

*Nicolás de Aguilar and the Jurisdiction
of Salinas in the Province of New Mexico,
1659-1662*

Joseph P. SÁNCHEZ
University of New Mexico

On December 7, 1664, at the Convento de Santo Domingo in Mexico City, Nicolas de Aguilar stood before the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition and heard his sentence. On charges of obstructing the missionary program, infringing on ecclesiastical jurisdiction and immunity, inciting hostility toward Franciscan friars and disrespect for the church and its teachings, undermining mission discipline, and encouraging native Kachina dances considered to be idolatrous by Franciscan missionaries, his trial had run nineteen months. Although Aguilar had offered a bold and stubborn defense of his conduct in New Mexico, he was found guilty of all charges and sentenced to walk the *auto público de fe*, suffer exile from New Mexico for ten years, and made ineligible to hold administrative office for the rest of his life. Having abjured his errors he was set free¹. Despite his controversial sentencing in which one of the four judges dissented, Aguilar's case had called attention to fundamental problems regarding protection of Indians against colonial abuses. Furthermore, Aguilar's case had rai-

¹ Sentencia de Nicolás de Aguilar in El Fiscal del Santo Oficio contra Nicolas de Aguilar, 1661-1665, Archivo General de la Nación, Sección Inquisición 512, ff. 195. Also see, France V. Scholes, *Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670*, (Albuquerque: Historical Society of New Mexico, 1942), p. 187. The entire case against Nicolás de Aguilar is found in El Fiscal del Santo Oficio contra Nicolás de Aguilar, 1661-1665, Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), México City, Sección Inquisición, 512. Given the nature of the information presented in documents of the Sección Inquisición, AGN, this paper, to a degree, follows a similar story line as that found in *Troublous Times*, but differs in the interpretation of Aguilar by Scholes who followed that made by seventeenth century-Franciscans against Aguilar. The spellings in all footnotes herein are as they appear orthographically in the documents.

sed questions concerning inconsistencies in the execution of church and state policies and the maintenance of balance between the two institutions. In spite of his Franciscan detractors, who called him Attila², Aguilar, a tough, rustic, illiterate frontiersman, believed that his implementation of the pronounced policies and orders of Governor Bernardo López de Mendizábal offered alternatives, albeit contrary, to the Franciscan dominated mission field as regards the treatment of Indians in New Mexico.

Nicolas de Aguilar was born sometime in 1623 of mestizo parentage, and was reared at Yuriripundaro in Michoacan³. He said he had lived with his mother until he was eighteen years old, when he moved to Parral in southern Chihuahua. Aguilar first came to the attention of Spanish officials in 1641 after claim jumpers had caved-in his mine⁴. The teenaged frontiersman appealed to the *justicia mayor*, Juan Soltero Francisco, to bring charges against four men: Sebastián de la Canal, Diego Jiménez, *Alférez* Alonso García de Cárdenas, and Pedro Gonzáles. Apparently, these men had entered Aguilar's mine which was located on land owned by Juan Gutiérrez at Real de San Diego and pulled down a supporting pillar collapsing the mine in the hope of intimidating the young miner to abandon his claims. Aguilar stated that his mine was seventy-two feet deep (six estados) and that among other minerals, he was mining for iron. *Justicia Mayor* Soltero brought charges against the marauders and found in favor of Aguilar.

For the next thirteen years nothing was heard about Aguilar until a fateful night in mid-February 1654. On the eve of Ash Wednesday of that year, Alonso García de Cárdenas, one of the perpetrators against Aguilar in 1641 and now captain and *alcalde mayor* of the Real de Minas de San Diego, was awakened by a loud knocking on his door⁵. It was late at night, about ten o'clock, and García's servants scurried around in the dark, fumbling for their lanterns. Outside could be heard the sound of men's voices. «Come and do the business important to the service of the king», shouted one of the men to García. When García opened his door, he was greeted by an angry Hernando de Villagómez,

² *Declaración del Capitán Miguel de Noriega, México, October 3, 1661, and Descargo de Acusaciones hecho por Nicolás de Aguilar, Capítulo 42, El Fiscal contra Nicolás de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisition 512, ff. 113.*

³ *Causa de denunciación por querrela que dio Nicolás de Aguilar contra Sebastián de la Canal y otras personas sobre averlo derrumbado un pilar de su mina, 11 de marzo de 1641, Archivo Histórico de Parral, Ciudad Chihuahua, Sección Causas Criminales, año 1641.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Causa criminal contra Nicolás de Aguilar por homicidio cometido en la persona de Germando de Villagómez en San Diego de Minas Nuevas, Archivo Histórico de Parral, Sección Causas Criminales, año 1654.*

mayordomo of the mines and uncle to Nicolas de Aguilar, Villagómez complained that Aguilar had forcibly taken his daughter, his daughter-in-law, and the wife of Nicolas Aroche to a hideout in nearby hills. Without hesitation, Captain García organized the men into a posse of eight Spaniards and eight Indians, and followed a trail to the place where Aguilar held the women.

From his hideout, Aguilar could see the orange-yellow light of torches used by the possemen as they came up the hill, some on horseback, others on foot. Suddenly, from behind a large boulder, he appeared before them. Heavily armed, he pointed an arquebus at the men. In the faint light, they could see that he carried two other arquebuses, one slung and the other in his left hand. He shouted some words at Captain García. The intrepid García shouted back that Aguilar was a thieving dog (*perro ladrón*) and ordered him to «give himself up to the law.» Words were exchanged between Aguilar and his uncle. Aguilar fired his weapon and withdrew into the darkness. Before anyone had realized it, Hernando de Villagómez lay dying from a wound to his forehead. From atop a large boulder, Aguilar held the posse at bay as the man's life ebbed from him. Realizing something terrible had happened, two of the captured women came from behind a boulder. Upon seeing her father dying, one of the women begged Aguilar to let someone get a priest, but he refused. Villagómez died that night in southern Chihuahua. The last any of them knew of Aguilar was the sound of his horse galloping into the night. The next day Captain García and his men tried to find his trail but failed⁶.

Years later in 1663, Aguilar told his version of the shooting. He said his uncle had gone «with the men to kill him.» According to Aguilar, Villagómez fired first with a musket, but his weapon misfired; the spark hit the pan (*cazoleta*) but did not ignite the powder. At that instant, Aguilar returned fire and killed him. He said he escaped with only the shirt and a pair of white trousers he wore that night. Aguilar explained that after he had served the king for eight of ten years, he had been personally pardoned by the governor of Nueva Vizcaya⁷. Actually, he was confused about the chronology of the pardon, for Governor Bernardo López de Mendizábal of New Mexico stated that Aguilar had taken advantage of a *cédula de indulto* issued by the king on the occasion of a prince being born to the royal family. The *cédula de indulto* granted a general amnesty throughout the Empire⁸. As Aguilar

⁶ *Ibíd.*

⁷ Descargo de Acusaciones hecho por Nicolás de Aguilar, Capítulos 42 and 44, El Fiscal contra Nicolás de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512.

⁸ Capitulaciones, Capítulo 75, Primera Audiencia de don Bernardo López de Mendizábal, 1663, AGN, Inquisición 594.

had entered New Mexico during the administration of Governor Juan de Samaniego y Jaca (1653-1656), Governor López vouched that he had satisfactorily proven himself as an able and loyal soldier and citizen. During the late 1650s, Aguilar served as a soldier, actually like most frontiersmen in the category called men-at-arms. As *sargento* and adjutant in the Villa de Santa Fe, probably under Governor Samaniego, and later as inspector (*visitador*) of the trade carreta caravans of Andrés de Gracia, who lived at the bend of the Rio Grande near present El Paso, Aguilar earned his way into the graces of New Mexican administrators. Sometime during this period, he married Catalina Márquez⁹, granddaughter of Gerónimo Márquez, one of the conquistadors who had come to New Mexico with Juan de Oñate (1598-1609). Nicolas and Catalina raised a family of four children¹⁰. In 1659, Governor López upon the recommendation of Governor Juan Manso and the former governor, Juan de Samaniego, appointed Aguilar as *alcalde mayor* of the Jurisdiction of Las Salinas.

As *alcalde mayor*, Nicolas de Aguilar played an important role in the development of Governor López' Indian policy. The office of *alcalde mayor*, which had been created in the mid-1640s in New Mexico, was introduced to administer Indian districts called jurisdictions¹¹. As *alcalde mayor* of the Jurisdiction of Las Salinas, Aguilar was expected to live within the district. His duties included informing Indians of their legal status. To do so, he familiarized himself with issues between Spaniards and Indians in his jurisdiction. In particular, he was expected to report all offenses against Indians. Like other *alcaldes mayores*, he served unsalaried. That aspect of the office of *alcalde mayor*, however, resulted in the use of Indian labor for their own interests¹². Perhaps it was the status of the office that intrigued Aguilar. Governors expected loyalty from their *alcaldes mayores*. In that way, Aguilar was well suited to carry out López' policies. Besides his loyalty to don Bernardo, he was a rugged frontiersman and had proven himself to be a good man in a fight. Aguilar would not wait long to demonstrate his worth to his governor.

⁹ *Ibíd.*

¹⁰ Genealogía de Nicolás de Aguilar, May 8, 1663, El Fiscal contra Nicolás de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512.

¹¹ Información hecha en las Provincias del Nuevo México en virtud de Patente del Reverendísimo Padre, fray Juan de Prada, Comisario General de las Provincias de Nueva España, por el Padre Predicador, fray Tomás Manso, Custodio, sobre agravios hechos a los religiosos de San Francisco que están en dicho Nuevo México por el Governador d. Luis Rosas, Año 1644, Archivo General de Indias, Sevilla, Sección Patronato 244, ramo 7.

¹² Scholes, «Civil Government», *New Mexico Historical Review* (April 1935), Vol. X, No. 2, p. 93. Scholes, *Troublous Times*, p. 40.

As required by law, each governor made a *visita* or inspection of the province he governed¹³. The laws of the Indies specified that an inspection and a report on the Indian pueblos and Spanish settlements in the province be made early in each governor's administration. During his inspection of the pueblos, the governor must explain to the Indians his role as judge and defender of their legal rights. For example, López was required to listen to Indian complaints and submit them to the *jueces ordinarios* (ordinary judges) in the Villa de Santa Fe for investigation, and if necessary, prosecution. One restriction was placed on inspection tours. The law stipulated that the governor was required to make the *visita* only once during his term of office. That did not mean that he could not later visit certain pueblos or consider any other complaints from Indians; the law merely limited the obligation to ensure that for each administration, the entire province would at least be seen once, and that each governor would become familiar with places and situations within his jurisdiction.

In October 1659, López and a retinue of *alcaldes mayores* undertook the inspection of the province¹⁴. Quickly the friars pointed out that the *visita* was made to investigate them, not the items required by law. Everywhere López went the Franciscans were defensive. After the occurrence at the pueblo of Alamillo near Socorro, the friars felt justified in their concern. At Alamillo, López made clear his intention to put the administration of Indian policy under his control and take it away from the missionaries. Taking advantage of anti-missionary sentiment at Alamillo, López demonstrated support for Indian causes.

Sitting at a table which he had placed in the plaza, the bald-headed, bespectacled Governor López gathered his soldiers and the Indians around him. In a series of leading questions, he asked the natives if they «supported the missions.»¹⁵ Furthermore, he wanted to know about concubinage among them and punishments they received for it. López specified that certain crimes not be punished by the friars. Philosophically, López felt that the friars would distinguish between sins against God and crimes against the state. In drawing the line between offenses punishable by friars and those punishable by the civil authority, the governor ordered that Indians could

¹³ *Recopilación de las Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*, 1681, Tomo II, Libro V, Título II, Ley X. *Recopilación*, Tomo II, Libro V, Título II, Ley XV and Libro V, Título II, Ley XXI.

¹⁴ Título I, Fray García de San Francisco de edad de 59 años faltó el juramiento en la ratificación se hace y en el [numero] 9 de esta declaración se dice hizo el juramiento. El Fiscal del Santo Oficio contra Bernardo López de Mendizábal, México, Año 1662, AGN, Inq. 593 and Primera Audiencia de don Bernardo López de Mendizábal, Item 67, AGN, Inquisición 594.

¹⁵ Capitulaciones, Capítulo 31, 32 and 33, AGN, Inquisición 594.

neither be placed in stocks or jails without his permission. That, he said, had already been determined by the King ¹⁶.

The friars presented another version. They claimed López deliberately entreated the Indians to testify against their minister «the ninety year old» Father Francisco Acevedo ¹⁷. One woman stood up and said the friar had «deflowered» her. Without further discussion, Governor López, they reported, ordered one of his men to Father Acevedo's cell to take a *manta* (blanket) from him as indemnity to the woman. Acevedo's fellow missionaries were outraged, for the judgement against the old priest assumed guilt on his part and the public humiliation discredited his reputation as a clergyman. The missionaries maintained that only their prelate, as the *juez eclesiástico* (ecclesiastic judge) had the right to judge them —not the governor. Although López' expedient way of meting out justice had defamed Acevedo, he explained that he was obligated to make the case public in order to discharge his duty ¹⁸. Already López could see the intricate relationship between Indian civil rights, ecclesiastical immunities and gubernatorial jurisdiction.

As the blanket was handed to the aggrieved woman, the pueblo broke into a great burst of laughter, as if in mockery of their minister. One of the friars ran into Acevedo's cell and asked him to go out and defend himself; but the old priest kneeling in prayer replied that his defense was his old age, his ill health, and his reputation as a simple and holy man who had worked among Indians for more than twenty-eight years. Besides, he said, given the false accusation made against him, he did not wish to make more of it ¹⁹. Years later, the Franciscan chronicler Fray Agustín Vetancurt wrote that Acevedo died at Abó and was buried there ²⁰. If so, it is likely that the old priest moved from Alamillo to Abó after the incident because he was no longer welcomed there.

¹⁶ Fray Miguel de Guevara, corroborating testimony against Cristóbal de Anaya, and testimony of Francisco Gomez in Primera Audiencia de don Bernardo López de Mendizábal, 1662, AGN, Inquisición 593.

¹⁷ Capitulaciones, Capítulo 31, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, 1663, AGN, Inquisición 594, and corroborating testimony of Francisco Gomez, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición 593.

¹⁸ Capitulaciones, Capítulo 32 and 33, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, 1663, AGN, Inquisición 594.

¹⁹ Capitulaciones, Capítulo 31, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, 1663, AGN, Inquisición 594.

²⁰ Fray Agustín Vetancurt, *Menológico*, p. 260, in *Teatro Mexicano: Descripción breve de los sucesos exemplares de la Nueva-España en el nuevo mundo occidental de las Indias*, (1698), 4 volumes, Madrid, José Porrúa Turanzas, 1960-1961.

After Alamillo, López continued his *visita* into the Manzano mountain Range. Everywhere he went he was received with disdain by the friars and with curiosity by the Indians. López visited Abó, Quarai, Tajique, and Chilili before pushing northward to Galistao and Santa Fe. At each place he visited, he informed the Indians of his policy to administer Indian affairs.

The *visita* of 1659 to the Rio Abajo was revealing in two ways. First, the friars were unwilling to accept any tampering with their mission program by the governor no matter what legalities he might present regarding the appropriateness of his actions. Second, Governor López had announced the basic premise of his Indian policy as it concerned the Pueblo Indians.

Among other elements of López' Pueblo Indian policy was the fact that he would attend only to matters of civil disobedience, but he would not cooperate with the friars in any punishments which were based on «sins committed» by Indians in contrast to civil offenses. Furthermore, he encouraged the natives to go directly to him and make their complaints. López stipulated that Indians were no longer to do any work for the priests unless the friars paid them according to the law; and that, as in other parts of the empire, Indians could participate in native ceremonies as long as they were not idolatrous. Finally, López pronounced that Indians were not obligated to attend the *doctrina* or mass because both functions adversely influenced them to work for the missionaries without pay and under conditions of forced labor²¹.

As *alcalde mayor* of Las Salinas, Nicolas de Aguilar wasted little time in acting on his instructions from the governor. At each pueblo he visited, Aguilar used a crier to proclaim the «no pay-no work» Indian policy. At Las Humanas, however, Fray Diego de Santander told his superiors that «from my window in the rear room (of the convent) near the plaza»²² he could hear Aguilar himself make the announcement. Aguilar, said Fray Diego, spoke first in Spanish, then in Tompiro. At Quarai Aguilar made a similar announcement and went a step further. He told the Indians that they would

²¹ These statements of policy and others formed the contentions of the prosecution in the case against López de Mendizábal presented *passim* in AGN, Inquisición 593 and 594. However, at least one person testified he had heard that the priest «of the pueblo de Abo had renounced his office because he had permitted the said Nicolas de Aguilar to announce that no governor, alcalde or fiscal, would punish any Indians, male or female, for any sin, or fault they may commit», Testigo 12, Capitulo 6, AAGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 154.

²² Declaración de Fray Nicolas de Freitas, El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 29. Aguilar was quick to respond that —«que el Padre [Freitas] mentia»—, the priest lied —Testigo 12, Capitulo 5, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 154 s.

no longer be permitted to serve the priests without pay, nor would they be allowed to serve as choir members or acolytes²³.

The question of Indian labor at the missions did not have a solution in the context of the seventeenth century mission regime of New Mexico. The practice of employing Indians to work in the fields, care for the herds, and serve the priests as house servants was long standing. Furthermore, the premise that it was done for the good of the mission was, as far as the friars were concerned, irrefutable. López, nevertheless, demanded that the missionaries pay the Indians one *real* a day for their services. His point was that Indians ought not be obligated to work for the priests, nor should they be made to feel morally guilty if they did not, unless a native voluntarily desired to serve the friars in which case an exception would be made. The crisis over Indian labor in the missions was one of jurisdiction and López attempted to define it. The friars argued that López' policy was calculated to debilitate the power of the Church in New Mexico²⁴.

López' mandates, which had been put into practice by the various *alcaldes mayores*, resulted in a series of altercations at the missions, which demonstrated the intensity of the struggle between the friars and the governor. If López meant to halt Indian servitude at the missions, the friars would show him how ludicrous was his proposition. Father Antonio Aguado reported that once when Aguilar passed by San Gregorio de Abó on his way to Las Humanas, he noticed a large gate to the pueblo had been left open and was in disrepair²⁵. As it was a Christian holy day, the Tompiros were in their pueblo enjoying a day of rest. It was around 3 p.m., and Aguilar estimated it would take about an hour to repair and shut the gate. He ordered a few men and women to mix some mud for mortar to make the repair.

Informed by one of the mission Indians, Fray Aguado went from the convento to the gate and reproached Aguilar for having made the natives work on a feast day. The *alcalde mayor* responded that it was such little work for the pueblo's protection. Besides, he said he was on his way to Las Humanas and it was more efficient to have the work done while he was at Abó than to have to return to do it later.

For a moment the confrontation between Aguilar and Aguado flared.

²³ Declaración de Joseph Jirón, 1662, testimonio 47, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición 593. Also see Descargo de Acusaciones hecho por Nicolás de Aguilar, capítulos 5 and 52, El Fiscal contra Nicolás Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512.

²⁴ Descargo de Acusaciones hecho por Nicolás de Aguilar, Capítulo 4, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 171.

²⁵ El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 118.

Agitated by Aguilar's breach of protocol, Aguado argued that he should have gone to the convent and asked permission for the laborers. Aguilar responded that he would have done so except that in the past the friar had always denied him Indian workers. The argument between the two mounted, as the Indians looked on. Suddenly, the priest fell to his knees, made the sign of the cross, clasped his hands in prayer, and upon rising, turned on his heel, and walked back to the convent as quickly as he had come²⁶.

The priests had found a way to tie the governor's Indian labor policy to a church issue. If the civil authority could stifle the use of servitude at the missions, the friars would find ways to turn to the governor's policy into a religious issue. The Aguado-Aguilar confrontation clearly demonstrated the pitfalls of López' Indian policy. After all, everyone knew that a Christian holy day was a day of rest.

Before 1659 was out, the friars met in council at Santo Domingo Pueblo and drew up a report against López' policies. They complained to the viceroy that the requirement to pay the Indians was too much of an imposition placed on the already meager earnings of the friars²⁷. «The religious of this kingdom, sire», they wrote, «who live by themselves in a convent without the enjoyment of company from his brothers, countrymen and relatives have no other conveniences. [They live] daily at great risk from enemies and even the Christian [Indians], who for one word of reprehension about their views take their lives.»²⁸ The isolation they suffered was exemplified by the fact that they walked «ten, twenty, and thirty leagues one way to the next convent and more for the return trip.»²⁹ Their only «stipend, alms, subvention or collection money at the altar, which they received, came to one hundred and fifty pesos, which the king gives every year to each priest.»³⁰ The money from the royal patronage was often stretched to buy necessities for the church. «And the governor does not want the Indians to serve unless we pay them one *real* each day... as if we had it...»³¹ wrote the friars. The brothers explained that the mission fields were used to giving food to the Indians, to needy Spaniards, and to travelers who came by their convents. Furthermore, they complained that the governor's order to the Indians not to serve the priests without pay, had been extended to include

²⁶ *Ibíd.*

²⁷ Declaración signed by Francisco Monte, Escribano Real, Mexicano, February 26, 1660, *El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal*, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 254.

²⁸ *Ibíd.*

²⁹ *Ibíd.*

³⁰ *Ibíd.*

³¹ *Ibíd.*

the stipulation that the natives should not assist the ministers in anything. The friars reiterated that the Indians «do not want to help the church and *doctrina* in anything because of this order; we here do not have anything with which to pay them other than the food which they cultivated for us.»³² In their report which they issued to Mexico City officials at the start of 1660, the missionaries demonstrated their need for Indian labor at the missions, their pecuniary straits in affording payment for Indian services, and a firm resolve to fight against Governor López' Indian policy which would eliminate the time-honored practice of Indian servitude at the missions.

Although López considered Aguilar to be the best of his *alcaldes mayores* to implement his policies, the friars saw him as a trouble maker. The incident at Quarai on June 14, 1660 was a case in point³³. After Aguilar had assembled the Indians in the pueblo and his crier had announced that they were not to serve the priests without pay, the ruffian from Yuriripundaro explained to them that they were not even to serve the priests in the choir or as acolytes in the mass. In announcing that Indians ought be paid for their work, Aguilar made it clear that neither could they serve the friars voluntarily³⁴. To allay their guilt feelings on the matter, the *alcalde mayor* further announced to the pueblo that all mission Indians would be permitted «freedom of conscience», and practically guaranteed that under no circumstances would anyone be whipped or punished in any way for «any sin or any offense» at the missions by civil authorities. The priests were shocked at such a statement and sought to combat the damaging announcements by teaching the Indians the error of an Indian policy which led to immoral rule.

Father Nicolas de Freitas led the attack against Aguilar's pronouncements at Quarai. The next morning when mass was finished, Freitas, still wearing his chasuble, began «to teach these poor Indians», who he said, had remained in the church to hear him. Aguilar, who had attended mass, also remained to hear what the priest had to say³⁵.

³² *Ibíd.*

³³ *Acusaciones* Capítulo 6, *El Fiscal contra Nicolás Aguilar*, AGN, *Inquisición* 512, ff. 108.

³⁴ *Ibíd.* According to testimony, Aguilar's paraphrased words were «...les mando no solo que no sirviesen a el conbento de su obligacion, mas que ni aun voluntariamente queria dicho señor Gobernador que sirviesen», in Letter from Fray Nicolas de Freitas to Fray García de San Francisco, vicecustodio del Nuevo Mexico, June 15, 1660, Quarac, *El Fiscal contra Aguilar*, AGN, *Inquisición* 512, ff. 13, Testigo 5, capítulo 1; and *Proposiciones y Hechos que se han de calificar*, tercera proposición, signed by Dr. don Juan Saenz de Manozca, July 29, 1661, *El Fiscal contra Aguilar*, AGN, *Inquisición* 512.

³⁵ *Acusaciones* capítulos 5 and 6, *El Fiscal contra Aguilar*, AGN, *Inquisición* 512, ff. 108.

The minister began by telling them «the truths of one God, one Church, and one supreme head who governs it». Then as teacher, Freitas reminded them of the Ten Commandments, emphasizing the Fourth Commandment: Honor thy father and thy mother. He told them that they were obligated to honor the friars as they would their own parents. «You are obligated», explained Friar Freitas from the altar, «to obey all your priests and ministers, and give them the necessary assistance in operating the missions.»³⁶ The Indians sat motionless, as if afraid to disturb the few seconds of silence which followed.

«Unable to stomach such Catholic truths»³⁷, Aguilar stood up and interrupted the lesson. Speaking loudly in their language, Aguilar ordered the Indians to leave the church. In response, Freitas look upward, asking God for help, and continued his lesson. Confused, the Indians looked at him sympathetically, trying to listen to him, while at the other end of the church, Aguilar, raising his voice even louder, harangued them about their civil obligations. The Indians remained in the church.

Afterwards, Friar Freitas went up to his room in the convento. Aguilar followed him into his quarters. In front of another clergyman, Aguilar told him that he should «acknowledge the evil deeds of the friars [instead] of preaching against what the governor had ordered»³⁸.

After the altercations in the church and convento at Quarai, Aguilar went to Chilili. There, the priests asked him not to execute López's mandates so rigorously. They also made two requests which he refused: first that an Indian named Francisco be permitted to accompany one of them to Quarai, and second, that Aguilar not order the lashing of a certain Indian musician, who went to sing mass at Las Humanas. Refusing their petitions, the *alcalde mayor* angrily told one of the friars that he ought not interfere with his duties, or he would take him «to the Villa de Santa Fe in a pack saddle»³⁹. The priest backed off for the moment, but he would commit the incident to memory so that he could report it to his superior at first opportunity.

³⁶ Declaración de Fray Fernando de Velasco, July 14, 1662, El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 4; and Acusación, Capitulo 8, El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 108.

³⁷ *Ibíd.* Also see copy of letter by Freitas to García de San Francisco, June 15, 1660, Quarac, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición, 512, ff. 144-145.

³⁸ Acusaciones Capitulo 7, El Fiscal contra Nicolás de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 108.

³⁹ According to testimony, Aguilar's paraphrased words were: «Que si se enfadaba hecharia a dicho Religioso en una enjalma y lo llevaria a la Villa de Santa Fe», in Acusaciones, Capitulo 8, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 108.

Aguilar went about his duty at Tajiique. After he had ordered the Indians not to assist the friars there, he waited for an opportunity to demonstrate that he meant what he had said. Shortly afterwards, Friar Freitas rode his horse from Quarai to say mass at Tajiique⁴⁰. When he arrived, the Franciscan asked Diego Chititi, the Indian *fiscal* of the pueblo, to have some boys feed his horse, and to have someone prepare some beans for him to eat. Aguilar was at Tajiique that Saturday afternoon, and when he heard that Chititi was actually ordering what Freitas had requested, he grabbed the Indian *fiscal* and beat him with his staff. Outraged by Aguilar's actions and having had nothing to eat, Freitas returned to Quarai; and, the people of Tajiique went without Sunday mass the next day.

By midsummer 1660, the friars considered Aguilar to be an enemy of the church. If his interruption of a catechizing sermon was bad enough in the eyes of the ministers, his stoppage of Sunday mass at Abó infuriated Father Aguado⁴¹. The incident at Abó begun as the Tompiros knelt in prayer. Aguilar entered the church at Mission San Gregorio and took out a number of Indians to help him cover the doors of the storerooms where salt from the Salines had been stored for Governor López. As the Indians were filing out of church, Father Aguado protested, «First let them hear mass». Aguilar responded, «It's orders from my governor, and he comes first»⁴². After the storerooms were covered, the *alcalde mayor* took the natives elsewhere to work at some other task.

At Tajiique López' policies took on a strange twist. It seems that Fray Diego de Parraga, after eight years of ministry there, had collected nearly six hundred wooden crosses of variable sizes⁴³. The crosses were used for processions that took place every Friday of Lent and on Holy Thursday. Burying the rest of the year, they were kept in bad repair, and that the Indians

⁴⁰ Testigo 5, Capítulo 22, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 152. Also see, Declaración de Fray Fernando de Velasco, July 14, 1662, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 4-6.

⁴¹ Testigo 7, Capítulo 2, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 146. That the New Mexico friars described Aguilar as an enemy of the Church is supported in the statement «Otra persona es el capitan Nicolas de Aguilar de pequena capacidad gran perseguidor de la iglesia y sus Ministros», in El Fiscal contra Aguilar, Testigo 8, Capítulo 2, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 147.

⁴² In Testigo 7, Capítulo 2, Aguilar explained that he ordered the work done in the afternoon, not in the morning, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 161. Accusaciones, Capítulo 4, ff. 108 and Testimony of don Juan Manso, ff. 19, AGN Inquisición 512. Testigo 7, Capítulo 2, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 146.

⁴³ Testificación de Ysabel Baca, viuda de 50 años, AGN Inquisición 512, ff. 7. Also see, Testigo 3, Capítulo 1, El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 142.

would break them. He said he knew that the Indians had even urinated on them⁴⁴. The crosses became an issue during the rigorous winter of 1660-1661 which caused the priests hardships.

In the dead of winter, after storms had ravaged the mountainous elevations of New Mexico leaving about forty-eight inches of snow in the Manzanos, the priests asked for help from their Christian Indians. In anticipation of such requests, Aguilar ordered the pueblos of Chilili, Tajique, Quarai, Abó, and Humanas to avoid helping the friars under penalty of two hundred lashes. They were not even «to take the priests one stick of firewood»⁴⁵. When Isabel Baca, a mestiza settler near Tajique, went to Aguilar's house to tell him to have compassion for the priests, the *alcalde mayor* responded that the priests should burn their wooden crosses, for «whatever the crosses served, it did not matter if they were burned»⁴⁶. Aguilar made certain that any Indians who served the friars were lashed. The priests protested the punishment of Indians. Still, Aguilar's comment about the crosses would haunt him later, for the priests not only construed the remark as irreverent, they interpreted his refusal to help them as persecution. Aguilar, however, defended his policy on yet another ground: that because of Apache raiders in the area, he had forbidden Pueblo Indians in his jurisdiction to leave their villages⁴⁷. Knowing of the Apache disdain for mission Indians, Aguilar felt it was too dangerous for the Tiwas and Tompiros to go to the foothills, even for a stick of firewood for the priests.

Nevertheless, as the friars saw it, Aguilar's effective surveillance of the Salinas Pueblos also played into their hands. It seemed he was always at a given pueblo at the wrong time. They made it a point to record every incident and altercation with him. Later, in 1663, when the priests from Salinas brought formal charges against him before the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, they cited fifty-two accusations, all stemming from similar incidents⁴⁸.

⁴⁴ Testigo 18, Capítulo 14, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 176.

⁴⁵ Declaración de Fray Fernando de Velasco, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 4.

⁴⁶ *Ibíd.*

⁴⁷ Aguilar explains his policy in Testigo 2, Capítulo 1, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 155. Testigo 9, Capítulo 11, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 149-150. Aguilar explained that it was his responsibility to defend the pueblos in his jurisdiction from their enemies, Testigo 9, Capítulo 14, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 165. Testigo 2, Capítulo 7, Aguilar defended his actions based on enemy threats to the pueblos in his jurisdiction, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 156-157.

⁴⁸ Aguilar was fully aware of each accusation in which he acknowledged having been given «cinquenta y tantos capítulos», Capítulo 9, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 179. Also see, Sentencia de Nicolás de Aguilar. Secretario Ibanez. El Fiscal contra Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 210.

The fight between Aguilar and the Salinas friars took on varied dimensions. The friars soon learned the breadth and depth of the governor's Indian policy. Increasingly, cooperation from pueblo Indian officials became difficult for them to achieve. Under Spanish rule, Indian governors and war captains were likewise considered to be «judges of Indians». Additionally, the Spaniards had even created an office of *protector de indios*⁴⁹. At Tabira, a *visita* of Las Humanas, an incident occurred which frightened the friars and demonstrated the debilitating effect López's Indian policies were having on the missions.

When the friars exposed a case of concubinage at Tabira they sought to punish those involved as an object lesson for those who would not abide by the sacrament of matrimony⁵⁰. The friars demanded that the war captains of Tabira take the two guilty persons before Aguilar for punishment. After rebuffing the war captains, Aguilar freed the two prisoners without punishment. Fray Diego de Santander was furious when the war captains explained what had happened. He could foresee the breakdown of mission discipline, especially in the area of matrimony. Aguilar stood his ground and recounted to Friar Santander that no Indian would be punished by civil authorities for concubinage or any other offense related to the mission program. To demonstrate his point, Aguilar acted on a similar issue at Quarai. When he heard that an Indian official, *Capitán Mayor* Juan Yguany from Quarai had punished two Indian girls at the request of Father Freitas for missing mass, Aguilar responded in kind⁵¹. Yguany was summoned to Tajique where the *alcalde mayor* had him seized and whipped. Not only did the Indians look on in awe, they noticed that it was the second time an Indian official had been punished for having carried out punishments ordered by the friars. Likewise, the Indians from other pueblos looked at the issue of Indian punishments with great interest. The pro-friar faction in the pueblos, composed of those Indians who held colonial titles and favoritism, was outraged

⁴⁹ The «protector y defensor de naturales cristianos», for the New Mexico pueblos under López de Mendizábal was Antonio Gonzales, En Santa Fe a veinte y nueve de octubre de sesenta y un años la prento el contenido ante mi el Sor, y Capitan General y Juez de Residencia, Antonio Gonzalez vecino desta Villa Protector y defensor de los naturales xpianos deste reyno, signed, Antonio Gonzales, AGN, Tierras 3268. See various references for October 5-29 in Sección Tierras 3268, Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City. Antonio Gonzales was also the *Escribano del Cabildo* of the Villa de Santa Fe, Testimonio de Antonio Gonzales, 29 de septiembre de 1662, El Fiscal contra López Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición, tomo 593, ff. 167, Testimonio #28.

⁵⁰ Declaración de Fray Nicolas de Freitas, Monday, February 21, 1661, El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 29.

⁵¹ *Ibíd.* Testigo 9, Capítulo 10, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 149.

by the change in policy, and some of them had come to side openly with the priests on religious matters. The anti-Spanish faction, comprised of those who had never accepted the colonial occupation of their lands, took the opportunity to disobey the priests at their pueblos; they bided their time. Spanish frontiersmen in the Villa de Santa Fe were also split on the effect of López' policies. They all agreed on one thing: to an extent López' policies had weakened the missionaries' grasp on the pueblos. Whether it had created a dangerous situation for the colonials remained to be seen.

The missions of New Mexico received another blow to their work of almost sixty years, when Governor López gave the pueblos permission to dance the Kachina dances and practice other «superstitions» which had been prohibited for nearly thirty years. The issue of the dances would be used against López in the Inquisition case which the friars were building against him. While friars accused López of working to undermine mission discipline, Spanish settlers voiced their fear that the permissive López Indian policy would create a dangerous condition for revolt.

Governor López saw nothing wrong with the dances and tried to demonstrate it to the friars and the settlers by inviting the dancers from Picuries to dance in the plaza of Santa Fe⁵². He even permitted the Indians to dress in one of the rooms of the present day Palace of the Governors. The dancers came out with their masks, chanting, while the settlers, supposedly frightened by their demonic appearance, looked on. When the dancers were finished, Governor López, who had been enjoying the dance from his vantage point in the corridor in front of his quarters, stood up and in a loud voice proclaimed, «the knavish priests say that this is evil, this is not evil but good»⁵³. At another time López defended the dance as similar to the «*palo volador*» spectacle he had enjoyed in southern Mexico. Once, he said the chanting had no more effect than the Gregorian Chant sung by the friars, and as far as the dancing aspects were concerned, he didn't see it as being any different than popular Spanish dances of his day, or for that matter, any other kind of dances⁵⁴. López was intrigued by them for he had seen nati-

⁵² Corroborating testimony taken from Dona Theresa de Aguilera de la Rocha, El Fiscal contra López Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 181. Testimony of Fray Gracia de San Francisco, Senecu, 9 May 1661, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 100. For Kachina dances held at other pueblos see Testimony by Juan Munoz Polanco, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 160-161.

⁵³ Corroborating testimony taken from Dona Theresa de Aguilera de la Rocha, El Fiscal contra López Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 181.

⁵⁴ *Ibíd.*, Testimony of Pedro de Arteaga, 25 October 1661, Inquisición 593, ff. 181. Also see, Testimony by Fray Miguel de Guevara, 29 September 1661, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 172.

ve dances in other parts of the Americas. When in 1659 the Isletans asked him for permission to dance the «*catzina*» for the first time in decades, López agreed. Before long, settlers were reporting Kachina dances at the pueblos of Alameda, Sandia, Cochiti, Isleta, Picuries, Santa Cruz de la Canada, Galisteo, San Cristóbal, San Lázaro, La Cienega, Tesuque, Pojoaque, Santa Clara, San Juan, San Ildefonso, Sevilleta, Tajique, Chilili, Quairai, among others.

The priests and their Christian Indian and Spanish followers condemned the dances as «diabolical and superstitious», and they set out to prove their contentions. Fray Estevan Perea, a missionary who spoke the language of Sandia, once said that the dance was «evil and superstitious»⁵⁵. From such testimony the friars hoped to assemble their case against López. If anyone could claim to understand the Indians and testify that they prayed to the devil, the friars welcomed their testimony as fact. Francisco Pérez Granillo, who lived near the mission at Socorro, testified that he understood Piro, and that one of the Indians there told him the «dances are evil»⁵⁶. Another settler, Juan Barela, who lived near Sandia, said that in the winter of 1661 at the pueblo of Alameda, he found the Indians enjoying a Kachina dance. Barela asked one of them, «Why don't you go and dance?». The man responded, «I don't wish to dance those dances, for they are not good and I am afraid of the priests, don't you see a demon there?». Barela must have believed the Indian; he said he was afraid to turn his face and look⁵⁷. At Sandia Pueblo the friars observed that the dances there «are held day and night», and that the church at Sandia had been desecrated by permitting two calves in the *capilla mayor*, the main chapel⁵⁸.

In the Jurisdiction of Salinas, *Alcalde Mayor* Nicolas de Aguilar encouraged the dances, for he had attended them and had failed to see anything evil about them. Later, when he testified before the Holy Office in Mexico, he described the Kachina dance by saying,

They entered the plaza wearing ugly masks. Each one carries in his hand fruit, the kind which is commonly eaten. The fruit is tied with a string and is placed in a circle in the plaza one after another. The

⁵⁵ Testimonio de Juan Griego, Santa Fe, 1 November, 1661, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 201.

⁵⁶ Declaración de Francisco Pérez Granillo, April 22, 1662, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 238.

⁵⁷ Corroborating testimony by Capitan Juan Barela de Lossada, 1661, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 145.

⁵⁸ Testimony by Alvaro de Paredes, Sandia, 29 May 1662, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 246.

masked dancers then form a circle to guard the said fruit, while other dancers masqueraded as old men, walk among the fruit making ridiculous figures. Then other Indians come as strangers and who ever of them dares to enter to take the fruit, enters and snatches what he wants and flees. The masked dances attempt to hold him and hit with some *palmillas* (yucca leaves). Ultimately, in this way all of the fruit is taken. They neither add to the dance anything else in ceremony nor anything diabolic⁵⁹.

Although Aguilar failed to see anything evil about the dances, he failed to understand their meaning and symbolism. A true rustic, he described only what he saw. To him, the Kachina dance was a form of entertainment with a plot. Perhaps this is why the priests often saw him enjoying himself at the dances. They said he «would laugh so hard at seeing the dances that the masqueraded Kachina dancers would come over to him playfully and hit the said Nicolas de Aguilar with *palmillas*»⁶⁰.

The fun was over, however, when Aguilar ordered the Christian Indians under penalty of whippings to dance with masked dancers. But the worst part of his involvement with the *catzinas* was yet to come. Anger coursed through the veins of the friars when they heard about the time when the snow at Chilili was deep and the Indians wished to dance the *catzina*. Father Fernando Velasco was unaware of it at the time, but the sacristan later told him that Aguilar had ordered the dance despite the snow⁶¹. It seems Aguilar and Juan de Moraga, a blacksmith from Santa Fe, had gone to the *convento* of Chilili and called Father Velasco outside to see the dance. With a twist of humor, Aguilar turned prankster, pointed to the church rooftop and said, «Father, why did you order the Indians to dance the *catzina* on the roof of the church?». Flustered, Friar Velasco denied it, saying it was «false and that he had neither ordered nor encouraged things which were offensive to God, our Lord»⁶².

After Aguilar had approved the dancing of Kachinas at Quarai, the Indians prepared their people for the occasion. In October 1660, the Indians showed their brashness to an offended Father Freitas. The drama unfolded like a midsummer's nightmare for the friars. Just before the Kachina dan-

⁵⁹ Declaración de Nicolas de Aguilar, May 21, 1663, El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 103-104.

⁶⁰ Descargo de acusaciones hecha por Nicolas de Aguilar, Capítulo 16, El Físcal contra Nicolas Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 110.

⁶¹ *Ibíd.*, Capítulo 12, ff. 109.

⁶² *Ibíd.*

cers appeared at Quarai, an old man came to the plaza and announced that they Kachinas were coming. «Be ready for they are your pagan priests», he reportedly exclaimed⁶³. The Kachina dancers, who had taken a woman from Quarai out of the pueblo, returned with her. The people of Quarai received them outside the pueblo. In a loud voice, one of them, pretending to be a demon, announced to the pueblo that he had been exiled for some time and that the people should be happy for he now returned to be among them. Then he gave the woman a small pine tree. She took it from the old man and returned to her house. The old man entered the kiva, whilst the Kachina dancers went all over the pueblo, whooping and hollering as they gathered up earthen bowls, calabashes, and other items necessary to carry out their dance⁶⁴.

The issue whether the Kachina dances were evil was argued by the friars who gathered testimony to use against Governor López⁶⁵. Some witnesses, moreover, felt that the ancestral Kachinas had truly been recalled from the spirit world. It was real and believable that this was one of the spirits' periodic visits to the pueblo. Real or not, Governor López had created a revival which would be difficult to stamp out. Reaction in the Spanish community began to grow.

In contrast to Aguilar, who was a newcomer to New Mexico, Hernando Martín Serrano, a true colonial frontiersman, who had been in the province many years and knew the correct statement to make before the Commissary of the Inquisition, recognized the Indian point of view in his testimony. Carefully choosing his words, Martín said,

The Indians receive great consolation with the freedom and license to dance the Catzinas. The dances are idolatrous in that generally the natives of this kingdom place their hopes in them for a good harvest in all that they sow; in the dances they ask for water, good fortune to marry, and for their amours, and they ask their false gods for *mantas*, health and all of their necessities. With this liberty Governor López placed the kingdom in such danger that the Indians do not pay attention to their ministers... If a remedy is not found fast, it is certain that what is left of the kingdom will be lost⁶⁶.

⁶³ *Ibíd.*, Capítulo 17, ff. 110.

⁶⁴ *Ibíd.*

⁶⁵ Scholes, *Troublous Times*, pp. 153-154.

⁶⁶ Declaración de Capitán Hernando Martín Serrano, March 6, 1662, El Fiscal contra López de Mendizábal, AGN, Inquisición 593, ff. 221.

The friars demanded colonial conformity regarding the Kachina dances from everyone. When in 1660, Father Juan Ramírez, the custodian of the New Mexican missions, and a personal friend of Governor López, presented a different view, the friars sought to remove him from the province. Upon seeing a Kachina dance, Friar Ramirez was not bothered in the least about it. Indeed, looking beyond the religiosity of the dances, Ramirez said he liked the rather festive atmosphere created by the dances and the native foods which attended them⁶⁷.

After sixty-four years of living among the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, some colonials chose not to understand the cultures among which they had been living. Although some settlers had participated in Indian religious rituals, the majority of them did not wish to comprehend the rich Indian spirit world the friars had condemned as «demon worship», nor did they truly understand the sanctity of the Puebloan man-woman relationships which the friars branded as «concubinage». Once the López Pueblo Indian policy went into effect, the friars reacted against every facet of it. Their first reaction against the Kachina dances was to condemn them as idolatrous and demonic; their second was to confront López and his agents as well as the Indians whenever the dances took place; and, their third response was to oppose openly the dances which they had forbidden for thirty years. After López was removed from office, under arrest by the Holy Office of the Inquisition on this and other charges, the friars sought to suppress the Kachinas once again. The suppression of the Kachinas became a burning grievance, among other causes, leading the Indians to revolt. In the meantime, the Tribunal in Mexico City had taken a different view: the burden of proof regarding the alleged superstition of the dances was on the friars, not the defendants⁶⁸. The friars had failed to make their point, but Indian resentment over the issue had grown great.

Given the animosity between the governor and the friars, both claimed they had some ground for protest against one another. Some of the accusations made by each side bore a semblance of truth, but the friars held the upper hand, for their accusations were made before the Inquisition.

The end came after the friars had reported all offenses by López, Aguilar and several others to the Inquisition. Juan Manso, a former governor with an ax to grind against López, was made High Sheriff of the Province

⁶⁷ Declaración de Fray Juan Ramirez, 15 September 1660, *El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar*, AGN, Inquisición 512.

⁶⁸ France V. Scholes, *Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670* (Albuquerque, 1942), pp. 117, 121-122.

of New Mexico⁶⁹. He was instructed to arrest López and his followers and turn them over to Inquisition authorities. As Aguilar, Diego Romero, and Francisco Gomez had returned by way of Moqui, Manso was determined to apprehend them at Isleta. It was feared that once Aguilar got beyond Isleta and into the Manzano Mountains that it would be difficult to capture him. Actually, Fray Alonso de Posada, commissary of the Inquisition, arrested Aguilar and imprisoned him at Isleta⁷⁰. Shortly, he was transferred to a cell at Santo Domingo Pueblo and finally, after a lengthy investigation, he was sent to Mexico City for trial⁷¹.

«Aguilar made a vigorous defense against» the charges against him «before the tribunal», wrote France V. Scholes in 1942. Aguilar's depositions were characterized by a certain quality of directness. Although he could not «evade the major issues», he took a stand against all charges against him⁷². All of his arguments received careful consideration by the Tribunal. The main issues before them, however, were whether Aguilar, as *alcalde mayor*, had been responsible for obstructing the mission program at Salinas and had committed acts hostile against the clergy and the church. Aguilar attempted to show the contrary: that they had obstructed his ability to carry out his duties as prescribed by law, and that they had committed acts hostile to the administration of a royal governor. Because the Tribunal of «Holy Office was extremely jealous of ecclesiastical rights and privileges», surmised Scholes, «Aguilar would have [had] to make a very strong case in order to offset the evidence against him»⁷³. Had Aguilar been tried in a civil court, and had he had the opportunity to present his own witnesses, rather than to respond to testimony against him, the result might have been different.

Nicolas de Aguilar, *alcalde mayor* of the Jurisdiction of Salinas, was basically guilty of following an anti-conservative colonial Indian policy. Whatever the motives of Governor López de Mendizábal, the elements of his policy were in line with the Laws of the Indies. Bureaucratically, Governor López' trial dragged on until September 1664, when he died of

⁶⁹ Declaración de Juan Manso, January 13, 1661, El Fiscal contra Nicolas de Aguilar, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 19 and Signed statement by Fray Alonso de Posada, Santo Domingo, 14 June 1662, AGN, Inquisición 512, ff. 78.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² France V. SCHOLES, *Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670* (Albuquerque, 1942), p. 179.

⁷³ France V. SCHOLES, *Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670* (Albuquerque, 1942), p. 184.

an illness from which he had been suffering. After all had been said about his Indian policies in New Mexico, judgement of his case was suspended until 1671. Finally, his case was declared closed, and his name was cleared posthumously for absolution⁷⁴. For the rest of the century, in faraway New Mexico, the next succeeding governors knew better than to challenge Franciscans ministers with Indian policies that ran counter to mission practices.

⁷⁴ *Ibíd.*