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In 1996 the University of New Mexico Press issued a paperback edi-
tion of Herbert Bolton’s *The Spanish Borderlands*, adding a new introduction by Albert Hurtado. When the book originally appeared in 1921, it created almost single-handedly the field of borderlands historical study. In certain respects, Bolton’s book has aged well over the last three-quarters of a century. It established the geographical scope of the Spanish Borderlands and defined the chronological limits across time. Moreover, Bolton introduced many of the historiographical themes that have occupied several generations of scholars.

Despite the work’s status as a classic, readers should evaluate it carefully. *The Spanish Borderlands* remains an appropriate starting point for students interested in the subject. But its implicit and explicit assumptions about race, ethnicity, gender, and social history raise troubling questions for contemporary readers. Scholars of the Spanish Borderlands must confront both the strengths and the weaknesses of Bolton’s book in the context of the voluminous literature that has followed in its wake in the last seventy-five years. Yet few scholars today would be willing to dismiss *The Spanish Borderlands* because we are still building on Bolton’s ideas.

Study of the Spanish borderlands has become increasingly complex in terms of defining and delimiting the field. Bolton’s objectives in writing his book, however, were surprisingly straightforward: “This book is to tell of Spanish pathfinders and pioneers in the regions between Florida and California, now belonging to the United States, over which Spain held sway for centuries” (p. xiv). Bolton considered Spanish influence as fundamental to understanding borderland history as that of the Dutch to understanding colonial New York. In introducing the term *borderlands* and laying out its organizational scheme, Bolton’s book created the parameters for study of the region for future generations of historians and initiated debates that still rage over the definition, focus, and scope of the field.

The “Bolton school” that grew out of Bolton’s influence can be identified by its emphasis on narrative history, a focus on institutions and great men, and a pro-Spanish point of view. Bolton devoted about half of his 1921 volume to telling the stories of the great Spanish explorers of the Southeast and the Southwest and the rest to chronicling colonization according to geographical areas. Bolton thus focused on Spanish pioneer leaders and their accomplishments. Oddly enough, the term *borderlands* was actually not Bolton’s but came from someone on the staff of the original publisher, Yale University Press.

*The Spanish Borderlands* displays Bolton’s tendency to glorify things Hispanic, in reaction to the Anglo-American historiographical perspective prevailing when he wrote the book. To combat the anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish biases of “Black Legend” history that were common in his time, Bolton produced a “White Legend” record of great civilizing institutions, heroic soldiers, and selfless missionaries. But in so doing, he ignored the costs of the conquest and settlement to the Native Americans.
To judge the *Spanish Borderlands* fairly, readers should keep in mind that the book was written in the early decades of the twentieth century and that Bolton collaborated with a ghostwriter. The book’s rhetorical style and cultural sensibilities reflect a time when now-discredited theories of Anglo-Saxon superiority over other racial and ethnic groups were assumed by most U.S. citizens. The use of phrases like “standard-bearer of the white race” (p. 12) strike a dissonant note seventy-five years later. Yet Bolton was ahead of his time in other important ways. Writing in the racist and ethnocentric intellectual milieu following World War I, Bolton stressed the many positive contributions of the Hispanic past in the southeastern and southwestern United States. He set the early history of these areas within a Spanish imperial context rather than as background to the arrival of the Anglo-American settlers.

Albert Hurtado’s fascinating introduction to the 1996 paperback edition traces the evolution of *The Spanish Borderlands* from Bolton’s initial concept to the finished product, shedding insight on the collective creative process that produced it. Bolton originally proposed the book as a volume in Yale University Press’s Chronicles of America Series, as a study that would present solid historical research in the compelling narrative style of Francis Parkman. The press accepted Bolton’s proposal, and he wrote a first draft. The style of his manuscript, however, was rejected by the series editor. After a major second revision, the editor still refused to approve publication. Bolton, overcommitted and pressed for time, agreed to a ghostwriter furnished by the press to make the manuscript stylistically acceptable for the series. The press selected Constance Lindsay Skinner, another author in the series, to rewrite the work. Bolton retained final control over the historical content of the finished manuscript.

This joint literary parentage explains certain anomalies in the book’s point of view. Bolton was unhappy with Skinner’s revisions, especially her Anglocentric historical perspective. Skinner, in turn, wanted Bolton to write from “an American point of view,” not “a Spanish one.” Bolton considered this view backward and refused to comply. He also fought with the ghostwriter in order to maintain his organizational scheme. In the end, Bolton accepted many of Skinner’s literary revisions. Thus in a work inclined to present the Spanish in a positive way, passages reflecting an Anglocentric bent occasionally crop up. For example,

Spain had kept the minds of her people dark in a day when other nations, accepting the challenge of new forces, were working out the principles of constitutional government and of individual liberty. In clinging to a selfish and fictitious ideal and in forcibly molding her people to it, she deprived them of the power of initiative and of systematic labor—the power which is derived from hope and joy—and so rendered them incapable of intellectual supremacy in an age differentiated from its predecessors by greater freedom and spiritual enlightenment. (Pp. 233–34)

When he wrote the book, Bolton worried that “the borderlands”
constituted a neglected area of historical study. The success of *The Spanish Borderlands* ended any such neglect. By the end of the 1920s, Bolton had become one of the most influential historians in the United States. His graduate seminar at the University of California at Berkeley quickly proved to be the foundation of a new school of historical interpretation. Dozens of his students formed a generation of “Boltonians” who dominated the study of the field as defined in their mentor’s classic. These Boltonians and their students in turn produced a constant stream of books and articles that legitimized the historical field now known as the Spanish borderlands.

The Boltonian perspective even influenced popular writing on the Hispanic colonial heritage of the United States. Robert Silverberg’s *The Pueblo Revolt* is an excellent example of the Boltonian influence at work in the popular history of the region. First published in 1970, this book actually harked back to the epic style of historical narrative popular during Bolton’s era. *The Pueblo Revolt* reflected a more current focus and perspective than those of the early Bolton school, however. Written by an author known best for his fiction, the volume provided a descriptive overview of New Mexican history from the Coronado expedition to the refounding of the province of New Mexico in 1692 by Diego de Vargas. The title is therefore somewhat misleading in that only a few chapters deal explicitly with the 1680 revolt. Much of *The Pueblo Revolt* presents a straightforward historical narrative examining the early civil, religious, and military development of New Mexico. The book also includes chapters on the demography of Native American populations prior to the European encounter, the initial explorations of Francisco Coronado, the founding of a permanent settlement by Juan de Oñate, the governorship of Pedro de Peralta, subsequent expansion of the colony, and its troubled times in the mid-seventeenth century. The volume nevertheless emphasizes the Pueblo Revolt as the defining event of New Mexico’s history during its first one hundred years.

*The Pueblo Revolt* thus provides a readable overview of the first century of New Mexican history. As a professional writer rather than an academic historian, Silverberg stressed spinning a good tale calculated to hold the attention of nonspecialists. Such an approach still appeals to beginning students and general readers. Expert readers along with those already familiar with New Mexican history, however, will find nothing new nor much analysis beyond the explicative presentation of historical events.

*The Pueblo Revolt* rests at times on a presentist frame of reference. For example, Silverberg characterizes Popé, the leader of the revolt, in almost romantic contemporary terms: “At the heart of this conspiracy was a man neither peaceful nor harmless: Popé, the embittered medicine doctor. . . . We would call him a militant today, or perhaps a Pueblo nationalist. Certainly he was something of a religious fanatic, imbued with a fiery love for the kachina faith” (p. 113). Moreover, the book places the Pueblo Revolt in a global context that presupposes a “march of time” frame of reference. Silv-
verberg comments, “Human history is an archive of conquests. . . . in the past five hundred years, particularly, the men of Europe have spilled forth to the other continents, coolly claiming land that other men thought they owned” (p. 203).

This passage also highlights Silverberg’s frame of reference, the Native American viewpoint. Yet this pro-Native American perspective rests as much on his acceptance of a “Black Legend” view of the Spanish as on empathy with the indigenous populations. Writing of the initial Spanish forays into the Rio Grande pueblos, Silverberg observes, “lacking that streak of cruelty that marked most of his countrymen, Coronado was unable by nature to commit the atrocities and acts of treachery that had marked the Spanish conquests of Mexico and Peru” (p. 24).

The broad narrative approach of The Pueblo Revolt with its almost guileless historical analysis can be explained by the fact that Silverberg based his entire study on the few secondary and published primary sources available to him in the late 1960s, when he researched the book. Charles Wilson Hackett’s 1942 collection of documents, Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermín’s Attempted Reconquest, forms almost the entire documentary base of The Pueblo Revolt, along with secondary works by J. B. Bailey, Herbert Bolton, J. M. Espinosa, and Edward Spicer. As a result, the book lacks sophisticated inquiry into factors such as racial intermixing and problems of acculturation as causes of the revolt. It favors instead motivations based solely on the politics of Spanish policy, economic determinism, and religion. A more recent historical analysis by Andrew Knaut, The Pueblo Revolt of 1680: Conquest and Resistance in Seventeenth-Century New Mexico (1997), provides more in-depth historical analysis of the uprising than Silverberg’s volume. Nonetheless, Silverberg’s book may never be equaled as a literary exposition of the Pueblo Revolt. More than a quarter-century after its first publication in 1970, the book still represents a fine example of borderlands history as epic narrative of high adventure.

The Bolton school’s dominance of borderlands history began to wane in the 1960s and 1970s, as younger scholars asked historical questions based on their own social, cultural, and demographic interests. While many scholars continued to write in the Boltonian mode, a growing number of historians departed from the institutional focus and pro-Spanish point of view. Some also redefined the geographical area encompassed by the term borderlands.

Elizabeth John’s groundbreaking study, Storms Brewed in Other Men’s Worlds: The Confrontation of Indians, Spaniards, and French in the Southwest, 1540–1795, marked a transformation in the historical viewpoint previously associated with the Boltonian borderlands. Her 1975 study cast aside Bolton’s institutional frame of reference and assumed the perspective of Native Americans. A native of southwestern Oklahoma who had written on the Taovayas of that region, John presented in this volume a “grand syn-
thesis” of European-indigenous relations from the sixteenth to the late eighteenth centuries. Her finely crafted narrative focused on Native American reactions to European encroachment from the expeditions of Coronado to the arrival of Anglo-Americans. The study showed that the borderlands region between the Mississippi and Rio Grande rivers marked an area of geographical rivalry among the empires of France, Spain, and Great Britain, with Native Americans functioning as both pawns and third-party catalysts in the struggle. John postulated that the advent of the Anglo frontier of the United States ended this rivalry and created an enduring stability in the region. Her basic orientation was to present “the triumphs of humane intent, of law and justice, and of intelligent, purposeful adaptation to sweeping change among both Indians and Spaniards” (p. xii).

Storms Brewed in Other Men’s Worlds has now been reissued in a second edition with a new preface by John, who has continued to research the topic actively. Her intention in the mid-1970s was to write a second volume that would continue her story of “adaptive interplay” between Native Americans and Europeans into the middle of the nineteenth century, when Mexican domination ended after the war with the United States. The disarray of documents on that time period delayed the second volume, although John has continued to publish while anticipating new scholarship from a rising generation of borderland students.

Scholars will continue to acknowledge Storms as a landmark in the refinement of borderlands scholarship for several reasons. First, it firmly shifted historical viewpoints from the Spaniards to Native Americans. Second, the book employed a transnational European perspective of the borderlands that emphasized equally Spanish, French, British, and U.S. influences in the region. Third, the book’s geographical frame of reference rejoined the frontier of the Mississippi Valley borderlands with that of the upper Rio Grande. Historians of the Bolton school had long tended to compartmentalize the region into two distinct zones: the southwestern and southeastern borderlands. John demonstrated that no such conceptual division existed, at least not in the minds of its inhabitants. In her view, events in Santa Fe impacted those in New Orleans, while the Red River served as a natural highway that tied the mid-Mississippi Valley to Hispanic New Mexico from the Native American point of view. For all these reasons, Storms will remain a landmark in borderlands historical literature.

Oakah Jones’s Los Paisanos: Spanish Settlers on the Northern Frontier of New Spain (1979) also ranged far afield from Bolton’s geographical and historical focus. The 1996 paperback edition includes a new preface by the author. Jones’s thesis remains the same:

Spanish settlers on the northern frontier of New Spain were more numerous than has been supposed, and they not only developed a culture distinct from those in other parts of the viceroyalty but contributed markedly to the development and permanent occupation of a ten-state region on the northern frontier of New Spain.
These settlers were everyday people who created a culture reflecting institutions brought from Europe, yet modified to meet the challenge of different environmental conditions. This culture became the nucleus of the present Mexican society in the northern states of that republic and the Spanish-speaking lifestyle in the southwestern states of the United States of America. (P. vii)

In the late 1970s, Jones found that most scholars had studied institutions and leaders, despite the importance of ordinary settlers. Jones concentrated instead on these everyday people and their role in northward expansion from the early sixteenth century to the end of Spanish control of Mexico in 1821. He focused on the establishment of civilian settlements (rather than presidios or missions), who the settlers were and what they represented, and their lifestyles. Jones found northward movement occurring along four general lines, gradually and unevenly over three centuries. He organized his subsequent chapters along the four lines of expansion, starting with the northeast but concentrating always on civilian settlement.

Settlers headed for the northern frontier of New Spain for many reasons, although royal incentives were usually needed to get civilians there. Most came from other settled areas in New Spain, not directly from Europe. They were working people, mostly agriculturists, ranchers, and artisans. Land attracted those living in central New Spain, where land was in short supply. Also, mining activities and presidios created a market for agricultural products. But despite the existence of some mining districts, most settlers were farmers and ranchers who lived in frontier communities rather than dispersed out on the land. These communities tended to be founded first, with land given out as part of community membership. Residents later dispersed into the surrounding areas to obtain land grants. Unlike the pattern on the U.S. frontier, urban areas did not form when population density in rural areas increased through random settlement of individuals. At least one civilian community developed in each province, even where missions and presidio establishments were strong. The civilian population in frontier areas was much larger than most have supposed, about 10 percent of New Spain’s population of 4,483,559 (as calculated by Alexander von Humboldt in the 1790s). Population concentrated in certain regions, notably in Nueva Vizcaya, Sonora, and Sinaloa, where mines were operating. The smallest numbers were found in Texas and California, which were newly settled in the 1790s.

In Los Paisanos, Jones pointed out numerous historical differences between the main Spanish settlements in the center of the viceroyalty and those of the borderland periphery of New Spain. The middle-class rancho was more characteristic of the northern frontier of New Spain than the hacienda system common in the center. Class distinctions differed in the frontier and the center. In the north, the word Spaniard “came to mean anyone of Spanish heritage or ‘civilized’ life style” (p. 246). Spaniard could also include castes and Hispanized Indians, leaving only unpacified Indians as
outsiders. In this reality, class conflict among whites largely disappeared. Conflict between criollos and peninsulares on the northern frontier was minimal by the onset of Mexican independence. Land was owned both communally and privately, private property being handed out in town grants. Thus private property was more common on the frontier than in the center, where ejidos were the rule. Isolation from central New Spain and the interdependence of all groups of settlers may explain northern Mexico’s strong support for liberalism in the nineteenth century and for the revolution in the twentieth.

Jones also highlighted numerous differences from the later Anglo-American frontier. Northern New Spain was more organized and controlled by its government. Civilian communities were planned in advance and established at first occupation. Settlers were recruited—they did not decide individually to go out and make their fortune on the frontier. Civilians were not even allowed to travel freely in New Spain. The frontier was not a “safety valve” for population pressure. Nor was land speculation part of the picture on the northern frontier of New Spain.

While acknowledging the importance of Bolton and his students, Jones diverged from the Bolton school in various ways in Los Paisanos. He did not employ the term Spanish Borderlands, preferring northern frontier of New Spain. Jones expanded Bolton’s notion of geographical area to include several northern territories of New Spain that remained part of Mexico after 1848. For Jones, “the frontier is seen as a continuous northward expansion spanning three centuries, and no attempt is made to draw an arbitrary boundary between Mexico and the United States” (p. viii). He perceived northward expansion as a four-pronged process and separated Bolton’s northwestern borderlands into a northwest section (Sinaloa and Sonora) and a Pacific one (Baja and Alta California). Finally, Jones transcended Bolton’s narrow institutional scope by adopting Silvio Zavala’s expanded concept of frontier institutions to include the towns, ranches, and farms of Spaniards. Jones also examined simple people and everyday life, not just institutions and their leaders.

In his new preface, Jones discusses the historical works pertinent to the focus of Los Paisanos that have been published since the first edition in 1979 as well as recent changes in the field. Surveying trends in borderland research in the 1980s and 1990s, Jones perceives continuing movement away from institutional histories toward social and cultural studies of Hispanics in the Southwest. He also finds more methodological influences from other disciplines in the social sciences, notably anthropology, archaeology, ethnohistory, sociology, and geography. Finally, Jones notes an expanding time frame consisting of the Mexican period (1821–1848) and the U.S. period (1848 to the present). Los Paisanos fits well with these historiographical trends. Jones’s sources also reflect his differences from the Boltonians. He conducted his research in provincial and state archives, which
contain more documents with material on local issues and commonplace activities than do national archives. Jones made particular use of censuses, church records of baptisms, deaths, and marriages, legal records of wills and inheritances, and local laws.

Bolton and his students considered Spanish Louisiana, along with the rest of the colonial Southeast, to be part of the Spanish borderlands. The Spanish experience in the lower Mississippi Valley attracted the notice of a number of Boltonian scholars, including John Caughey and Lawrence Kinnaird. Their scholarly studies subjected the province to the same sort of institutional histories created elsewhere in the literature on colonial borderlands. That institutional viewpoint began to wane in the 1960s and 1970s, as younger scholars posed different questions.

The early 1980s marked an era when new sources and new perspectives changed the study of the Spanish Borderlands. This trend can be seen clearly in the case of Spanish Louisiana. Derek Kerr’s Petty Felony, Slave Defiance, and Frontier Villainy: Crime and Criminal Justice in Spanish Louisiana, 1770–1803 serves as a benchmark analysis in this transition. Researched as a dissertation at Tulane University and completed in 1982, the work was later published with little revision as the 1993 book of the same title. Kerr was among the first historians to consult the extensive records of the Cabildo of New Orleans to assess the legal culture and social relationships of Spanish Louisiana reflected in these materials. In so doing, he “examined the judicial process in the courts of Spanish Louisiana to determine the extent of criminal activity, the composition of the judiciary, and the specific adaptations to the Spanish system of justice to accommodate the Louisiana situation” (pp. xv–xvi).

The Cabildo served as the province’s primary court of legal procedure as well as the New Orleans municipal council. Hence its historical records contain a tremendous amount of material on social deviancy, the socioeconomic nature of crime in the colony, race, and the role of slavery in Louisiana’s criminal justice system. Kerr consulted all 269 criminal cases heard by the Cabildo and found that these cases highlighted socioeconomic and class pressures in the colony. “Criminal activity,” he concluded, “was mainly limited to a small sector of foreigners, the military garrison, and the lower-class urbanites” (p. 147). This description applied especially to Spanish soldiers stationed in the colony, who represented “the dregs of European and colonial society” (p. 159). In contrast, Kerr determined that most criminal proceedings against slaves and free blacks represented Spanish attempts to control Africans rather than the adjudication of criminal deviancy.

As a product of the early 1980s, Kerr’s study heralded a wholesale reorientation in the historical literature on Spanish Louisiana. Within the decade, important studies of the nature of slavery in the colony, the role of free women of color, and the material culture of the province had transformed the basic orientation of this body of scholarship.
The scholarly emphasis on Native Americans in the borderlands has reached new heights in recent decades with the work of ethnologists and historical archaeologists. Some of the best research in the colonial borderlands has been accomplished in disciplines other than history. The same may be said of the southeastern borderlands, especially Spanish Florida, where various scholars focused closely on native populations, including John Griffin, Charles Fairbanks, Charles Hudson, Kathleen Deagan, Jerald Milanich, and John Worth. They have rejected a Eurocentric frame of reference by studying indigenous groups on their own terms. The most impressive recent example of this orientation is John Hann’s *A History of the Timucua Indians and Missions*.

The Timucua, along with the Apalachee and the Calusa, were one of the three major Native American groups encountered in the Southeast by the Spanish. Hann notes, “Timucua-speakers were the most numerous among the three groups at contact and directly occupied more territory than any other native people in sixteenth-century Florida” (p. xi). He employed a sophisticated blend of documentary, ethnographic, and archaeological sources to study Timucua religion, language, culture, and society. The book also offers a compelling survey of relations between the Timucua and the Spanish, always using the Native American frame of reference. This perspective enhances readers’ understanding of the mission era, the Timucua Revolt of the 1650s, the eventual failure of the missions, and the gradual decline of the tribe. The process culminated with the transshipment of the few remaining Timucua to Cuba as Florida was transferred to the British in 1763.

Also reflecting the increasing influence of disciplines other than history is Frederick Gehlbach’s *Mountain Islands and Desert Seas: A Natural History of the U.S.-Mexican Borderlands*. Professor Emeritus of biology and environmental studies at Baylor University, Gehlbach seeks to acquaint general readers with the diversity of the natural landscape of the borderlands in order to foster interest in its conservation. His engaging storytelling skills and nontechnical language draw his readers into the drama of a changing landscape.

Believing that environmental decisions must be informed by knowledge of natural history, Gehlbach uses a historical approach in his work on borderlands environmental issues. He asserts the importance of knowing how and when the landscape arrived at its present condition in order to create a base of knowledge for land-use planning. Gehlbach compares the conditions described in the materials produced by participants in two United States-Mexican Boundary Surveys, the first (1849–1855) and the second (1891–1896), with information from the more focused works of nineteenth-century naturalists, the observations of mid-twentieth-century field biologists, and his own findings in twenty-five years of fieldwork from the 1950s to the 1970s. Gehlbach relies on a literal notion of border-
lands: the lands on either side of the modern international boundary. He addresses the border systematically, sector by sector from the eastern end of the boundary in Texas west to California. Because Gehlbach has criss-crossed all sectors of the borderlands, his narratives exude a personal quality that enhances the book’s accessibility and its poignancy.

Gehlbach is particularly interested in the impact of “culture” (human interaction), which has accelerated the natural processes of change in the borderlands. Time and again, man-made impacts on the environment are portrayed in their far-reaching (and frequently negative) effects on the landscape and animal life of the border zone. In Gehlbach’s assessment, changes wrought by natural causes (such as fire, flood, and drought) have been far outstripped by those triggered by man-made “unnatural causes.” These include water use and diversion, overgrazing, trampling, insecticide use, hunting, predator-eradication programs, and the introduction of new plants and animals into ecological systems.

The sum of these impacts—and anticipated effects if human penetration of borderlands wild areas continues unchecked—leads Gehlbach to call for establishing extensive “living museums” to sustain the borderlands ecosystems amidst the pressures of population growth and concentration. His study of the human-carrying capacity of these lands has led to his estimate that maintaining the environment would require setting aside an overall average of 40 percent of the acreage in the borderlands (more in arid regions, less in better-watered areas) and limiting these areas to nondamaging recreational use.

The volume edited by Ralph Vigil, Frances Kaye, and John Wunder, *Spain and the Plains: Myths and Realities of Spanish Exploration and Settlement on the Great Plains* also reflects the contributions to borderland studies of disciplines other than history. Yet many essays in this work are based on perspectives similar to Bolton’s. Drawn largely from articles published in the *Great Plains Quarterly* in the early 1990s, this collection seeks to separate myth from reality in considering the Spanish presence in the Great Plains. In the first two chapters, editors Vigil and Wunder contribute an introduction and a narrative timeline running from 1494 to 1821, thus setting five previously published articles into a broader context. Each of the two main sections of the book has a brief introduction by the editors.

Five essays on diverse topics form the core of *Spain and the Plains*. In “Spanish Exploration and the Great Plains in the Age of Discovery,” historian Vigil points out that Spanish explorers of the sixteenth century have often been presented as more modern than they really were. Although eighteenth-century explorations were driven by military needs, early explorers were motivated by mythical geography (looking for the fountain of youth, the straits of Anian, or Quivira) and combined religious and economic motives that would seem antithetical in the twentieth century. Thus
early exploration of the Great Plains is congruent with the exploration and settlement of the main areas of Spanish colonization.

“Coronado and Quivira” by Waldo Wedel combines historical and archaeological evidence to validate Bolton’s conclusion that central Kansas was the location of Coronado’s Quivira. Wedel reinforces the documentary analysis used by Bolton for his 1940 retracing of Coronado’s journey in Coronado, Knight of the Pueblos and Plains with a geographical analysis of Kansas topography and analysis of physical artifacts (pottery and chain mail) found in two counties in present-day central Kansas.

Félix Almaraz’s “An Uninviting Land: El Llano Estacado, 1534–1821” discusses the early history of that region of Texas. Although the Spanish had many contacts with its inhabitants and crossed the Llano Estacado for various reasons, they did not settle there in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Lack of sources of fresh water in the region precluded its settlement under the provisions of Spanish law. After the resettlement of New Mexico in 1692, interest reemerged in the area as the key to linking the settlements of Santa Fe and San Antonio on the northern frontier of New Spain. In pointing out the centrality of water scarcity to the lack of Spanish settlement, Almaraz challenges Walter Prescott Webb’s and J. Evetts Haley’s imputations of Spanish inability as the cause of nonsettlement.

In “The Villasur Expedition and the Segesser Hide Paintings,” Thomas Chávez assesses the historical value of two eighteenth-century hide paintings sent to Europe by the Swiss Jesuit Father Philipp von Segesser von Brunegg. These two paintings (now in the Museum of New Mexico in the Palace of Governors in Santa Fe) depict battles fought during the disastrous 1720 expedition of Don Pedro de Villasur to investigate French incursions on the Great Plains. One hide painting shows both Europeans and Indians attacking the Spaniards and their Indian allies. Chávez concludes that this depiction proves that the French were involved in the ambush, as Spanish survivors claimed.

Russell Magnaghi’s “The Genízaro Experience in Spanish New Mexico” describes the free detribalized plains Indians living in Spanish New Mexico. Most were sold to the Spanish as slaves by the Comanches. They worked off the price of their ransom as “indios sirvientes” to masters who attended to their acculturation. They were then freed. Denied access to land because they were neither Spanish nor Pueblo, many Genízaros settled on the frontiers of New Mexico and thus formed a buffer against “wild Indians.”

Vigil’s epilogue ties the Hispanic presence in the Great Plains to the broader issues of Mexican and Mexican-American history and culture. Like Bolton, Vigil argues that Spanish-American history can be presented properly only as part of an integrated view of North American history. It cannot be compartmentalized. As Vigil explains, “In this sense, Hispanic history is
the history of frontiers in which various cultures have met, clashed, and blended. Given this perspective, southwestern history of the United States and the history of the Great Plains is a part of European, Indian, Mexican, and U.S. history that cannot be fully understood except in the context of the epic of Greater America” (p. 144). Vigil also summarizes Hispanic contributions to the Southwest’s economic development in farming, ranching, and mining.

Oscar Martínez’s recent textbook U.S.-Mexican Borderlands: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives illustrates both the redefined geography and the expanded time frame of borderlands studies described by Oakah Jones in the preface to Los Paisanos. In recent decades, numerous social scientists have begun to study the region surrounding the modern boundary between the United States and Mexico as part of a common international frontier zone they call “the borderlands.” These analysts use the term to mean the modern geopolitical and cultural region running along both sides of the international boundary from Texas to California, a very different usage of the term in time and place from that of colonial historians steeped in the Bolton tradition. This “border studies” orientation in the social sciences has yielded much solid borderlands scholarship examining the contemporary international boundary zone by focusing broadly on its history, economy, culture, language, and demography. These scholars come from history but also from economics, business administration, anthropology, sociology, and political science, among others. Their time frame generally starts no earlier than 1848, when the modern international boundary began to assume its current configuration. In addition, they often employ a more defined frame of reference than colonial historians, concentrating only on geographic areas of commonality along a shared frontier zone.

Martínez’s U.S.-Mexico Borderlands exemplifies the border studies orientation also delineated in current scholarship under the borderland rubric. The book contains scholarly essays as well as primary documents from the era reprinted as commentaries on the times. The volume features essays by Martínez, Richard Griswold del Castillo, Angela Moyano Pahissa, Joseph Park, Miguel Tinker Salas, Mardee Belding de Wetter, Linda Hall, Donald Coerver, Thomas Sheridan, Lawrence Herzog, Bill Lindering, Daniel Arreola, and James Curtis. U.S.-Mexico Borderlands also contains contemporaneous documents ranging from the “Texas Declaration of Independence” of 1836 to modern newspaper articles dealing with border issues.

The various essays illustrate the use of the term borderlands to define presentist issues touching the modern border zone. Topics include the making of the modern international border in the nineteenth century, filibustering and racism in the area, the border zone during the Mexican Revolution, the boom and bust of the wartime era, and the area’s current diversity as an economic zone dominated by maquiladoras. Martínez clearly views the
international boundary as “the borderlands” and styles those who live in the region as “borderlanders.” He observes, for example, “Since the early nineteenth century, borderlanders have witnessed protracted conflict rooted in the vastly unequal power relationship between Mexico and the United States” (p. xiii). Although this usage of the term is valid, the borderlands being analyzed in *U.S.-Mexico Borderlands* exist in a very different chronology than that employed by those who study the same geography as the northern frontier of New Spain.

The volumes reviewed here show that the field of borderlands studies is still flourishing in the 1990s. Scholarly study of the borderlands has been invigorated by debates between Boltonians and their critics over geographical definition, institutional focus, and ethnic perspective. It has also been enriched by numerous social science methodologies and the contributions of scholarly researchers from an array of disciplines. The history of the peoples of the border areas of the United States before and after annexation is also gaining acceptance as part of the mainstream of U.S. history. The original vision of the borderlands as defined by Herbert Bolton has been stretched to include the border areas of modern Mexico, refocused to include Native Americans and everyday life, and expanded chronologically to extend beyond 1821. Given all these changes, it may be assumed that the study of the Spanish borderlands will continue to attract historical analyses of expanding and widening scope for generations to come. What would Bolton think?