Southwest Contesting the Southwest Re-Inventing the Southwest." *Journal of the Southwest* 36, no. 3 (1994): 221–41. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40169909.

Sacks, Benjamin. "Charles Fletcher Lummis at Hotel Del Coronado: The Spanish Fiesta, Spring 1894." *Southern California Quarterly* 78, no. 2 (1996): 139–74. https://doi.org/10.2307/41171808.

Snead, James E. "Lessons of the Ages: Archaeology and the Construction of Cultural Identity in the American Southwest." *Journal of the Southwest* 44 no. 1 (Spring 2002): 17-34.

Sobré, J. M. "Don Quixote, the Hero Upside-Down." *Hispanic Review* 44, no. 2 (1976): 127–41. https://doi.org/10.2307/472831.

Stahl, Wayne. "The U.S. And Native American Education: A Survey of Federal Legislation." *Journal of American Indian Education* 18, no. 3 (May): 28–32. 1979. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24397200

Staples, Joseph Perry. "Constructing the *Land of Sunshine*: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Marketing of a Post-Frontier West." Dissertation. University of Arizona. 2004.

Tanrisal, Meldan. "Devising a Syncretistic Version of Catholicism Among the Pueblo." *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty Letters* 191 no. 21 (2002): 43-52.

Thompson, Raymond Harris. "The Antiquities Act of 1906 by Ronald Freeman Lee." *Journal of the Southwest* 42, no. 2 (2000): 197–269. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40170127.

Trennert, Robert A. "From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930." *Pacific Historical Review* 52, no. 3 (August 1983): 267–91. https://doi.org/10.2307/3639003.

Van Slyck, Abigail A. "Mañana, Mañana: Racial Stereotypes and the Anglo Rediscovery of the Southwest's Vernacular Architecture, 1890-1920." *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 5 (1995): 95–108. https://doi.org/10.2307/3514248.

Vecsey, Christopher. "Pueblo Indian Catholicism: The Isleta Case." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 16, no. 2 (1998): 1–19. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25154631.

Watkins, Frances E. "'He Said It with Music': Spanish-California Folk Songs Recorded by Charles F. Lummis." *California Folklore Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (1942): 359–67. https://doi.org/10.2307/1495602.

Watkins, Frances E. "Charles F. Lummis and the Sequoya League." *The Quarterly: Historical Society of Southern California* 26, no. 2/3 (1944): 99–114. https://doi.org/10.2307/41168959.

Watts, Jennifer A. "Photography in the *Land of Sunshine*: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the Regional Ideal." *Southern California Quarterly* 87, no. 4 (2005): 339–76. https://doi.org/10.2307/41172283.

Weber, Francis J. "The California Missions and Their Visitors." *The Americas* 24, no. 4 (1968): 319–36. https://doi.org/10.2307/980221.

Wilcox, David R., and Don D. Fowler. "The Beginnings of Anthropological Archaeology in the North American Southwest: From Thomas Jefferson to the Pecos Conference." *Journal of the Southwest* 44, no. 2 (2002): 121–234. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40170244.

Winship, A. E. "Charles F. Lummis, Pioneer of the Great Southwest." *The Journal of Education* 102, No. 17 (1925): 449–449. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42832003.

Pamphlets

Lummis, Charles. *Let's Save California's Noblest Monument of History and Romance.* Pamphlet. *1925.*

Supreme Court Cases

Barker v. Harvey, 181 U.S. 481 (1901).

Congressional Acts

United States Congress. The General Allotment Act. 25 U.S.C. §§ 331-334, 339, 341, 342, 348, 349, 354, 381. 1887.