

THE STORY OF GUADALUPE, ARIZONA:
THE SURVIVAL AND PRESERVATION OF A YAQUI COMMUNITY

by

Leah S. Glaser

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

December 1996

ABSTRACT

Guadalupe's formation and persistence in the Phoenix area is a long overlooked topic of local history. Despite heavy residential, commercial, and industrial development, the once remote farm labor community has remained impervious to urban expansion. Residents have managed to preserve a degree of cultural and geographic separatism while participating in the economic and political structure of Phoenix's dominant Anglo society.

When late nineteenth century land reform policies of Mexican dictator Porfirio Diaz forced Yaquis from their homeland in Sonora, Mexico and threatened to kill them, Yaqui Indians fled to Arizona. Anglos there were sympathetic to their plight as refugees and Yaquis were able to find a niche in the Salt River Valley's agricultural economy. Catholic and Presbyterian missionaries also supported the community and helped secure land for a legal townsite. But as immigrants and squatters, the political status of both Yaquis and Guadalupe was legally ambiguous.

Meanwhile, many corporations set up labor camps, or "company towns," the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association established an exclusively Yaqui village that provided stability for the community's sustenance and persistence. These factors combined with self identity, determination, and community consciousness to place the Yaqui community in a promising position for sustenance and longevity. By the 1960s, Guadalupe was no longer just a Yaqui community, but a Mexican-American as well. Whether by choice or by proximity, they joined Mexican-Americans in their fight for political voice and economic improvements. Eventually, residents voted to incorporate the town in 1975.

In many economic and political ways, the history of Guadalupe, Arizona is similar to other ethnic communities, particularly Mexican barrios, in the United States. The story of

Guadalupe, however, is unique and complex because of its Yaqui heritage and influence.

The history of this Yaqui community suggests some factors and conditions that made it possible for this group to preserve its culture and community in the face of numerous economic, political, and social obstacles. By placing Guadalupe's development within local and national contexts, this study hopes to illuminate the historical circumstances that have allowed this small Mexican-Indian community to survive and contribute to the history and development of Arizona's Salt River Valley.

DEDICATION

This story is dedicated to the citizens of Guadalupe in hopes that it not only will help to illuminate and clarify contemporary issues, but will contribute to a sense of pride in their heritage, accomplishments, and contributions in the face of countless obstacles. Ideally, this study will provide a framework from which the town's citizens and youth can further explore their community's valuable and fascinating history.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Countless people have offered aid, encouragement, enthusiasm, and support for this research. Christine Marín and Patricia Etter were invaluable in suggesting sources for research in the Arizona and Chicano Collections. Dr. Octaviana Trujillo provided tremendous insight into her hometown of Guadalupe, Arizona. I offer considerable gratitude to Karen Smith, Catherine May, Shelly Dudley, Fred Andersen, David Introcaso, and Paul Weimann at the Salt River Project for their support, suggestions, and of course, the opportunity to work with the company's collections.

Thank you to my committee chair, Jannelle Warren-Findley, who cheered me on throughout my research and convinced me that I was capable of turning a small paper on a fascinating and overwhelming topic into a Masters thesis. Professors Albert Hurtado and Phillip VanderMeer provided much needed advice, instruction, academic foundation, and confidence.

Finally, I am extremely grateful to fellow graduate students and other faculty who have taken an interest in this important topic and consistently offered encouraging words.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| LIST OF MAPS | viii |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2 THE FORMATION OF A YAQUI COMMUNITY IN ARIZONA | 18 |
| 3 COMMUNITY GROWTH AND DISPERSION | 40 |
| 4 THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN PERIOD AND AUTONOMY | 67 |
| 5 EPILOGUE: HOW TO PRESERVE A COMMUNITY | 102 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 107 |

LIST OF MAPS*

- A. United States Geological Survey (USGS) Map, 15 Minute Quad, 1915.
Note the location of the original settlement, church, and cemetery illustrated by the □ just south of the Wormser/Western Canal.
- B. Original Plat Map for the townsite of Guadalupe, 1910.
- C. Aerial Photograph, 1934.
- D. Aerial Photograph, 1949.
- E. USGS Map, 7.5 Minute Guadalupe Quad, 1952.
- F. USGS Map, 7.5 Minute Guadalupe Quad, 1967.
- G. Current Plat Map for the Townsite of Guadalupe, 1961.
Compare with map B.
- H. Aerial Photograph, 1969.
- I. Aerial Photograph, 1991.

*The original forty acre townsite is designated in yellow on each map.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The crowded, dilapidated homes and modest storefronts of Guadalupe are a striking contrast to the cookie cutter subdivisions, wide streets, and brightly lit strip malls of metropolitan Phoenix, Arizona.⁵ Founded about 1904 by a group of Yaqui Indians from Mexico, the incorporated town of Guadalupe has a 1996 population of 5,500 people of primarily Yaqui and Mexican descent. The town exudes an ethnic flavor not seen elsewhere on the urban landscape. Despite heavy residential, commercial, and industrial development all around it, this once remote farm labor community has remained impervious to the urban expansion of neighboring cities. Residents have managed to preserve a degree of cultural and geographic separatism while participating in the economic and political structure of Phoenix's dominant Anglo society.

Recent works like Dolores Hayden's *Power of Place* suggest that cultural landscapes offer clues to urban development, particularly in regard to often overlooked minority groups.¹ Likewise, Guadalupe's persistence in a now highly desired location deserves examination. The story of Guadalupe's survival is not only a vital and long overlooked part of the Salt River Valley's history, but a significant contribution to Yaqui, ethnic, and Indian history as well. As will be discussed, Guadalupe shares some similar characteristics and experiences with American Indian and Mexican-American communities, but its story is even more unique and complex because of its Yaqui heritage and influence.

Applying traditional models of ethnic community or American Indian historical studies to Guadalupe is particularly difficult without a basic historical framework. Prior to

the following endeavor, a comprehensive historical narrative of the community did not exist. Very little credible information is available on Guadalupe's early development. Official documents are scattered throughout county, state, and federal records. Historical accounts as background for anthropological and social studies, as well as newspaper articles, are vague, incomplete, factually inconsistent, and not based on any official documentation. While much has been written about the Yaqui village of Pascua near Tucson, Guadalupe has not received adequate attention. As a result, journalists and interested scholars have based their observations on anthropological studies of the Yaqui people in Mexico and Tucson and assessed Yaqui behavior in Guadalupe independent of their particular historic economic, political, and cultural experiences.

The community has grown and persisted over time because Yaquis secured steady employment in the Salt River Valley economy, established permanent settlements, and retained their ethnic identity through religious ceremonies, cultural traditions, and social organization. These aspects of development were documented through the Yaquis' interactions with Anglo- Americans, but not recorded through any historical narrative of the community. Numerous stories of discrimination, racial exploitation, internal political conflict, missionary activity, and cultural interaction and adaptation are embedded in Guadalupe's history and worthy of future study. Before any of these issues can be responsibly addressed or understood, however, Guadalupe's contemporary problems must be viewed within the historical context of its formation, survival, and, finally, its successful efforts to establish autonomy. When examined within this local and national historical

context, the story of Guadalupe suggests conditions and factors that made it possible for this ethnic group to preserve its culture and community.

Most Yaqui Indian scholarship has been in the field of anthropological and ethnographic studies. This includes a plethora of articles, academic and popular, on the Yaqui Easter dances, the Yaqui language, and other aspects of their syncretic religious life, mythology, and enduring culture. Anthropologist Edward Spicer introduced ethnohistory as the premier methodology for studying Southwestern Indians. His works examine early Yaqui Indian history and offer background for the Yaquis' responses to circumstances in twentieth century central Arizona.

Spicer first applied an ethnographic methodology in his often cited 1964 work *Cycles of Conquest: the Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest 1533-1960* -- the most ambitious and comprehensive collection of historical accounts on ten major Native American groups including the less well known tribes like the Tarahumaras, Opatas, and Seris.ⁱⁱ Spicer crafted these historical compilations to explain how European contact transformed each group through cultural processes.

By forming enclaves, Spicer argues, "small groups of native peoples maintained to some degree their own ways of life as cultural islands in the midst of the European societies expanding around them."ⁱⁱⁱ Cultural frontiers arose, intensified, or weakened in response to varying forces of conquest. According to Spicer, the political object of the Spanish mission was to civilize native peoples through political economic assimilation and religious conversion. Likewise, Mexico sought to integrate the Indians into their system. Spicer

evaluates each Indian group's process of acculturation to the degree and nature of their political incorporation, language adaptation, community organization, religious diversification, and economic integration. He concludes that while economic participation is the most powerful assimilation tool, social structure is the most important factor in maintaining cultural continuity within a group.

In his later work, *The Yaquis: A Cultural History* Spicer used many of the same models and themes to analyze the Yaqui people in depth. The book's premise was to assess how, in all their complexity, twentieth century Yaqui communities evolved. Spicer traces Yaqui behavioral patterns from the 1970s back through three centuries by analyzing the evolution of their religious, social, and governmental organization. According to Spicer, the concept of the Yaqui community is based on the structure that evolved during the Spanish mission, or Jesuit, period. Yaqui culture and beliefs combined with Spanish Catholicism in a variety of ways to form a distinct syncretic religion. Similarly, mythology fusing both Biblical and native concepts identified both the Yaqui River land and the eight towns founded during the period as sacred and holy land to which Yaquis held a divine right.^{iv}

In their article, "The Holy Dividing Line: Inscription and Resistance in Yaqui Culture," Larry Evers and Felipe Molina discuss the existence and origin of such an historical account written by the Yaquis themselves. The narrative includes the original events in the Yaqui homeland, a world flood, the definition of the Holy Dividing Line, the tribal boundary and the establishment of the Eight Pueblos "which are the backbone of Yaqui social, political, and cultural life."^v Evers and Molina claim this narrative was "one of the cornerstones upon which Edward Spicer built his theories" regarding the evolution of

the Yaqui's syncretic beliefs.^{vi} The idea of the Holy Dividing Line is that it establishes physical, political, and psychological boundaries for Yaqui identity.

After the Jesuits, as result of political differences, were expelled from New Spain in 1767 and replaced by Franciscans, the Yaqui communities began a long period of economic, political, and religious autonomy. The physical layout of Yaqui towns reflected their civil and cultural organization. The local church and the supporting Yaqui households became the foundations of both the ritual and social structure. Two cemeteries filled with wooden crosses flanked the sun-dried adobe church building. A cleared plaza, as large as a quarter mile in diameter surrounded each church. Residents used the plaza for the activities and processions during the Lenten and Easter period and often built ramadas for annual saints' day fiestas. To the east, another building served as the headquarters for the civil government and the associated military society. Houses, filled with extended families, clustered around these communal centers without conforming to the grid pattern encouraged by officials and missionaries of New Spain. The complex Yaqui system of *compadrazgo*, presumed to be a custom first adopted from the Spanish, was a means of extending family-type relationships and loyalties beyond kinship through ritual, much like godparents. Such households maintained the town's religious and cultural institutions.^{vii}

While Edward Spicer's vast studies are primarily contemporary ethnographic, anthropological, or theological, historian Evelyn Hu-DeHart has made the most concerted efforts to record historical events in Yaqui history. In *Missionaries, Miners, and Indians: Spanish Contact with the Yaqui Nation of Northwestern New Spain 1533-1820*, Hu-DeHart narrates military and political events within an economic context. While working

for the mines and living among the Jesuit missionaries, the Yaquis sustained an autonomous society. As mining and *hacendados* grew profitable for Spain, pressure for Indian production and labor increased. Local and civil military authorities asserted their jurisdiction in the economically efficient missions. As missions and mines vied for Yaqui labor, each accused the other of exploitation. Jesuit authorities had been accustomed to their autonomy, but so had the Yaqui, and tensions were mounting within that relationship as well. According to Hu-DeHart's interpretation, the two hundred year old strife culminates in a singular event when, in 1740, the Yaqui Indians launched the first of many rebellions to maintain their autonomy and secure their sacred lands.^{viii}

In her second book, *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: the Struggle for Land and Autonomy, 1821-1910*, Hu-DeHart continues the Yaquis' saga of constant guerrilla warfare with the Mexican government to retain their land. By the twentieth century, Dictator Porfirio Diaz issued extermination and deportation policies which finally forced Yaqui communities out of their Yaqui River towns and into prolonged dispersion. Hu-DeHart uses secondary sources like Spicer to augment theories about the Yaquis' rejection of assimilation. The Yaquis, she argued, accepted foreign systems like the missions and mines, but their insistence on political autonomy and rejection of assimilation allowed their culture and identity to survive.^{ix}

As in her previous effort, Hu-DeHart discusses the Yaquis within the overall economic structure of Mexican Sonora. She argues that Yaqui survival under the Mexican regime was contingent on Yaqui "flexibility," the value the Mexicans had on Yaqui labor, and the Indians' recognition of that fact. Although Yaquis worked within the Mexican

economic system, they never became a part of it, treating it instead as a vehicle for survival, one that ensured the autonomy of their villages. This observation is just as true when applied to Yaqui workers in the Salt River Valley throughout the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s.

Still, the Yaquis' perpetual warfare with the Mexican government dominates Yaqui historiography and has earned them a reputation for violence. Scholars like Hu-DeHart have characterized Yaqui actions with other terms like "resistance" and "survival." These characterizations accurately suggest that Yaquis have historically maintained their autonomy in the face of various challenges. The militaristic focus, however, implies a one-dimensional conception of a militant people, for whom war dominated their history above all other elements. This idea contradicts over one hundred and fifty years of amiable relations with the Jesuits while under Spanish rule. In addition, violence has never been a significant part of Yaqui life in Arizona, where many have resided for almost a century.

The Yaquis' unique development of a distinctive syncretic culture in response to European contact lends a more complex meaning to the term "resistance," one that should be considered and defined when writing their history. Yaquis carried their historic experiences with them and responded similarly when faced with cultural choices of establishing and maintaining communities in twentieth century Arizona.

Unfortunately, historical literature about the Yaqui people stops at the twentieth century with their deportation and dispersion out of Mexico. There are a number of anthropological studies, but no secondary historical accounts written on their nearly one hundred years in Arizona. Edward Spicer provides ample ethnographic work in works like *People of Pascua*, and *Pascua: A Yaqui Village in Arizona*. As well, these studies have

concentrated primarily on the Yaqui community in the Tucson area. They mention Guadalupe, the first officially recognized Yaqui settlement in Arizona, only in passing. Individual biographies like *A Yaqui Life: The Personal Chronicle of a Yaqui Indian* by Rosalio Moises, Jane Holden Kelly, and William Holden, as well as modern anthropological studies such as those done by Holden, Kelly, Spicer, Ruth Giddings Warner, Murial Painter Thayer, Larry Evers, and Yaquis Felipe Molina and Refugio Savalas have offered some insight into the Yaqui lifestyle and folk literature in both Mexico and Arizona. *A Yaqui Life* provides a rare and valuable first hand account of spiritual life and history from the view of a Yaqui Indian born in 1896. Moises' reminiscence includes notions not only of the Yaqui rebellions, deportation, and Arizona settlement of his own experience, but those of his parents as well. Kelly also profiles the lives of four Yaqui women from both Sonora and Arizona in her popular 1978 work.^x However, these isolated studies fail to put the Yaqui American experience into its historical context or to fully recognize the significance of their dual identity as both Indians and Mexican immigrants to their story.

The Yaqui people were not an easily identifiable group in the Salt River Valley. Yaquis were immigrants from Mexico, but they were Indian. Though they practiced many traditions similar to other Native Americans, Yaquis were not American Indian. They fled their indigenous homeland in Sonora as refugees seeking safety and employment. They established settlements near urban areas, unlike the reservations assigned to local Indian populations like the Pimas and Tohono O'odham.

In his "Historical Survey of the Indians in Sonora 1821-1910," Jack Forbes evaluates various Southwestern tribes by their degree of independence and tribal identity.

Although Forbes discusses the Opatas and the Seris, it is clear that he considers the Yaquis unique. He cites contemporary testimonies to their invaluable work habits and skills, their strong, independent temperament, and their ability to hold on to their population and culture. “All late observers,” claims Forbes, “agree that the Yaqui ranked as the best, or among the best, of the peoples of Sonora.”^{xi}

Still, the experiences of Guadalupe’s residents cannot be separated from those of the Mexican-Americans in the Salt River Valley and elsewhere, who shared a regional homeland, and whose economic subjugation also evolved along with Phoenix’s growing prosperity. Their story provides a useful context through which to view the experiences of Guadalupe’s Yaquis and later Mexican-American inhabitants.

Mexicans played an enormous role in the historical development of America’s southwest, Phoenix, and the Salt River Valley.^{xii} Mexican labor was vital to the development of successful farming and irrigation operations, beginning with Jack Swilling’s first ditch in 1867. Mexicans were even active in politics. However the valley’s prosperity drew more Anglos into a town that, unlike many other areas of the Southwest, had not existed in the Spanish or Mexican periods. The new majority easily imposed cultural systems that denied Mexicans an active place in the broader community. Physically segregated by racial discrimination, they created their own cultural life in neighborhood barrios with celebrations, organizations, and even their own Catholic church, Immaculate Heart, founded in 1928.

Likewise, race, immigrant status, economic need, and identity have guided Guadalupe’s physical and demographic development and defined its character over time. Over the past thirty years, scholars of ethnic history have produced a barrage of community

histories as a framework for studying the complex processes of cultural transference and the impact of diversity on America and its regions. Race and immigration are key factors affecting a group's choices and community development. Spicer believed that "external pressures are an important factor in the unity and persistence of any social or political group."^{xiii} Economic systems, political policy, and discrimination, directly or indirectly, helped create enclaves. Official government and civil policy, as well as various forms of racism, also determined the fate of Native American tribes in North America. Laws against all of these groups often limited their accessibility to economic resources and social or political institutions. Past studies of ethnic groups have examined the acculturation and assimilation process.

In his 1951 landmark work, *The Uprooted*, Oscar Handlin contended that the individual immigrant responded to the pressures and opportunities of his new environment and created an entirely new culture. Handlin argued that the stress of migration tore families and communities apart and that inevitably each person would melt, or assimilate, into American society. He failed to recognize the tendency for migrants to preserve any of their old political, economic, and cultural institutions.^{xiv}

Earl Pomeroy, a western historian who broke from the general and romantic interpretations of Western Frontier History, viewed Western pioneers as migrants who transplanted both themselves and their culture to a new region. He suggested historians look at local development rather than westward expansion. In his signature work, *The Pacific Slope*, he contended that a deeper understanding of migrants, cultural transference, and communities was necessary to interpret western settlement, growth, and character.

Pomeroy's work provided models for minorities to examine their own place in history.

Though Pomeroy himself virtually ignored the relevance of women and ethnic groups in the grand scheme of the Western historical process, his colonial theories and his emphasis on migration, acculturation, and urban history encouraged the study of women, ethnic groups, Indians, and local history.^{xv}

Facing such obstacles as language, cultural differences, and discrimination, North American ethnic communities experience similar general patterns in their development. Each sacrificed, adapted, or preserved certain parts of their cultural identity while appropriating aspects of the dominant society and ideology. Acculturation varied as widely as the groups and communities themselves.

In his 1986 work, *The Transplanted*, John Bodnar asserts that the process of social and economic adjustment was far more complex than Oscar Handlin had suggested. Bodnar argues that the intimate relationship between capitalism and immigration directly influenced the rate of assimilation.^{xvi} Racial and cultural discrimination is regularly credited for causing economic disadvantages, limited opportunity, and segregation in other areas like education. Similarly, hundreds of studies of Black, Asian, Hispanic, Indian, or European immigrant communities have revealed that economic marginalization was at least one reason for residential segregation into poor, neighborhood "enclaves." Such enclaves are recognized in many urban areas as ghettos, Chinatowns, and barrios. Oscar Handlin believed that immigrants sought out their "brethren" for support during their adjustment to the new environment. Within these enclaves, each ethnic group maintains a degree of self-sufficiency and "separateness" through their distinctive customs, institutions, or both. In

many instances, however, residential clustering was at least somewhat of a voluntary action for people wishing to maintain their identity and culture through familial and community ties. Depending on the group, cultural preservation limited assimilation and economic advancement.

Early studies of European immigrants like Oscar Handlin's downplay the role of economics and labor in the nature of acculturation and community formation. Yet Mario Barrera and many other Mexican-American historians have emphasized class and race as the primary forces defining minority communities.^{xvii} Mexicans desired work and American communities needed inexpensive laborers. Low wages and racial discrimination dictated the choice and location of housing and facilitated the formation of the barrio enclave. Thus the communities were subject to a foreign system, which relegated minority groups to the status of "colonies" working to support the dominant class. Occupational stratification relegated Mexican immigrants, and later Mexican-Americans, to a labor class regardless of their community's circumstances.

In *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California*, Albert Camarillo describes a relatively stable ethnic community, based in formerly Spanish and Mexican territory, transformed by the overwhelming onslaught of a new Anglo-American economy and society. As a result of this change, as well as ideas of racial hatred and Anglo superiority, the Mexican community became socially isolated, economically deprived, and politically powerless. By illustrating the occupational structure over time as Barrera does in his colonial model, Camarillo argues that Santa Barbara's Chicanos were channeled into the unskilled work pool.^{xviii}

Unlike Camarillo's Santa Barbara, Mario Garcia's El Paso community was formed by a capitalistic economic system. Racial discrimination, as well as political and economic exploitation, retained El Paso's Mexicans in a low-wage, unskilled labor status. *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920* carefully connects the trends of rising national capitalism to the local level. Industries such as the railroad, mining, smelting, commerce, cattle, and trade with Mexico all provided a large market for unskilled labor. Employers recruited Mexicans and formed an ideal, available, and inexpensive labor force for the growing El Paso economy. Segregation, politics, and even limited education opportunity worked maintained this labor force and increased production. Meanwhile, an economically deprived enclave evolved.

Garcia observes, however, that the subjugation of the Mexican populace was not entirely externally imposed. The community developed a separate society in the barrio by creating institutions like fraternal, political, and voluntary organizations, and emphasizing cultural traditions through family relations, food, religion, and fiestas. Essentially, El Paso's Mexican community chose to react to their class restriction through accommodation instead of direct resistance.^{xix}

In his work *Becoming Mexican American*, George Sánchez focuses on cultural continuity in Los Angeles by examining Mexican-American culture and identity. He looks at cultural adaptation and retention by immigrants and minorities on a variety of levels, including race, class, gender, and generation. Sánchez asserts that despite efforts by both the Mexican and the American governments to impose a "fictive ethnicity," Mexican-Americans

have developed a far more complex and dynamic notion, that reaches beyond that of customs and culture and involves a multitude of identities..^{xx}

Though many similar trends appear throughout Guadalupe's history, historical studies of ethnic and immigrant communities in Arizona are sparse.^{xxi} With his book, *Minorities in Phoenix*, urban historian Brad Luckingham tackles the long overlooked demography of Phoenix, Arizona. Anglo culture historically predominates, but the presence of significant minority populations contributed to its growth. Racism, discrimination, and economic circumstances dictated the assimilation process of Mexican-, Chinese-, and African-Americans. Unfortunately, Luckingham left out several minorities. Native American communities are the most glaring omission. The stories of the Chinese-American and African-American communities follow similar patterns of discrimination, struggle, survival, and slow, steady progress. As the book title suggests, Luckingham views each group in terms of its oppressed minority status in an Anglo dominated environment, rather than as ethnic groups with choices and persistence. The world wars, the Great Depression, changes in city government, and ethnocentrism all encouraged separatism and inequality. Thus, unlike Sánchez, Luckingham emphasizes the struggle of minorities for first class citizenship over cultural maintenance, interaction, and identity.^{xxii}

In his article, "Community, the West, and the American Indian," Michael Welsh argues that historians should include American Indian communities with the scholarship concerned with other ethnic groups. They too have a sense of place and kinship that traditional historical narratives have overlooked. This is clearly illustrated in the case of the

Yaqui Indians from Mexico who transplanted and redefined their communities for life in the United States.^{xxiii}

By analyzing such community dynamics through issues such as cultural adaptation, transference, and maintenance, many scholars of ethnic history have often emphasized sociological methodology over historical context. Others have employed ethnohistory, a discipline that unites anthropology and history and often used by Native American historians. Thus, most histories about ethnic communities focus on tracing social, political, and economic structure and organization over time. They use sociological and anthropological techniques to examine such unifying cultural aspects as relationships, traditions, institutions, religion, kinship, language, food, and celebrations. Such an endeavor is beyond the scope of this initial study.

Traditional models of ethnic community or American Indian historical studies cannot easily describe Guadalupe. It is problematic to apply the same methodologies to Guadalupe that historians have used to study American ethnic and Indian communities without first understanding the specific historical conditions of the Yaquis themselves. Yaquis were a unique minority group with a unique combination of circumstances. Yaqui communities did not develop the same types of social or political institutions as other immigrant groups, including Mexicans. They revived only portions of culture and ceremonies and certain aspects of community organization which, according to Edward Spicer, revolved around the church and the religious celebrations. An intimate understanding of the community's dynamics, behavior, religion, culture, and finally, historical development is necessary to fairly apply further scrutiny.

Spicer's works do offer insight into recognizing important Yaqui characteristics in Mexico and Tucson, and identifying similarities in the lifestyles and beliefs of the Yaquis in Guadalupe and the Salt River Valley. Historical records documenting Guadalupe and the Yaqui community are located in various state, county, university, and corporate repositories. These types of documents suggest that this story can be told through the Yaqui community's various economic, political, and social interactions with American society.

Instead of using socio-anthropological methods and models to describe community dynamics and cultural continuity, some historians have advocated this type of inter-cultural approach. In her essay "Landscape of Enclaves," Sarah Deutsch is more concerned with modes of community survival, such as cultural contact, rather than marginalization. Deutsch argues that the experiences of majority and minority groups occurred in a multicultural context and that larger narratives must follow an interactive model to fully understand the forces that shaped the Western region.^{xxiv} In an essay on western women, Peggy Pascoe similarly suggests that future work illustrate the interaction of diverse peoples and cultures to create a region's character and history.

Since their arrival in the Salt River Valley, the Yaqui community of Guadalupe made choices when faced with a variety of obstacles, opportunities, and contact with Americans and other immigrants from Mexico. These choices and contacts have influenced the growth and persistence of Guadalupe in the Salt River Valley. By placing Guadalupe's development within local and national contexts, this study hopes to illuminate the historical circumstances that have allowed this small Mexican-Indian community to survive and contribute to the history and development of Arizona's Salt River Valley.^{xxv}

ⁱ Dolores T. Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge: The MIT Press), 1995.

ⁱⁱ Spicer discusses various groups of the Navajos, Apaches, Pimas, Pueblos, Mayos, Yaquis, Tarahumaras, Opatas, and the Seris.

ⁱⁱⁱ Edward H. Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest: the Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962), 1.

^{iv} Spicer, *The Yaquis: A Cultural History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980).

^v Larry Evers and Felipe Molina, "The Holy Dividing Line: Inscription and Resistance in Yaqui Culture," *Journal of the Southwest* (Summer 1992), 4.

^{vi} *Ibid.*, 4.

^{vii} Military battles, political events, and economic changes are episodic, and Spicer treats them as subordinate information to his behavioral observations. He discusses them mainly from secondary literature, otherwise using sparse primary documents and his own notes as sources. Spicer, *The Yaquis*, 117, 121.

^{viii} Evelyn Hu-DeHart, *Missionaries, Miners, and Indians: Spanish contact with the Yaqui Nation of Northwestern New Spain, 1533-1820*, (Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1981).

^{ix} Hu-DeHart, *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: the Struggle for Land and Autonomy, 1821-1910*, (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press), 1984.

^x Larry Evers and Felipe Molina, *Yaqui Deer Songs: A Native American Poetry* (Tucson: Sun Tracks and the University of Arizona Press), 1990; Rosalio Moises, Jane Holden Kelly, and William Curry Holden, *A Yaqui Life: The Personal Chronicle of a Yaqui Indian* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971); Jane Holden Kelly, *Yaqui Women: Contemporary Life Histories* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1978).

^{xi} Jack Forbes, "Historical Survey of the Indians of Sonora, 1821-1910," *Ethnohistory* 4 (1957), 368.

^{xii} Much of Arizona was almost indistinguishable from the state of Sonora both in landscape and population.

^{xiii} Pamela Ann Bunte and Robert J. Franklin, *From the Sands to the Mountain: Change and Persistence in a Southern Paiute Community*, (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1987), 3.

^{xiv} See Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*, 2nd ed., (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1973).

^{xv} Earl Pomeroy, "The West and New Nations in Other Continents." in *Reflections of Western Historians*, ed. John A. Carroll, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969), 241.

^{xvi} John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), xv.

^{xvii} Mario Barrera, *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979).

^{xviii} Albert Camarillo, *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1939* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979).

^{xix} Mario Garcia, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981).

^{xx} George J. Sánchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

^{xxi} Anthropologist Thomas Sheridan provided a long awaited study of a Mexican -American community in Arizona from 1854-1941. *Los Tucsonenses* emphasizes the culture and economic subjugation of the early Mexican middle class of Tucson, most of whom were indigenous to the area. Unlike Sheridan, Oscar Martinez discussed the working class in his essay, "Hispanics in Arizona." Scott Solliday further researched the development of the Mexican community in nearby Tempe for his Master's thesis. His focus, however, was the early community. In addition, of all the barrios in his discussion, Guadalupe is the only enclave that remains intact today, and it is a legally defined entity, not simply a neighborhood. Thomas Sheridan, *Los Tucsonenses: The Mexican Community in Tucson, 1854-1941* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1986); Oscar Martinez, "Hispanics in Arizona," in *Arizona at Seventy-Five: the Next Twenty-Five Years*, ed. Beth Luey and Noel J. Stowe (Tempe: Arizona State University Public History Program and the Arizona Historical Society, 1987), 87-122; Scott Solliday, "The Journey to Rio Salado: Hispanic Migrations to Tempe, Arizona," M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, 1993.

^{xxii} Bradford Luckingham, *Minorities in Phoenix: A Profile of Mexican-American, Chinese American, and African-American Communities, 1860- 1992*, (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1994).

^{xxiii} Michael Welsh, "Community, the West, and the American Indian," *The Journal of Arizona History* 31 (Summer 1989), 141-158.

^{xxiv} Sarah Deutsch, "Landscape of Enclaves: Race Relations in the West 1865-1990," in *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past*, ed. William Cronon, George Miles, and Jay Gitlin (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1992), 110-131.

^{xxv} Peggy Pascoe, "Western Women at the Cultural Crossroads," in *Trails: Toward a New Western History*, ed. Patricia Limerick, Clyde E. Milner II, and Charles E. Rankin, (Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas Press, 1991), 52-53.

CHAPTER 2

MIGRATION AND FORMATION

For the last 35 years, Guadalupe's Yaqui Indian and Mexican-American residents have struggled to maintain their town in the face of economic distress and the rapid urban development of the Phoenix metropolitan area. Today, Guadalupe is located on the western edge of Tempe, south of Baseline Road and east of Priest Drive. Around the turn of the century, however, thirty Yaqui Indians established the first settlement about a mile northeast of the present site.ⁱ These first Yaquis sought temporary economic support in Arizona to fight for their homeland back in Sonora, Mexico. The Salt River Valley's agricultural boom coincided with Yaqui employment needs and labor skills. However, the Tempe community desired Yaquis as a labor force, but not necessarily as neighbors. Anglo missionaries, farmers, and even government officials fostered the growth of a separate Yaqui community amidst the Salt River Valley's growing economy. The political, economic, and racial issues and events surrounding the establishment of the Yaquis' settlements had significant ramifications for Guadalupe's future.

When Europeans first encountered the Yaqui Indians in the seventeenth century, they were irrigating their fertile land by the Yaqui River in Sonora, Mexico. From that time forward, they resisted encroaching European and Mexican settlers who sought to seize their sacred land for economic profit and take political control of their towns. By the nineteenth century, turbulent economic and political conditions in the Mexican state of Sonora sometimes required a few Yaquis to seek employment outside the eight established Yaqui

River towns. Many worked in the mines and local *haciendas* of Sonora. Others journeyed to Southern California or to the Arizona territory where the landscape, vegetation, and climate were familiar, the border was fluid and unpatrolled, labor needs were similar, and the economy was rapidly growing.ⁱⁱ

In the 1880s, Yaqui resistance escalated to warfare. The government executed Cajame, the Yaquis' charismatic leader, in 1887 after he lead numerous insurgencies against Mexican troops. Soon after, the Mexican government further weakened Yaqui forces by launching aggressive military campaigns to secure their fertile land. Yaquis dispersed, many forming small battalions known as *brancos* to fight for their sacred homeland. Others (*pacíficos*) fled to local farms (*haciendas*) or to the Arizona Territory to work, raise money, and send arms to support their rebel kin. The majority of refugees settled around Tucson. Over the next thirty years, the land reforms and rapid economic development instituted by dictator Porfirio Diaz finally forced the Indians out of their towns and off their land. The Mexican military and government became frustrated with the Yaquis' continual resistance and guerrilla warfare tactics. Diaz instituted an indiscriminate persecution and deportation program against *all* Yaquis, whether or not they were personally involved in the rebellion.ⁱⁱⁱ Hundreds were deported to the Yucatan for slave labor, while others escaped to the United States. Families broke apart and scattered.^{iv}

Meanwhile, the arrival of the railroad in the late nineteenth century linked the Southwest to the nation's marketplaces. It also allowed transport for a huge Mexican labor force from Sonora into the United States, providing both Mexicans and Yaquis with their

first employment opportunities in Arizona. Yaquis settled with Mexican workers along railroad company land as squatters. Many remained on these lands even as more opportunities in mining and farming began to arise. Eventually, they began to disperse and form several enclaves across the state on the model of the eight Yaqui River towns.

By 1910, there were four major settlements near Tucson. Mezquital and Barrio Anita, on the north edge of Tucson, grew from employment opportunities with nearby farms. In 1906, corporations in Tierra Floja, a large irrigated farming area, and in the copper smelting town of Sasco, recruited and provided a place for workers to settle elsewhere in Southern Arizona. Even larger settlements formed further north in Tempe, and later Scottsdale.^v

The Yaqui Indians first arrived in Tempe in time to take advantage of an expanding capital economy in need of cheap labor. Tempe residents had been irrigating their lands for over thirty years until a series of contemporary problems forced them to enlist the aid of the federal government. With the Salt River Valley's population at 240 people, Jack Swilling began digging the first canals in 1867 and turned the desert into fertile agricultural land. The arrival of the railroad a little over a decade later allowed farmers to ship their produce to eastern markets. The area's growth attracted land developers and investors, banks, newspapers, and canal companies. Mexican laborers and landholders were responsible for much of the early canal work. Mexican settlers made up a significant portion of the population, but as Scott Solliday observed, even Tempe's early "Hispanic settlers' ability to hold onto their land was determined by not only how they dealt with the Anglo-dominated

legal system, but what relationship they developed with the Anglo leaders who controlled capital and political authority in the area.”^{vi} The same would be true for the Yaquis.

The original Salt River Valley Yaqui community formed about 1904. The “founders” arrived sometime in the 1880s, accompanied by a missionary, and crossed the United States border west of Sasabe.^{vii} Once in Arizona, they sought assistance from Franciscan friars. The friar(s) brought the group of about thirty up to Phoenix where a Tempe homesteader, Sylvester Roche, relinquished five acres of his desert land to the Catholic Church on February 1, 1898 for one dollar. Under the friar’s direction, the Yaquis reportedly contacted friends and relatives in the area to come live on the Church’s land.

Since the Jesuits first encountered the Yaquis in the sixteenth century, Catholicism and the local church have been central to Yaqui life and community. The Yaquis eventually built their settlement on the model of their nineteenth century Sonoran towns, with a small adobe Catholic church, a number of wattle and daub dwellings, and a cemetery on Roche’s five acres. Residents named the village and the church after their homeland’s patron saint, Our Lady of Guadalupe.^{viii}

The Yaqui settlement was conveniently located just south of the Wormser Canal, a branch of the Tempe Canal, constructed in 1871. The land was fertile enough for subsistence farming, but not for cultivation on a commercially profitable scale. Although the settlement was somewhat isolated, it was accessible to town and work opportunities. The Yaquis were skilled and experienced laborers, having performed comparable work in Sonora, which had a similar climate.^{ix} They took odd jobs and worked as domestics or as

laborers for the railroad, farmers, ranchers, and, perhaps as early as 1907, the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association. Many used their earnings to buy arms that runners smuggled across the border to aid the ongoing resistance efforts in Sonora. Most planned to return permanently someday and kept close communication ties with family. But meanwhile, Yaquis kept a low profile for fear of deportation and harsh retaliation by the Mexican government. The situation in Mexico was increasingly dangerous for Yaquis as Diaz's extermination and deportation policies grew more severe and hundreds continued to flee to Arizona and join its Yaqui settlements. Many therefore adopted the identities of other Indians or Mexicans who worked alongside them in the fields.^x

About 1906, Yaquis realized that the United States government considered them refugees. Having no intention, nor obligation, to extradite them back to Mexico, the government provided asylum. Soon after, the community began reviving cultural activities. With the church as a common center for households, organizing and participating in sacred ceremonies provided Yaquis with a communal identity in Arizona. In the Sonoran Yaqui River towns, the Lenten period and Easter ceremony was an annual focus of activities and customs and had been a major foundation of community solidarity. Pooling the knowledge and skills of families and individuals who most likely hailed from all eight Yaqui River towns, Guadalupe was the first Yaqui settlement to revive the Easter ceremonies following the height of the deportation period. The action encouraged other dispersed Yaquis to settle nearby.^{xi}

Those who worked for the railroad or at mines further away returned to Guadalupe for special ceremonies and to visit with family.^{xii} Contemporary journalists reported a church, a cemetery, and even a school. A local Franciscan priest, Father Lucius Zittier, frequently rode in from St. Mary's friary in Phoenix to perform religious services.^{xiii} The Indians remained south of the canal until 1910, but by then a number of internal and external pressures had arisen which forced them to relocate.

Rapid growth and natural disasters throughout the 1890s brought a number of problems for Tempe's agricultural community. A series of floods followed by periods of prolonged drought complicated matters. The effects on farmland were nearly disastrous, especially south of the Salt River. Much of the land contained an abundance of underground water within easy pumping distance. A wealth of water, however, brought an overabundance of chemical salts that became a serious farming problem.^{xiv} Land was no doubt "unfarmable," and Sylvester Roche, who had only cultivated ten of his forty acres, went to work, and perhaps even to live, elsewhere.^{xv} In addition to the problems amidst all of the agricultural expansion, there was virtually no enforcement of water rights within the Salt River Valley. Continuous challenges to prior appropriation rights expressed the need for comprehensive water storage plans, but the community lacked the capital.^{xvi}

On June 17, 1902, the United States Congress passed the National Reclamation Act. The act allowed the government to build engineering structures for localized water storage with interest-free monies. Valley landowners responded by forming the Salt River Valley Water Users Association to negotiate a federal loan. Surveyors chose the Tonto Basin as the

ideal site for a dam from which to irrigate the Salt River Valley. The federal government agreed.^{xvii}

Though the Roosevelt Dam at the Tonto Basin was not completed until March 20, 1911, it promised a controlled water supply for the entire Salt River Valley. Meanwhile, settlers continued to purchase the valuable farmland. Developers descended on Tempe for its opportunities in canal and land speculation. The land beneath the Wormser Canal, upon which the Yaquis first settled, did *not* get first priority for the normal flow of water in the river.^{xviii} Although area owners did not apply for their water rights until the late 1910s, Tempe farmland south of the Wormser would clearly benefit from the irrigation project via the Western Canal.^{xix} The amount of water siphoned off the canal and the rights of people to it were soon to be highly contested issues in the Salt River Valley. The Guadalupe Yaquis would find themselves in the middle of the flurry.

On March 19, 1908, Charles L. Bishop applied for a homestead on the entire southwest quadrant of Section 33, except for the northeast quarter for which Sylvester Roche and the Catholic Church held the land title and patent. In 1909, Bishop asked the Director of the U.S. Reclamation Service about the likelihood of receiving water for his land.^{xx} Bishop may have considered the Yaqui Indians undesirable neighbors. Documents indicate that he may also have explained his land speculations to Father Zittier, despite the fact he had no legal recourse to evict any settlers from the small Church owned parcel.^{xxi} However, it is also entirely possible that the growing Yaqui community had expanded across the

physical boundaries of the church's legal ownership and was indeed encroaching upon Bishop's claim.^{xxii}

The decision over where to move the Yaquis fell on the shoulders of Father Zittier. Under pressure from the reclamation project and probably intimidated by Bishop, Zittier hired a Mesa lawyer, M. J. Dougherty, to help him decide what to do about re-locating his Yaqui Indian community. A widow, Marian Higgins, offered to donate land for the Yaquis. The area was just east of South Mountain, where the Yaquis reportedly held various religious ceremonies. Perhaps some had squatted there as well. Higgins relinquished her arid forty acre homestead, located about two miles southeast of the Yaqui settlement, in May 1910.^{xxiii}

At that point in time, Yaquis apparently accepted the idea of a new settlement without much protest. First, they probably felt little tie to the land itself. At least initially, the refugees considered themselves temporary residents, working to support the guerrillas that continued to fight for what they believed was their divine right to land on the Yaqui River in Sonora, Mexico.^{xxiv} Edward Spicer made the bold assessment that in Arizona, "Yaqui self-conception of land rights and proprietorship required that they see themselves as guests of Anglo-Americans."^{xxv} But their refugee status and Indian identity elicited sympathy from many Anglos, especially missionaries, who believed the Yaquis needed guidance, aid, and protection.

Second, Yaquis farmed the land only for their own subsistence; their income came from working for local farmers.^{xxvi} In addition, there was no threat to the holy site of the

cemetery regardless of the Indians' presence. The five acres remained secure under Church ownership even though adjacent lands would soon be quite profitable. Guadalupe residents continue to use the cemetery today, and they maintained the original adobe church for religious purposes until they built a new one in 1916.^{xxvii}

Finally, due to the rise in the community's population, more land was no doubt a benefit.^{xxviii} The Yaqui community was growing too big for the five acre area. By 1910, there were about 200 residents.^{xxix} Many of them had sought refuge in Arizona from the Mexican government's deportation and persecution program, joining the friends and family who had immigrated earlier. Some were beginning to doubt the outcome of their struggle to secure their homeland in Sonora.

Additional local labor opportunities arose as well, as the Salt River Valley economy, spurred by reclamation, prospered.^{xxx} The increasing need for labor in the Salt River Valley's agriculture enterprises provided further incentive for a larger, more permanent Yaqui settlement. While racial stereotypes about the honesty and hygiene of most Native American people disturbed the white farmers moving into the area, the Yaquis also carried a reputation as dependable, hard workers. Senator Carl Hayden recalled that the Yaquis "were good farm workers and the forty acres were a convenient location from which they could go to their (places of) employment."^{xxxi} Others have similarly suggested that the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, as well as area farmers, may have encouraged a settlement for the Yaquis because they provided a convenient labor force on the south side of the Salt River.^{xxxii}

Regardless of all the support for the donation, Higgins' land claim entry was contested, canceled, and the relinquishment was nullified. Her forty acres were included in the area that Reclamation Services withdrew from public domain for irrigation.^{xxxiii} According to the 1902 Reclamation Act, the property was unavailable for individual or public entry, except in the case of a townsite.^{xxxiv} This exception provided an alternative option.

On April 16, 1906, Congress had passed another act that allowed the delivery of water to lands in reclamation projects needed for townsite purposes.^{xxxv} The Secretary of the Interior provided water rights in the amount he deemed necessary. The townsite of Guadalupe could be established under the 1867 United States statute which allowed town authorities to enter public lands and establish townsites to benefit occupants according to their respective interests. Both laws stipulated that such land could be surveyed and subdivided into lots for appraisal and public auction with an appropriate area set aside for public purposes. These public reservations would be maintained by town authorities. Further, the 1867 and 1906 Townsite acts specified that the disposal of individual lots should be directed by the local state, or legislative authority.^{xxxvi}

Zittier's lawyer, M. J. Dougherty, may have conceived the idea of the townsite in consultation with Judge John C. Phillips, who, having probated Sylvester Roche's will earlier that year, may have been familiar with the Yaqui land situation. As refugees, and not American Indians, Yaquis could not secure land for an Indian reservation. Father Zittier

agreed, though with some qualms, to Dougherty's recommendation that establishing a townsite near South Mountain was "the best outlet to an unpleasant situation."^{xxxvii}

The townsite solution was conducive to Zittier's desire to establish a settlement site exclusively for the Yaquis. Zittier hoped they would become full citizens of Anglo society, both in a secular and religious sense. At the same time, he had an intimate understanding of their history. He expressed uncertainty about the possibility of establishing any permanent settlement in the Salt River Valley for the Yaquis, fearing that when some decided to move on, either back to Mexico or to perform seasonal labor, non-Yaquis would move in and disrupt the cohesive community. Zittier hoped that the Catholic Diocese would obtain the deed to the land so that outsiders could not buy lots and that the Yaquis could keep the land for as long as they wanted it.^{xxxviii}

While Zittier's motives were paternalistic, Dougherty's were more professional and perhaps personal as well. While the townsite solution seemed beneficial to all involved, Dougherty may have voiced the less altruistic motivations of many of the Yaquis' neighbors south of the Wormser Canal when he wrote that they were "savages prone to thievery and intoxication and unwanted amidst populated communities."^{xxxix}

According to the Arizona townsite law, based on the 1867 federal statute, the procedure should have progressed the following way. Immediately following the submission of the plat map to the County Recorder and its approval by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, the trustee should have posted a notice in newspapers for sixty days announcing the land entry and requiring every claimant of any lot to file a written statement. Each

claimant was required to make proof of his or her claim in sixty days. After ninety days of claim files, Phillips *should* have executed the deeds. With a petition signed by the occupants, he could even set aside a site for a school. The trustee had full power to do everything necessary to enter lands at the proper land office and keep records of all financial transactions.^{xi}

In July 1910, county surveyors plotted Marian Higgins original forty acres and the map was deposited in the Office of the County Recorder. By September, the Board of Supervisors filed it for approval. On July 15, Dougherty applied, through then Congressional Delegate Carl T. Hayden, to the United States Department of the Interior for a townsite, on behalf of Maricopa County Judge John C. Phillips.^{xli}

The *Tempe News* published a notice of intention for the town's establishment on July 16. As well, the Guadalupe community paid the judge an entry fee of \$50. On September 13, the Land Commissioner ruled that "entries of land within the Roosevelt Irrigation Project subsequent to July 25, 1910 cannot be made until such time as the Roosevelt Project is declared open by the Secretary of the Interior."^{xlii} Situated too far below the highline to receive canal water, the Yaquis' new home would not be farmable and was thus excluded from the Reclamation Project. Water could only be serviced to the mesa land by pumping.^{xliii} On February 24, 1913, Congressman Hayden notified Dougherty that the forty acres had not been determined irrigable, nor valuable, and had been eliminated from the reclamation zone. The Yaquis' Franciscan preacher and political liaison, Father Zittier, declared triumphantly, "We are now in the position to proceed to secure title to the land."^{xliv}

Again, *Tempe News* printed a notice, and on February 24, 1914 someone filed the proof to establish claim. It cited forty-two townsite claimants, 125 inhabitants, and \$3500 of improvements upon the land. A survey divided the land into lots, streets, and alleys. The notice also reported that fifteen acres had been cleared, thirty lots fenced, one common well installed for domestic water, and 42 adobe, frame, and combination dwellings constructed. The federal paperwork was finally complete on November 14, 1914, when President Woodrow Wilson signed the declaration establishing the townsite of Guadalupe. It was filed in the Maricopa County Recorder's Office on July 20 of the following year.^{xlv}

The execution of the trust and individual lots should have followed. Apparently, however, none of the subsequent stipulations of the townsite law, those that would ensure that the land from trust status to individual property ownership, occurred. The uncompleted process would be a primary cause of many of Guadalupe's future social divisions and political status. Phillips *should* have turned over the title to any lots to the town's governing authorities after overseeing their individual sale. Instead, the townsite process dragged on for four years because the townsite was originally located within the reclamation project. Poor communication between political officials and the town's representatives also delayed the process. Judge Phillips was promoted to the Superior Court bench in 1912 and became state governor in 1929. Although he remained trustee of the Guadalupe townsite land for the next thirty years, he never fully executed the trust in accordance with the stipulations of the law, and he died on June 25, 1943.^{xlvi} Dougherty handled all the legal proceedings on Phillips' behalf. Late in 1915, he was drafted for service during World War I and never

completed his oversight of the matter in accordance with the Townsite Act under which it was established.^{xlvi} The economic and social concerns of the war itself may have taken priority for the Guadalupe residents as well. Many young Yaquis were also drafted. Despite the legal glitches, the Townsite of Guadalupe grew into a substantial settlement attracting more Yaqui as well as Mexican migrant workers.

Visiting in 1921, the Superintendent of the Pima Agency estimated that about 350 people and about forty school age children lived in Guadalupe. At the time, the Superintendent considered Guadalupe to be in a “fairly prosperous condition,” though the Church run school was having difficulties maintaining attendance during cotton-picking season.^{xlvi}

While its population grew during the 1920s and 1930s, Guadalupe more than doubled its physical boundaries again under the auspices of a religiously motivated benefactor. Along with fellow Presbyterian missionaries Dr. C. H. Ellis and Louise Lynd, widow Jennie Biehn provided health care for the Yaqui community for years.^{xlvi} In 1924, she purchased and donated one hundred acres of land east of the original townsite land “for Yaqui homesites.” She intended to house a young Indian there from the local Cook Bible School to conduct a mission on the property. She also intended the land to be used for Indian settlement.¹ But like the townsite, this land parcel was put into a trust status with the Cook Indian School, and subsequently the Presbyterian Church, for decades. Thus, again, individual land plots were never deeded out to residents.

As Father Zittier predicted, Mexicans settled on adjacent lands, including much of the terrain near South Mountain which Yaquis used for ceremonial and sacred rituals. In 1930, Biehn obtained the patent on an additional 40 acres southwest of the townsite to erect permanent housing for the Yaqui families.^{li} Some residents today also believe the land was for a Presbyterian cemetery. Guadalupe's Presbyterians and others not desired in the Catholic Cemetery further north were buried at this site from the 1920s to the 1950s.

Responding to the heavy labor demands of Valley farmers, numerous Mexican nationals moved to Guadalupe in subsequent years. Mexicans Apericio Garcia, Maximo Solarez and Louis Gastello purchased the 80 acres north and 40 acres southeast of the townsites, respectively.^{lii} Over time, Mexican immigrants settled principally on these properties, leaving Guadalupe's original forty acres primarily Yaqui. With the 1916 construction of a Catholic church, a smaller Yaqui church, and an open plaza for ceremonies and other activities, the townsite land would gain tremendous religious, cultural, and historical significance. Residents referred to the original forty acre townsite land as *La Cuarenta* (Spanish for "40").

In 1938, a Mexican minister reportedly tried to sell *La Cuarenta* for taxes. Although the Certificate of Taxes was later canceled, the attempt has a significant implication.^{liii} The general populace did not understand the conditions of ownership on both the forty acres and the Biehn Colony Trust, and people continually disputed land claims. It is also entirely possible that Yaquis were not informed about what, if anything, *needed* to be done about securing individual title to property lots. Most only spoke Yaqui or Spanish, and

Yaqui River towns had usually been under communal ownership.^{liv} They settled their homesites without regard to plat survey maps. According to Guadalupe school teacher Ruby Haigler Wood,

It (the forty acres) was supposed to have been deeded out to the people. They had a plan but they never told them how to do it. Everybody just put their houses where they wanted to, where a road should have been. . .Whoever set it down didn't show them how they should have put out the streets and put up the stakes for the lots and such as that. They made little twenty-five feet lots, which, you know, isn't big enough for a house with a big family like most of those people are. But that's the way it was.^{lv}

For decades, outsiders described the Indian-Mexican town of Guadalupe, Arizona as little more than a third world country, economically and culturally. It was known to most Salt River Valley residents simply as “Yaqui Town.” The community was poverty-stricken and politically weak. Most buildings and homes were deteriorating. Sanitary and health conditions were equally poor. Indoor plumbing was limited, and residents took most of their water from unreliable wells operated by the Guadalupe Water Company.

During the Great Depression, Guadalupe qualified for a number of the New Deal's federal service programs. The Federal Emergency Relief Act (FERA) sent social workers into Guadalupe and later set up a school as part of Works Progress Administration (WPA). Other adult educators, such as Ruby Haigler Wood and Louise Lynd, taught adults homemaking, how to feed babies, and basic medical care. Meanwhile, these women grew very close to the community and often enlisted legal and political help on its behalf.^{lvi}

At first, the community formed no town council or political body that to deal with Guadalupe's problems. Much later, local organizations hoped to improve the village's

condition. By 1948, the Guadalupe Home Convenience Cooperative Association succeeded in improving plumbing and constructing a second well, pump, and tank, and the town finally received electricity. In the early 1960s, the Guadalupe Health Council became the springboard for the politically powerful Guadalupe Organization.^{lvii}

Essentially, the failure to fully execute the provisions of the townsite act, as well as the provisions of the Biehn Colony trust, left Guadalupe mute, politically ill-defined, and economically devastated for years. Establishing a townsite put the land in trust for the Yaquis only temporarily, and individual title could have been secured thereafter. But until the land conveyances finally began in 1961, local authorities and other outsiders considered the Arizona Yaquis either Indian refugees or first generation Mexican-American squatters on company or county lands.

The decision to establish a townsite called Guadalupe for the Yaqui Indians had been a quick, easy, and practical fix to a problem. Economic and personal interests were involved. These included the paternalistic desires of a local priest and the Catholic Church to help, educate, and influence the Yaqui Indians to become dedicated parishioners.^{lviii} The plot of land which the Church had initially secured for the Yaquis in the Salt River Valley was located in a district targeted for a massive irrigation project. The waterlogged area would soon be farmable and profitable and the Yaqui settlement had to relocate. Had the townsite process been completed, it may well have been an ideal solution. Instead things

turned out much less than ideal. Land disputes and racial views followed Guadalupe into the future.

Altruistic outsiders had failed to follow through on a plan they themselves had initiated, and Guadalupe's Indian community suffered the consequences. It is evident from early events and later circumstances that the Indians accepted the decisions the Anglo community made on their behalf at economic and political levels. Their desire to continue living as community for religious and cultural purposes, as well as the current economic needs of their scattered families gave them little cause to protest.

The settlement of Guadalupe, however, was established as a townsite under the laws of the United States on infertile land. In a local agricultural economy, they earned food and clothing only through wage labor. Because the townsite process was never fully completed, Guadalupe also lacked a structured political organization or a clearly understood legal status. Like their kin living near Tucson, the Salt River Valley's Yaquis had difficulty securing title to any land and essentially lived as "squatters" for several decades. Political attempts throughout Arizona attempted to establish better administrative control over the increasing immigration across the Mexican border. Separate tracts of land were set aside in Tucson and in Phoenix.

Spicer identifies three types of landholding for the Yaquis in Arizona: individual title to land, a Yaqui non-profit corporate title, or a corporate landholding under a trust arrangement with non-Yaquis.^{lix} The Yaquis in the Salt River Valley did not achieve the first two types until the 1960s. Until then, they lived primarily under a trust arrangement with

Maricopa County, the Catholic and Presbyterian Churches, and local farming corporations, particularly the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association. These relationships enabled them to establish communities and preserve a culture that had been threatened by dispersion.

Unfortunately, despite their benefactors' intentions, these paternalistic efforts to aid and protect Yaqui refugees ultimately offered little independence, political legitimacy, or voice-- a precarious position from which to sustain a community. As with other minority ethnic groups, particularly Mexicans, attitudes toward race manifested themselves in economic, political, and social segregation. Subsequently, the very cultural, economic, and political forces that pushed the settlement of Guadalupe to resettle, provided a means for the community to survive within the growing Salt River Valley society.

ⁱ The Guadalupe town cemetery still marks the location today.

ⁱⁱ Salome Hernandez, "Prelude to Exile: Conflict Aspects of Mexican -Yaqui Relationships which Led to Tribal Deportation, 1887-1909," (M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, 1975).

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid.; Evelyn Hu-DeHart, *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: The Struggle for Land and Autonomy, 1821-1910* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

^{iv} Edward Spicer, *The Yaquis: A Cultural History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1985); Hu-DeHart, *Yaqui Resistance and Survival*.

^v Spicer, 235-245.

^{vi} General Tempe History compiled from Dean Smith, *Tempe: Arizona Crossroads* (Chatsworth, California: Windsor Publications, Inc.), 1990; Scott Solliday, "The Journey to Rio Salado: Hispanic Migrations to Tempe, Arizona," (M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, 1993), 64.

^{vii} M. J. Dougherty, Exhibit C, "Memorandum in Re Guadalupe Townsite," *Diocese of Tucson v Guadalupe Community Association*. Case, no. 104499, microfiche, Maricopa County Superior Court, Phoenix, Arizona.

^{viii} Homestead entry file for Charles Bishop #04212, General Land Office Records, National Archives, Suitland, Maryland; *Hurley v Abbott*, Case No. 4564, Maricopa County Superior Court, (1910); Land tract books, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, Arizona; "Yaqui History Notes," (Scottsdale, AZ: Scottsdale School District), 10 February 1977; Warranty Deed of T. Reverend Peter Bourgade from Sylvester Roche, 1 February 1898, Office of the Recorder, Maricopa County; Dougherty, "Memorandum in Re Guadalupe Townsite."

^{ix}Becky James, "Labor and Refuge in Arizona: the Yaquis of Guadalupe, 1880-1940." Term Paper, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ), 7-8.

^x Spicer, *The Yaquis*, 236-237.

^{xi}Government officials, from governors to the INS (Immigration and Naturalization Services), seemed to take the position that Arizona Yaquis were refugees when applying any policy or decision to them. According to Edward Spicer, the United States government never officially decreed that Yaqui Indians from Mexico had political asylum which was an unofficial legal status at best. Spicer, *The Yaquis*, 242; Spicer, *People of Pascua*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1988), 19, 260; Spicer, "Yaqui" in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*, 78. For a detailed discussion on the history and definition of political asylum in the United States of America, see Walter O. Walker III, "Asylum," in Alexander Deconde. Ed., *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy: Studies of Principal Movements and Ideas* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons), 49-57.

^{xii}Dane Coolidge, "The Yaqui in Exile," *Sunset: The Magazine of the Prairie and of all the Far West* 23 (September 1909), 300-301; James E. Cook, "Guadalupe Remains an Enigma," *The Arizona Republic*, 14 July 1992, sec. H, 2.

^{xiii}Father Zittier was in charge of all of the mission in the east Salt River Valley including Tempe, Mesa, and Chandler. Personal information obtained from St. Anthony's Seminary, Santa Barbara California. A 1921 article in the Catholic mission journal, *Indian Sentinel*, implies that Zittier and the Catholic Church may have viewed the Guadalupe community as an opportunity to spread Catholic doctrine through to their families down in Mexico, where the Church felt it had neglected the Indians' spiritual guidance since the time of the Jesuits in the sixteenth century. "Yaqui Indians," *The Indian Sentinel* 11 (July 1921), 310-312.

^{xiv} Christine Smith, "A History of Irrigation in the Tempe Area," (M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, June 1963), 96-98.

^{xv} It is likely that Roche had given up on his land when he donated part of it to the Catholic Church. There is no mention of his presence in any documents, nor as having any contact with the Indians or the Franciscans after he sold his land. Roche was a bachelor employed by Niels Peterson, a prominent and wealthy Tempe citizen. He did not, therefore, depend on his land for income. When he died at 55 in March of 1910, he was in California. He had only one heir, a sister in Massachusetts to whom he left a buggy, a horse and the land itself. Obituary of Sylvester Roche, *Tempe Daily News* Biography files, Tempe Historical Museum; "In the Matter of Estate of Sylvester Roche deceased," Probate Case #1515, Recorded Book 8, 517, Superior Court of Maricopa County, Phoenix, 7 January 1911.

^{xvi} Fred Andersen, "Western Canal, South Side of Salt River," (Historic American Engineering Report. National Park Service, Western Region. Department of the Interior. San Francisco, CA. 1990. HAER No. AZ-2), 4-9; Karen L. Smith, *The Magnificent Experiment: Building the Salt River Reclamation Project 1890-1917* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986), 6.

^{xvii}Amidst all of its growth and natural disaster, there was virtually no enforcement of water rights within the Salt River Valley. The customary system had been that of prior appropriation where the first users had an established right to a canal's natural flow. A diverter could get as much as he needed to grow crops. Therefore, in times of drought, early appropriators had priority. Instead, upstream diverters took water without regard to priority downstreamers. A landmark court battle, *Wormser v the Salt River Valley Canal*

Company in 1892 resulted in what is now known as the Kibbey Decision. It proclaimed that water rights are established according to the continual appropriation of water and use of the land. Ownership in a canal company did not constitute a water right. Priority rights were based on the date of appropriation. Despite the decision, canal companies continued to barter for water rights, and thus profits, on undeveloped arid lands. Continuous challenges to prior appropriation rights expressed the need for comprehensive water storage plans. Andersen, 4-11; Smith, 1-3, 14-42.

^{xviii} The original Yaqui settlement was most likely waterlogged from the natural conditions in the 1890s.

^{xix} Water Rights Application for Section 33, Township 1 North, Range 4 East, Salt River Project Files.

^{xx} Supervising Engineer to the Director, U.S. Reclamation Service regarding an inquiry from Charles L. Bishop, 6 April 1909, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xxi} Father Zittier identifies Bishop as claiming to own the patent on the land upon which the Indians were settled in the “Memorandum in re Guadalupe,” *Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v Guadalupe Community Association*, No. 104499, located in the Maricopa County Superior Court. Local lore often mentions the Yaquis were moved as a result of a “court order” from Judge Phillips. I have never been able to find any real evidence of this. Therefore, I can only conclude that because they were moved under his direction, people may have interpreted the action as a “court order.”

^{xxii} Bishop died in 1913. The claim was divided three ways among his in-laws who received the patents in the 1920s. Homestead entry file for Charles Bishop #04212, General Land Office Records, National Archives, Suitland Maryland; “Yaqui Indians,” *The Indian Sentinel* (11, July 1921), 312.

^{xxiii} Patent file #442696, Records of the General Land Office, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

^{xxiv} Coolidge, 301.

^{xxv} Edward Spicer, “Yaqui,” Edward Spicer, ed., *Perspectives in American Indian Cultural Change*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 80.

^{xxvi} Coolidge, 301.

^{xxvii} 1915 USGS Topographical map, Guadalupe Quadrant, illustrates the presence of a church and cemetery with dirt roads connecting to the Guadalupe townsite. This conclusion was supported by an affidavit of Mrs. Philip Estrada, in the case *Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v Guadalupe Community Association*.

^{xxviii} Frank Brophy. Interview by the author. 2 March 1995. Mr. Brophy, who acted as an attorney for the Catholic Church in the court battle, offered this suggestion.

^{xxix} Maricopa County, Tempe Precinct-Indian Population, Census Records (1910), Arizona Collections, University Libraries, Department of Archives and Manuscripts, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

^{xxx} Thomas Sheridan, *Arizona: A History*, (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1995), 214-17; Cook, 2.

^{xxx}i Carl Hayden to Frank Brophy, 17 May 1963, Box 331, Folder 35, Papers of Carl T. Hayden, Arizona Collections, University Libraries, Department of Archives and Manuscripts, Arizona State University.

^{xxxii} Spicer, 241; James, 17; Ruby Haigler Wood, Interview by Marjorie H. Wilson, 7 August 1968, typescript, Oral History Collection, Arizona Historical Foundation, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, 14.

^{xxxiii} Dougherty memorandum; Land tract book, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, Arizona.

^{xxxiv} Dougherty memorandum.

^{xxxv} The 1906 Townsite Act, *Statutes at Large* 34, Sec. 5, 116-117 (1906).

^{xxxvi} The townsite of Guadalupe was established under a federal act of Congress entitled, "An Act for the Relief of the Inhabitants of Cities and Towns upon Public Lands." It is also known as the Townsite Act. It allowed town authorities to enter public lands and establish townsites "for the several use and benefit of the occupants thereof, according to their respective interests." Further, the act specified that "the execution. . . as to the disposal of the lots in such town, and the proceeds of the sales thereof, to be conducted under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the legislative authority of the state or territory in which the same may be situated." *The Townsite Act, United States Statues at Large* 14: 541, (2 March 1867).

^{xxxvii} Father Lucius Zittier, "Memorandum in re: Guadalupe," Exhibit "B," Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v. Town of Guadalupe, No. 104499, Maricopa County Superior Court.

^{xxxviii} Zittier, "Memorandum in re Guadalupe Townsite.

^{xxxix} Zittier and M. J. Dougherty, "Memorandum in re Guadalupe Townsite."

^{xl} "Townsites." *The Revised Statutes of Arizona Territory*, Title 70 , 1024-1032 (1901).

^{xli} This was in accordance with the 1867 townsite act which designated the probate judge of the state or territory as trustee of such properties.

^{xlii} Father Lucius Zittier, "Memorandum in Re: Guadalupe."

^{xliii} Letter from Superintendent of the Pima Agency to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, August 30, 1921, File #510, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xliv} Zittier, "Memorandum in re: Guadalupe."

^{xl}v *The Townsite Act*, 541.

^{xlvi} Biography of John C. Phillips. Finding Aid, Arizona State Archives, Luhrs Reading Room, Hayden Library, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

^{xlvii} Lucius Zittier, "Memorandum in Re Guadalupe Townsite"; James C. Cossetto, "Report of County Commissioner," (Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v. Guadalupe Community Association, No. 104499, Maricopa County Superior Court).

^{xlviii} "Town of Guadalupe, 1975," Chicano Collection, Hayden Library, Arizona State University; Letter from Superintendent, Pima Agency to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, August 30, 1921, File #510, Salt River Project Archives; Frances Sanita, "Yaqui Indians," WPA History, Arizona State Archives; Letter

from Commissioner James L. Houteling to Senator Carl Hayden; December 8, 1937, Carl Hayden Papers, Arizona Collections.

^{xlix} Dr. Ellis worked for the Phoenix Indian Mission to advocate and support the health and water rights of the Salt River Pimas before relocating to the Guadalupe Clinic to continue his work.

ⁱ Letter from Superintendent, Pima Agency to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 30 August 1921, File #510, Salt River Project Archives.

ⁱⁱ Patent #s 922280, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, AZ.

ⁱⁱⁱ Patent #s 1037441, 971100, 831490, Bureau of Land Management, Phoenix, AZ.

ⁱⁱⁱⁱ Wood, 32; Letters of Correspondence between Hayden and Wood, Box 203, Folder 15; and Louise Lynd, Box 620, Folder 42, Papers of Carl T. Hayden, Arizona Collection; Thornton Jones to Hon. Carl Bernstein, "Report from the Special Investigator," 28 April 1958 in *Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v. Guadalupe Community Association*.

^{liv} 1910 Manuscript Census, Maricopa County, Arizona Collections.

^{lv} "Order Appointing Court Commissioner," *Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v. Guadalupe Community Association*, Maricopa County Superior Court.

^{lvi} Wood, 11.

^{lvii} Andrew W. Nichols, "Proposed Manner of Introduction of More Adequate Medical Care to a Semi-isolated Mexican-Indian Community." (Stanford: Stanford School of Medicine, 1961), 3.

^{lviii} "Yaqui Indians," *The Indian Sentinel* (11, July 1921), 312.

^{lix} Spicer, *The Yaquis*, 237.

CHAPTER 3

COMMUNITY GROWTH AND DISPERSION

As the proceedings for establishing the Guadalupe townsite progressed, Yaqui Indians seeking political asylum and economic support continued to enter Arizona. Some joined the Guadalupe settlement, but others converged in other enclaves throughout the expanding and prospering Salt River Valley. For four decades, several magnet communities in Arizona cushioned the potentially harmful effects of dispersion on the refugee Yaquis' broken families and community.

While the new townsite of Guadalupe remained a center for Yaqui settlement and cultural celebrations, it was home to few year round Yaqui residents. Individuals and families moved from place to place according to seasonal work opportunities, but convened for celebrations and burials. During seasons of heavy labor demand, Guadalupe experienced periodic depopulation, while company towns filled beyond capacity.

The Salt River Valley Water Users' Association (SRVWUA) offered Yaqui Indians additional settlements at their residential labor camps. Reclamation and the increased agricultural opportunities brought great prosperity to the Salt River Valley in the early part of the twentieth century. Farmers required hundreds of laborers to sustain their crops and maintain the irrigation system. They considered Yaqui Indians in particular a convenient and exceptional labor force. Yaquis were skilled, in need of work, and, like Mexicans, they worked cheap. In addition, the government regarded them as refugees, so Yaquis were not subject to immigration restrictions. Though it is unclear whether this political status was a legal one, state and immigration officials supported this position. Yaquis therefore did not share the problems associated with recruiting other workers from Mexico.

Their ambiguous legal status allowed them to remain in Arizona and work for local farms and associations. The Arizona state government granted Yaquis protection as long as they did not become a social or economic burden. Both Yaquis and Anglos viewed Yaquis as a political enigma. Many people regarded them as a tribe, even after the majority of them had been born in the United States. Though Yaquis maintained communities and settlements in Arizona, their historic tribal lands were in Mexico. Thus, the government denied certain services to Yaquis because they considered them refugees, not American Indians who were granted full citizenship in 1921. Yaquis counted upon the protections promised to them first as refugees, and later as American citizens. In turn, the governor's office expected the Yaquis to behave like American Indians, but follow the rules of an American democracy as well. Though confusing, this equivocal conception helped sustain the Yaqui communities politically and culturally within the Salt River Valley's economic system.ⁱ

While the SRVWUA periodically recruited other groups according to labor demands and immigration laws, but the Yaqui workers were consistently the most vital contributors to the construction and maintenance of the irrigation system in the Salt River Valley. In return, the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association provided political sanctuary, economic security, stability, and a segregated, stable settlement for a group of displaced people looking to preserve their culture, lives, and community.

When Mexican dictator Porfirio Diaz's land development policy squeezed out peasant villages, it created "a rootless labor force that wandered throughout the countryside and into the cities seeking work."ⁱⁱ With the fall of the Diaz government in 1910, the

Mexican Revolution further devastated Mexican lands. Fighting forced out thousands of civilians. Yaquis fled across the border to Arizona and California with thousands of Mexican nationals. But while Mexican nationals sought economic relief and advancement, Yaquis sought political refuge and survival.ⁱⁱⁱ

Both groups arrived in Arizona to take advantage of heavy labor demands. When the United States Reclamation Services completed the construction of the Roosevelt Dam in 1911, the Salt River Valley flourished into a major agricultural commercial center. The number of available workers, however, was quite low in the sparsely populated state, so employers eagerly hired laborers from Mexico. Ranching, irrigation, and farming associations established racially segregated work camps to consolidate a steady and dependable labor pool.

When the Arizona territory became a state in 1912, hundreds of Mexicans, as well as Yaquis, had already found employment and settled at these various camps. Along with Tucson, Phoenix and Tempe soon became “the ecological bases of the developing Yaqui community life, within the wider region of the cattle, cotton, copper, and tourist economy of 20th century southern Arizona.”^{iv} By the time the war came, a number of them were even drafted as American soldiers to fight in Europe.

World War I created an enormous demand on the resources available from the Salt River Valley. Tire companies preferred the fiber of extra long staple cotton for industrial fabrics, particularly rubber tires. They turned to Arizona when Britain’s wartime embargo cut off their supply. Maricopa County contained fifty percent of the state’s agriculture, with cotton as its principal crop. As farming corporations developed, many companies established labor camps at Marana (known as *Campo Burro*), Eloy, and Somerton.

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Akron, Ohio set up a cotton camp at Chandler in 1917, and others followed. County agents helped companies and farmers secure labor from local Indian reservations or from across the border in Mexico.^v As had been the case in mining towns, camps segregated the living quarters of white, Indian, and Mexican workers. A wage differential also distinguished the ethnic groups.^{vi}

The members of the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association took over the operations of the Salt River Project (SRP) from Reclamation Services in 1917. Soon, post-war conditions and the success of cotton and other farming activities caused an inflation where "everything, including land, labor, and commodities of all kinds shared in this increase in valuation."^{vii} Employers attempted to hire more inexpensive Mexican workers.

Federal immigration restrictions, however, complicated efforts to recruit from outside the U. S. borders. Labor needs in the rest of the country were far less severe. In response to the overwhelming flow of immigrants into the Northeast, Congress passed the 1917 immigration act. While the act prohibited the solicitation of contract labor through recruiting, advertising, or any other tactic that encouraged migration into the United States, it also required a tax payment and most daunting, literacy tests. This hampered the farming industries' abilities in the Southwest to secure labor, or at least SRVWUA and other Salt River Valley employers perceived this to be the case.^{viii}

Desperate, Arizona's cotton growers and California's beet companies persuaded Secretary of Labor William B. Wilson to admit immigrants from Mexico on a temporary basis.^{ix} But the labor shortage continued. The Water Users' Association reported in its annual history that

. . . the labor situation has been one of increasing difficulty, making it at any time impossible to secure enough men to carry on the maintenance work on the canals and

ditches of the project. The demand for men has been constantly greater than the supply, and the difficulty is further increased by the fact that extra inducements have been offered by ranchers in order to secure sufficient labor to carry on their work.^x

On July 30, 1920, SRVWUA leaders met with Secretary Orval A. Knox of the Arizona Cotton Growers Association and Senator Marcus A. Smith at the Adams Hotel in Phoenix to discuss the dire labor situation.^{xi} By August, labor prices reached a peak. Individual contractors and farmers forced the Association to compete for Mexican labor against their \$4.00 and \$4.50 per day wages.^{xii}

In 1921, a prosperous post-war economy collapsed. The economy in agriculture fell twice as much as in other areas of the economy. By the mid-1920s, employers feared that immigration prohibitions might eventually cut off the supply of laborers from Mexico. SRVWUA and other Valley farmers searched for an alternative labor force and tapped the local Indian communities as a new source. Apaches, Navajos, and Pimas were among those reportedly hired to clean 1300 miles of canals and laterals by hand. The Association established an Apache Indian camp on the north side of the Salt River at 12th street and the Grand Canal. Eventually they let the Apaches go, and presumably the other Indian workers as well. Former superintendent Howard Rupperts surmised that they were simply “unsuited for this type of labor, since they were primarily sheep and cattle raisers.”^{xiii} Next, SRVWUA, along with the Arizona Cotton Growers, imported Puerto Ricans, who were also not subject to immigration laws. This attempt to secure a labor force also failed. Few of the recruited Puerto Ricans were experienced in agricultural work, and many expected far better working and living conditions than the Arizona employers provided. Rupperts reported that they too eventually “scattered to the four winds.”^{xiv}

Meanwhile, a number of Yaqui Indians from Guadalupe had worked for the Water Users' for some time and more continued to flee across the border troubles between Yaquis and the Mexican government continued to escalate. SRVWUA Construction and Maintenance Supervisor Lee Webb had lived in Mexico and was acquainted with their reputation as good workers, their honorable political plight as revolutionaries, and more than likely their supposed privileged status as political refugees. Though political asylum was never an official legal designation according to international or federal laws, state and immigration officials repeatedly supported the position that Yaqui Indians could remain in Arizona as long as they did not become public charges. As needed and desired workers, especially by the economically and politically powerful Water Users', Yaquis were subject to immigration restrictions only at the state's discretion, and they were presumably excused from regulations like the literacy test. Over the next few years, Congress took further steps to monitor the flow of illegal immigrants. In 1921 and 1924, it approved quotas on European immigration and created a border patrol.^{xv}

Between 1922 and 1924, Webb traveled to Tucson and Mexico to encourage more Yaquis to work for the Water Users'.^{xvi} Many moved to Guadalupe to join family members. Kinship, community ties, and their complex extended family system of *compadrazgo*, no doubt aided the SRP in recruiting large numbers of Yaquis to the Salt River Valley settlements.^{xvii}

Thus, the Salt River Valley Water Users Association became the primary employer for Yaquis in Guadalupe, and numerous others to come. Supervisors considered them "the finest labor force obtainable."^{xviii} Yaquis carried their reputation up from Mexico where even the railroad employees referred to the Yaqui Indian as "the workingman of Sonora."^{xix}

Irrigation was familiar work and they were accustomed to the climate. Association supervisors were also impressed with their dexterous use of tools, and noted Yaquis apparently had an “immunity” to scorpion stings. But despite the praise, the Yaquis were Indians, as well as from Mexico. They were therefore subject to a dual stereotype. Although always described as excellent workers, they were rarely promoted, and supervisors always recalled that, like the stereotype of the “drunken Indian” attributed to other Native Americans, Yaquis drank excessively.^{xx}

In December 1927, the Salt River Valley Water Users’ Association’s Board of Governors established permanent residence camps for maintenance crews. The majority of the camps’ residents were Yaqui Indians, many of whom moved to the labor villages from Guadalupe. At first the Association provided tents, but the Yaquis eventually built their own homes from available materials like aluminum shields.^{xxi}

The Construction and Maintenance Division based its camp operations from two sites. The first was located north of the Salt River in Scottsdale. The other was south of the river between Tempe and Chandler. The Association referred to them as Northside and Southside, respectively. Foreman Gene Bishop recalled picking workers up at either of the two camps, or the town of Guadalupe, by a truck and trailer each morning.^{xxii}

Usually arriving at the site at 7:00am, the Yaqui workers’ chief duty was canal cleaning and maintenance. It was long, tedious, and monotonous work. In the summer, they mowed the grass, and in the winter they used sickles, scythes, and shovels to remove growth. At noon they enjoyed a one hour lunch break and would work until exactly 5:00pm for six days of the week. Sometimes, supervisors took Yaqui crews to help build one of the dams.^{xxiii} Many would also assist with trouble-shooting and canal reconstruction. Over the

years, there were approximately five work crews at Northside and four from Southside. At its peak of 400 residents, about the early 1940s, Northside was the third largest Yaqui settlement in Arizona.^{xxiv}

The Salt River Valley's labor needs were generally seasonal. Although the Valley's cultivation, irrigation, planting and growing needs only required 8,000 men, farmers needed 12,000 workers in October when the demand for harvesting, delivery, packing and ginning cotton peaked. While cotton- picking season was in the early Fall and Spring, Winter and Summer were SRVWUA's busiest times for cleaning the canals. Many Yaquis secured steady year-round work by picking and chopping cotton for farmers. By the mid-1930s, SRVWUA's Construction and Maintenance was using up to twice the number of crews than the decade before to mow in the summer and even more to clean in Winter.^{xxv} Yaqui Indians were hourly workers. Throughout the 1920s and 30s, 300-400 of them worked during the busiest season.

By 1926, SRP now had 6000 farmers and landowners harvesting 230,000 acres in the Salt River Valley. SRP's management felt that Yaquis alone had failed to alleviate the enormous labor demand for unskilled farm workers. Yet again, additional immigration laws and border restrictions made it more difficult to secure Mexican migrants and ensure an adequate labor pool. On January 18, SRVWUA's Board of Governors wired Senator Carl Hayden and requested he use his influence "to amend the immigration laws . . . in order that this labor supply may be made available to the Southwest and the Salt River Valley in particular. . . ."^{xxvi}

The crash of the New York stock market in October of 1929 abruptly ended post-war prosperity. The entire country experienced massive unemployment and job competition.

Most American workers of Mexican origin did not fare well during the Great Depression. Congress cracked down on illegal and legal immigration. Targeted as scapegoats for taking jobs away from white Americans, federal and local governments deported or repatriated thousands nationwide despite any legitimate claims of American citizenship. In Arizona, employers recruited migrant workers from Oklahoma and Arkansas rather than from across the border. Meanwhile, the federal government sponsored programs to put unemployed “citizens,” rather than immigrants, back to work. A long time benefactor of federal programs and funds, SRVWUA secured the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) and WPA (Works Progress Administration) work crews to supplement the Yaqui workers, most of whom, unlike other laborers from Mexico, continued to live and work in Arizona throughout this period.^{xxvii}

Though many Anglos had trouble distinguishing Yaquis from Mexicans by racial and physical features, the government, employers, and of course the Yaquis themselves identified the two as distinctly separate groups. Once their fear of being deported to Mexico subsided, Yaquis sought to distance themselves from Mexican Americans though they often shared employment opportunities and residential areas. A mutual feeling of hostility and superiority between the groups remained, though the antagonism was never played out at work.^{xxviii}

Following a 1927 Yaqui uprising in Mexico, the United States again provided Yaquis in Arizona with political sanctuary. The events also drew the attention of state authorities to the Yaquis as a significant immigrant group. The arrival of the new refugees stimulated divisions among the Yaquis in Arizona. Both groups appealed to state officials for aid. Like many Mexican and European immigrants, Yaquis who had been born or

resided in the United States for some time wished to stay in Arizona, grown attached to their local Arizona communities, and did not want the assertions of recent arrivals to represent them. Few of the Salt River Valley Yaquis, for instance, recognized Tucson-based leaders, especially recent refugee Guadalupe Flores, who advocated the return of all Yaquis to their Sonoran homeland. Through appeals to state officials, he agitated much of the Arizona Yaqui community about the issue.^{xxix}

Though local politicians, farmers, and missionaries had aided Yaquis in consolidating and forming their own permanent communities, state officials now tried to impose a system of political organization on the Indians. They viewed the Arizona Yaquis as a tribe and thus insisted they elect a single Yaqui “chief” to act as spokesman and liaison to immigration officials. These naive and inaccurate notions about Yaqui organization and leadership, however, further aggravated divisions within the Arizona Yaqui community. According Edward Spicer, the Yaquis, who had always organized on the local community, rather than a tribal level, equated the idea of “chief” with the captain of their now defunct military societies. They disagreed with one another over the process of selection, term of office, and jurisdiction. By the 1930s, permanent local Yaqui communities had been established and though they were linked by cultural and kinship bonds, “an organizational level beyond that of a local group, under conditions of peace, still had no meaning.”^{xxx}

On April 24, 1932, Guadalupe Flores visited the Yaqui village at Northside Camp to organize elections for a Yaqui chief in Arizona. However, not everyone voted and most Salt River Valley Yaquis did not consider the allegedly elected Angel Matuz their leader and spokesman. In response, Yaquis in Guadalupe elected another Arizona chief, Cayetano Lopez, but that election also remained inconclusive.^{xxxi} According to Immigration labor

officials, various Yaquis denied that they had elected Lopez. Instead, the INS (Immigration and Naturalization Services) recognized Francisco Valencia as the Yaqui chief of Maricopa County, and Enrique Savala for Pima County. The following year, Lopez appealed to the state and county governments to intervene. In a letter to Governor George W. P. Hunt, he included a list of Yaquis from Pascua, Guadalupe, and SRVWUA's Northside camp in Scottsdale who were "disturbing the peace among the Yaqui Indian tribe."^{xxxii}

Although Governor Hunt expressed sympathy, he insisted that they had no legal or political interest in assisting the Yaqui. Their presence in the United States was only "by tolerance of the federal government" and because they were supported by the general public.^{xxxiii} By June 1932, the Yaqui situation had grown so volatile that Hunt sent a representative to Guadalupe to oversee elections and inform residents about their legal status in the Arizona. In a proclamation, the governor insisted the Yaquis organize and cooperate amongst themselves, whether by state or by village. He instructed them to settle their differences on the basis of "majority rule," just like white citizens. Again, Hunt maintained the position to tolerate a relatively small Yaqui presence in the United States only as long as they accepted American standards of government and demonstrated "their fitness for citizenship and did not become a burden on public systems, and thus become subject to deportation."^{xxxiv}

In 1936, the Sonoran Governor Roman Yocupicio paid a visit to Guadalupe. He encouraged the Arizona Yaquis to return to Mexico. He promised the former enemies of the Mexican government amnesty and requested the American government's aid in repatriating them. With such assurances, Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) no longer regarded the Yaquis in need of political protection. Many Yaquis, however, remained

skeptical about their safety and wished to remain in their Arizona settlements. Some did return voluntarily, but Arizona's INS district director in El Paso reported that thirty-four Yaquis were officially deported under a 1936 directive. Most of them, however, were recent arrivals from the 1927 uprising, possessed none of the documentation required by the 1924 Immigration Act, and were from Pima, not Maricopa, County.^{xxxv}

Prompted by concerned private citizens, Arizona Senator Carl T. Hayden queried the U.S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull, Acting Secretary of the Interior Charles West, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) James L. Houghteling, and Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier about the possibility that Yaqui Indians could become "wards of the State," and "extended the assistance usually given to Indians in that class."^{xxxvi} West promised Hayden and Secretary Hull an investigation but indicated the financial constraints on Indian services.^{xxxvii}

In his 1937 response to Senator Hayden, acting INS Commissioner Edward J. Shaughnessey recognized two large camps of Yaqui Indians in the Phoenix area-- one at Guadalupe, and the other at Scottsdale. He estimated 300 Yaqui families in two Salt River Valley villages, 225 children over six, and 60 more who were five and under. About 250 additional families lived on various ranches in the Valley. The settlements were periodically monitored, but INS regional officers claimed to take no active steps to deport or repatriate anyone in the Salt River Valley settlements. Shaughnessey observed that most of the adults in these communities were "either born in the United States or else had lived in the United States for many years past."^{xxxviii} At this time, he admitted to Hayden that "the political status of Yaquis in Arizona is wrapped up in misconception, neither Yaquis nor the majority

of Anglo-Americans understanding clearly what that status is.”^{xxxix} Both groups, however, had an economic interest in maintaining this ambiguous identification.

A 1932 University of Arizona study on Arizona’s farm laborers assessed that, “More than half of the heads of laborer households were of Mexican origin born in the state of Sonora or in Southern Arizona. Another third of them were from the cotton belt, from other states, or native to Arizona, and the remainder were Yaqui Indians, Negroes, or Orientals.”^{xl} Yaquis made up 7% of Arizona’s labor force.

Guadalupe and SRVWUA’s camps, however, were not unique as labor villages to the Salt River Valley. There were about 80 farm labor camps in Maricopa County. Most of them were located in the large cotton belt which began ten miles west of Phoenix and extended 45 miles east. The cotton boom had brought thousands of Mexicans into the Salt River Valley during the 1920s and 30s as well. Some settled into other Mexican barrios around Tempe and others in Guadalupe, which was centrally located in the cotton district. Still other Mexicans, and some Yaquis, moved to these work camps, where housing and sanitary conditions were deplorable. The Maricopa County Health Unit identified other types of migrant settlements as well. In 1937, sanitarian Noel McKeehan observed that squatters’ camps “spring up like mushrooms after cotton-picking season.”^{xli} About twenty-five tourist camps rented out accommodations to farm laborers for \$1.50-\$2.50 per week. Some employers found it preferable to have labor “convenient to the field of operation when needed and self-sufficient or employed elsewhere when not required.”^{xlii} As well, many migrants opted to “freelance” wherever picking and wages seemed the best.

For many, the seasonal nature of farm labor lent itself to instability, economic uncertainty, and transience. In an agricultural report, E. D. Tetreau observed that “the

people of the Salt River and Yuma Valleys were not especially cordial to Mexican settlers. The farmers of these areas needed their labor, but both farmers and townsmen preferred workers that would come when needed and move on when done with their work.”^{xliii} Tetreau also noted that the data for his report was slightly skewed because his Salt River Valley study areas encompassed the Yaqui populated “laborer towns” of Northside, Southside, and Guadalupe. He described their residents as “strong and warlike.” Communities such as these were ideal for seasonal labor because they constituted a reserve labor supply. In Guadalupe, practically every household was headed by a Yaqui or Mexican laborer.^{xliv}

Summer was the most demanding season, when all resident laborers were needed. In October, however, cotton picking required even more laborers. Over half of the resident supply and 90 percent of the 4,000 out of state (immigrant) workers remaining in Arizona resided in the Salt River Valley. During the year, the labor pool would fluctuate from 3,580 in February to 22,880 workers in November. Most workers lived in clusters of temporary residences less than twenty minutes from work.

In 1942, SRP’s Annual History reported that “wartime economics and unusual weather resulted in abnormal operating conditions. . . This situation may become extremely serious as large forces of labor are required to keep the ditches in condition to carry water.”^{xlv} The Association tried to secure Mexican nationals through the Farm Security Administration, but the 250 men were removed because other government agencies, such as the War Commodity Corporation, were “controlling this class of labor.”^{xlvi} Next, they enlisted Italian and German prisoners of war from nearby Papago Park internment camp to supplement Yaqui work. Papago Park had the second largest prisoner camp in Arizona

behind Florence, and the supplemental labor helped sustain Association operations through the war.^{xlvi}

Despite all the alternative labor sources over the years, the Water Users' Association seemed to prefer the Yaqui worker. Former Supervisor Bud Simser firmly believed that "They made the Water Users'. Don't let anyone kid you. Without them we would have had to shut down, and there wasn't any of the rest of us that they couldn't get by without."^{xlvi}

SRVWUA's labor camps were essentially Yaqui communities. Like Guadalupe, Northside Camp was known to outsiders as "Yaqui Town" and to residents as "Eskatel." They were part of a network of several Arizona Yaqui settlements including the cotton camps in Chandler (Hightown), in Gilbert (Sonora Town), and other smaller SRVWUA camps around the valley. The Scottsdale settlement was well known and Yaquis from Tucson and elsewhere in Arizona and California could usually find work with the Water Users' simply by showing up at the truck's pick-up site.^{xli} And when Yaqui employees began leaving for higher paying jobs and better housing elsewhere the Association constructed living quarters.¹

On September 9, 1942, the SRVWUA President Rod McMullin determined that it was going to be necessary to establish a new site for living quarters for the Yaqui Indians now living in a village camp near Scottsdale. Besides building small, two-room homes with traditional ramadas and moving in their families, the Association constructed a small chapel. Construction methods which may have combined frame and wattle and daub techniques, were traditional, but weak. One water faucet served the entire village and only a few homes received electricity. The lease for the land occupied by the Yaquis at 64th Street and Thomas Road would expire on May 15, 1943, and camp residents needed to move on or

before that date. The Board of Governors directed the Association management to determine if material could be obtained for the construction of a new camp.^{li}

Management was able to secure a tract of land for a Yaqui village at Northside camp, just north of the former camp at 64th Street and Osborn Road in Scottsdale. By 1946, they built over 50 one and two room houses for Yaqui Construction and Maintenance workers. At Alma School Road and the Western Canal, Southside camp expanded to 2.8 acres. By February 1943, cement houses with a kitchen and living room were painted and wired for electricity. Southside had 40 houses where one bathroom served two households. Residents soon personalized these concrete block houses, however, with brush lean-tos on the side of the house and a garden. A health clinic operated intermittently, and a grocery store near Northside offered the Yaquis credit to purchase between paychecks, but was also suspected of cheating them. Often, Yaquis even took home fish they caught in the ditches to eat for dinner. By April, every house was filled. Some homes even had more than one family as much of the community retained the ritual kinship system (*compardrazgo*) of extended family. Those who did not desire to work exclusively for SRP, settled across the street, forming a separate offshoot community known as “Turicate.” Many there worked at ranches and picked cotton. Living conditions remained the same as the old camp.^{lii}

Since the 1920s, Guadalupe and Eskatel had become “established both as to location and organization of [Yaqui] community life.”^{liii} Life at the camps during the 1940s seemed to function not only like a community, but a segregated cultural enclave fostered by the SRVWUA administration. *The Current News*, an employee newsletter, gossiped about camp individuals and activities with stories and features, and reported on illnesses, weddings, funerals, those returning from War, and various religious celebrations.

SRVWUA cultivated the activity and allowed liberal work schedules during fiestas.^{liv} The Association built a Catholic church at the Northside Camp.^{lv} Management provided a resident priest for the former who held services and performed wedding ceremonies. No such formal religious structure existed at Southside, but members from both camps regularly traveled to Guadalupe, about four miles west of Southside, for religious and cultural events and funerals. Several of SRVWUA's Yaqui workers were buried at the Guadalupe cemetery. Still, residents were proud of their homogenous community. One even boasted that "here we don't have any Mexicans, just Yaquis," as was the case in Guadalupe.^{lvi}

Although Yaquis participated in the Arizona economy, they maintained Yaqui traditions and values. Typical of most immigrants, Yaquis accepted integration on some levels, but maintained autonomy on others. They accepted Arizona's political rule, but, as seen during the 1930s efforts to elect a chief, were less accepting of ways to rule themselves. As squatters and wage earners, they served their host country within their position of wage laborers in a money economy rather than tending to their own land and livelihood in Arizona. The Yaquis attributed little meaning or practicality to reviving the local autonomy of the Yaqui River towns at the economic level. Likewise, military organization lacked a purpose in peacetime, and Yaquis accepted the police and court functions of the local authorities who had provided them employment and settlement.^{lvii}

Edward Spicer describes the adaptations and integrations that took place among the Yaqui communities in Arizona, versus those in Sonora. Deportation and extermination policies forced Yaquis to disperse and to keep their identity secret. The scattered communities from the original eight towns temporarily suspended their political and cultural way of life for one of survival. Because Yaquis felt safer in Arizona territory, however,

revival of Yaqui customs and community organization began sooner than in Sonora. While Arizona Yaquis abandoned their former political structure in order to accept that of Anglo-Americans, they maintained characteristic elements of a Yaqui community. Spicer defines a characteristic Yaqui community as one that a) identifies itself as Yaqui, b) uses the local church as a community center, c) households are made up of extended families through a network of relationships known as *compadrazgo*, and finally, d) celebrates the Easter ceremonies. The Yaqui Lenten Period and Easter Ceremony maintains both Christian and indigenous elements. It was and is the most sacred religious celebration.^{lviii}

Easter ceremonial participation was one of the most important activities for Arizona Yaqui communities. Various community members assumed positions in the ceremonial organizations. Though essentially a Christian passion play and expression of the cult of Jesus, Yaquis also took great care in reviving native aspects such as the pascola arts involving costuming, the pascola and deer dances, music, and other ritual behavior associated with it. The sites of these annual celebrations at Guadalupe, Pascua near Tucson, and sometimes Eskatel (Northside), identified permanent Arizona Yaqui centers.

Numerous Eskatel residents and other Yaquis who labored on nearby farms converged for the annual celebration. On occasion, residents held fiestas and ceremonies at the camps. For decades, the celebration attracted, and continues to attract both Yaquis and non-Yaquis from around the Salt River Valley. It was through these dances, and their reputation as excellent workers, that many Anglos knew the Yaquis.

Thus, while Phoenix institutions like Friendly House geared their social services toward mitigating the cultural differences of its Mexican labor force, SRVWUA established and fostered Yaqui segregation. Many residents continued to speak only Yaqui and Spanish,

though the influence of English vocabulary on the former became more apparent. The Yaquis' immediate supervisor at Northside, longtime Reclamation Service employee "Blackie" Yriogian, communicated with them in Spanish. Howard Rupperts supervised crews at Southside. Usually one or two Yaquis spoke English and acted as interpreters and as the intermediaries between the management and the Yaqui labor force. Nicknamed "chiefs," they also helped recruit additional workers when necessary.^{lix}

Despite SRVWUA's relatively harmonious arrangement with the Yaqui workers, labor relations were not always smooth. In 1933, the Yaquis in Scottsdale were frustrated with their low wages and living conditions. Electing three spokesmen, they pleaded to both Governor Mauer and SRVWUA management for help. The Yaquis complained that though they enjoyed working for the Water Users', they could not even afford clothes for their children. They requested a raise and expressed their reluctance to strike in order to get one.^{lx}

In addition to military service, wartime conditions further pushed the Yaqui community to participate as established American citizens and activities, rather than temporary refugees. By 1946, Yaquis paid income taxes and participated in union activities. In April, two meetings of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) were held at the camp. The union had recruited Association employees "on the water side" since the 1930s. *The Current* reported that, "The men have to work 40 hours per week and have been raised nine cents more on the hour. Not very many are pleased with this business now. . ." Soon after, IBEW Local #266 furnished cement for a 30 x 30 foot dance platform the Yaquis themselves built, and "the Association, wishing to cooperate, offered to furnish the sand and gravel for the project." Additionally, in March of 1949, Local 266 sent a \$75.00

check to Juan Martinez, the Yaqui “chief,” instructing him to spend it on a good time for the Northside and Southside employees.^{lxi}

The following year, a strike in December severely debilitated the functions of the Salt River Project. Although former supervisors are unable to recall if Yaquis were members, other clues suggest that many were, and that many took part in the strike. Renegotiated contracts between the Association and the Union stipulated a significant salary difference between the Yaquis and other laborers. Some reports suggest that administrators recruited Pimas to help them work around the clock in order to maintain operations.^{lxii}

A few years later the success and population of the Yaqui work camps began to decline. With several sanitary code violations, the County Health Department brought pressure on SRP to bring camps up to code or to abandon them. Rehabilitation would have required a million dollars. The Association’s declining incentive to do so eventually led to the closing of the camps.^{lxiii} School integration, salary equalization, and the development of modern transportation in the 1950s had contributed to a general feeling in the company that the Yaqui villages were more of a burden than the benefit they had been in the past. Technological advances had also reduced the need for heavy manual labor by introducing new, efficient machinery to clean and maintain the canals. Considerable friction between Yaquis and nearby property owners accompanied the rapid post-war urban development and expansion of Phoenix and the Salt River Valley. In addition, recalled one time employee Bud Simser, “Scottsdale got to raising Cain.”^{lxiv}

Simser suggested to manager Henry Shipley that the camps close and the Yaquis move elsewhere after a Scottsdale schoolteacher complained to Shipley that children were impossible to teach English, as it was discouraged at home in the isolated community. She

claimed that the school would not be able to keep the children for more than another year. Finally, most Yaquis were unionized by this time, and although the IBEW labor contract had distinguished between Yaqui and other laborers in the past, some Yaquis had better jobs and their overall wages situation had improved. Shipley explained that:

At that time I was negotiating for the Project and the Union, you know, and I got to thinking, gee, what are we going to pay them. We were paying them peanuts. So, start figuring it out, if we'd give them a decent salary, a regular laborer's salary...they wouldn't need housing, the kids would be integrated into the system, we wouldn't have this headache [of sustaining a community], and this problem that is continual, and we had a lot of trouble. You know, there was a Mormon Church and a Catholic Church in the compound. There was a lot of conflicts, . . . so we did away with the camp and integrated them into society, into the community.^{lxv}

On March 20, 1956, SRVWUA President Rod McMullin discussed the labor negotiations to date and subsequently the feasibility of discontinuing housing for labor at the Northside and Southside Camps. The Board unanimously decided that “the housing of labors at the Northside and Southside camps be discontinued as of August 1, 1956.” President McMullin sent a 30-day notice to all camp residents.^{lxvi}

The Association considered their decision successful. In a *Current* article that praised the Yaqui workers the following year, longtime Yaqui Supervisor Howard Rupperts raved, “These people now are buying their property, building homes of their own, and are no longer wards of the Association.”^{lxvii} Some Yaquis continued their employment. Sons and grandsons of the Association's first laborers were working for SRP in 1966 as truck drivers, foreman, and semi-skilled construction workers.^{lxviii}

But the work camp residents maintained a separate community. With upgraded salaries, most Northside residents, along with their farm worker counterparts across the street, reunited and moved to low cost housing on a flood plain along McDowell Road on Indian Bend Wash. Land was subdivided as *Vista del Camino* along the channel, but most

Yaquis were eventually flooded out. In 1971, Scottsdale officials relocated the community to 77th and Roosevelt to make way for a lush chain of flood control parks. The neighborhood, known as *Penjamo* after a town in Mexico, continued to function as a separate and independent residential community, though most residents actively began learning English. However, most maintained communal ties to Guadalupe, the largest Yaqui settlement in the Valley through familial and ceremonial relations and activities. Many Northside and most Southside residents moved back to Guadalupe.^{lxx}

In 1959, 20% of the laborers in Guadalupe still worked for the Water Users'. Others worked various odd jobs wherever they could find them. Yet unemployment was a continuing problem. A medical researcher estimated about two-thirds of Guadalupe residents were still seasonal agricultural workers. And for those who were employed, they earned only seventy-five cents an hour while minimum wage was \$1.15.^{lxx}

Yaqui Indians initially came to Arizona for refuge and financial support. The development of the Salt River Valley provided even more places to work such as railroads, mining, ranching, and agriculture. Though they were part of a stratified labor system involving thousands of Mexicans and other immigrant groups, Tempe farmers considered Guadalupe's Yaqui community a valuable labor force. Almost every household in Guadalupe was headed by a laborer. Often families worked together in field labor. This was one of the few ways women and children could earn money.^{lxxi} The type of employment SRVWUA and Arizona first offered the refugees was unstructured, regular work. It was even seasonal and therefore attractive to the Yaquis in the 1920s many of whom continued to cross the border smuggling supplies. Eventually, employment with SRVWUA provided

an opportunity for families and communities to stabilize, resettle, and adjust to life in Arizona.

In his work, *Foreigners in their Native Land*, Historian David J. Weber observed of Mexicans in the U.S., “Separatism meant that Mexican culture would be reinforced and acculturation would proceed at a snail’s pace.”^{lxxii} The Yaquis in the Salt River Valley illustrate this situation as well. While Guadalupe grew larger and more heterogeneous, the exclusive work camp communities established by SRVWUA, thrived by maintaining cultural continuity, while accepting full economic and limited political assimilation.

Now, Yaqui workers were no longer wards of the Water Users’ Association, and faced a cultural challenge. Even in Guadalupe, Yaquis were considered “tax-exempt wards” of the county residing on a legalized townsite.^{lxxiii} With stable settlement areas of the farming corporations no longer assured, the Salt River Valley Yaqui communities would have to adapt again to a new era and new circumstances. the 1960s, Phoenix’s post-war industrial growth and development threatened their communities’ isolation. Although accustomed to historical conditions of poverty and displacement, Yaquis, not yet legally recognized as American Indians, joined neighboring Mexicans as an undistinguished minority group subject to political discrimination and to a society and economy that had no place for their work skills.

ⁱEarly in the 1920s, Yaquis were still considered exiles of Mexico, but their status began to change as more were born on American soil. Yet even by the late 30s, certain Yaquis could only apply for citizenship if they identified themselves as Mexicans, not Indians, as only Caucasians and Blacks could naturalize. Mexicans, not Indians, were classified as Caucasian. Edward Spicer, *People of Pascua* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988), 43-61.

ⁱⁱMarc Reisler, *By the Sweat of Their Brow* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1976), 14.

ⁱⁱⁱ After the war, when the new Madero government promised to restore the Yaquis' land, many took up arms against bandits as a show of appreciation. Others remained distrustful and decided to stay in their Arizona communities.

^{iv} Edward Spicer, *The Yaquis: A Cultural History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1980), 236-7.

^v SRP Annual Histories 1917-18, 19-20, 20-21, 21-22, Salt River Project Archives; Howard Ruppers, "The Yaqui," *The Current News*, (February 1957), 3; Rod McMullin, Interview by Karen L. Smith, Salt River Project, 48.

^{vi} Oscar Martinez, "Hispanics in Arizona," in *Arizona at Seventy-Five: the Next Twenty-Five Years* (Arizona State University Public History Program and the Arizona Historical Society, 1987), 87-122.

^{vii} Ruppers, "The Yaqui."

^{viii} Congress, "Restriction of Immigration," 67th Congress, 1st Session, 1921, House of Representatives, H.R. 4; "Immigration Act," *Statutes at Large*, 39, chap. 29, 874 (1917).

^{ix} Ibid; Reisler, 50. All Mexicans were exempt from the quota system specified in the 1924 Immigration Act, but its passage further represented the U.S. government's growing in tolerance with unrestricted immigration.

^x SRP Annual History 1917-18, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xi} Salt River Valley Water Users' Association Minutes to the Meetings of the Board of Governors, 29 October 1920, Secretary's Office, Salt River Project, Phoenix, Arizona.

^{xii} SRP Annual History 1920, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xiii} Ruppers, "The Yaqui."

^{xiv} Ruppers, "The Yaqui," 3; Malcolm Brown and Otis Cassmore, "Migratory Cotton Pickers in Arizona," (Work Progress Association, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1939), 65-67; "Porto Rican Farm Laborers in the Salt River Valley," 5 *The Associated Arizona Producer* (1 October 1926), 6; "The Porto Rican Labor Bubble," 5 *The Associated Arizona Producer* (15 October 1926), 6; "Local Labor Men Caring for Puerto Ricans," *Sources for the Study of Puerto Rican Migration, 1879-1930*, 188-89; "Report from Jaime Bague to the Commissioner of Agriculture and Labor," *Sources for the Study of Puerto Rican Migration, 1879-1930*, 190-91.

^{xv} RG 1, Governor's Office, SG 8, 11, 16, Governors Hunt, Mouer, Pyle, 1932-1953. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records; "Immigration Act," 1917; Walker, 49-52; *Also see Chapter 1, note #9; Immigration Act, Statutes at Large*, 43, sec. 2, 143 (1924). Historians continue to debate if these congressional acts had any real impact on limiting labor recruiting and Mexican immigration. According to documents, however, SRVWUA and other Salt River Valley employers feared this might be the case.

^{xvi} Ruppers, "The Yaqui," 3.

^{xvii} "Immigration Act," 1917; Immigrants who were joining family members were also excused from restrictions.

^{xviii} Floyd Wright, Interview by Harriet Haskell, 20 February 1981, transcript, Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project, 8.

^{xix} Dane Coolidge, "The Yaqui in Exile," *Sunset: The Magazine of the Prairie and of all the Far West* 23 (September 1909), 299

^{xx}Floyd Wright, 8; Walter Walt, Interview by Harriet Haskell, 22 October 1980, transcript, Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project; Ragene Bishop, Interview by Paul Weimann, tape, Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project.

^{xxi}Walter Walt, 3; Floyd Wright, 9; Howard Rupperts, "The Yaqui," 4; "Yaqui History Notes," (Yaqui Information Program, Scottsdale School District, 1977); "Vista del Camino: A Historical Perspective," Yaqui Bedouin Project, Yaqui Indian Tribe of Arizona.

^{xxii}Ragene Bishop, Interview by Harriet Haskell (Tape: Historical Research and Archives Project, Salt River Project); Walter Walt, 3; Floyd Wright, 9; Howard Rupperts, "The Yaqui," 4.

^{xxiii}During the 1920s, Mormon Flat, Horse Mesa, and Stewart Mountain Dams were constructed to store water for hydroelectric power.

^{xxiv}Pascua, near Tucson, and Guadalupe, near Tempe, ranked 1 and 2.

^{xxv}Board of Governors Minutes, April 15, 1930; Annual Histories, 1935-36 (Describes their methods for ditch maintenance that would eliminate the need for hand labor); Ragene Bishop, Interview by Harriet Haskell.

^{xxvi}Board of Governors Minutes, Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, January 18, 1926, Secretary's Office, Salt River Project; Brown and Cassmore, 65-67.

^{xxvii}Francisco Balderamma and Raymond, *Decade of Betrayal* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995) Thomas Sheridan, *Arizona: A History* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1995), 217; Walter Walt, 3.

^{xxviii}Perspectives, 75.

^{xxix}Edward Spicer, *People of Pascua* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988), 46, 163-188.

^{xxx}Spicer, "Yaqui," in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*, Edward Spicer, ed., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 79.

^{xxxi}Spicer, *The Yaquis: A Cultural History*, 249.

^{xxxii}Cayetano Lopez to Governor Hunt, 5 May 1932, 18 May 1932, Governor George W.P. Hunt papers, Arizona State Archives.

^{xxxiii}"Arizona Yaqui May Return to Homeland," *Arizona Republican*, 25 February 1937, Carl Hayden Papers, Arizona Collections, University Libraries, Department of Archives and Manuscripts.

^{xxxiv}Governor George W.P. Hunt to Cayetano Lopez, 16 May 1932, Governor George W.P. Hunt papers, Arizona State Archives.

^{xxxv}"Arizona Yaqui May Return to Homeland," Correspondence with Edward J. Shaughnessey and James Houghteling, Immigration and Naturalization Services, Box 625, Folder 24, Carl Hayden Papers.

^{xxxvi}Correspondence with James Houghteling, Box 625, Folder 24, Carl Hayden Papers.

^{xxxvii}Government officials decided that granting the Yaquis privileges might antagonize the Mexican government who had made it clear that they had granted the Yaquis amnesty for their armed uprisings of the past. Correspondence, Box 203, Folder 15, Carl Hayden Papers.

^{xxxviii}Letter from Commissioner James L. Houghteling to Senator Carl Hayden, 8 December 1937, Carl Hayden Papers.

^{xxxix}Correspondence, Carl Hayden Papers.

^{xl}In 1937, E.D. Tetreau of the University of Arizona conducted a study of Arizona's Farm Laborers. Guadalupe, and other areas where Yaquis were numerous, is included in one of the sample spots of irrigated areas, 72% in Salt River Valley areas. E.D. Tetreau, "Arizona's Farm Laborers," (University of Arizona: College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, 1937), 312-327.

^{xli}Noel McKeehan, Sanitarian, Maricopa County Health Unit, "The Sanitarian's Role in Maricopa County's Transient Labor Problem," 1936.

^{xlii}Tetreau, 317.

^{xliii}*Ibid*, 321.

^{xliv}*Ibid*, 322.

^{xl}SRP Annual History 1942.

^{xli}SRP Annual History 1943.

^{xlii}Annual Histories 1944-45, 3; Ted Walker, Interview with Harriet Haskell, transcript, Historical Research and Archives Project, Salt River Project, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xliii}W.L. "Bud" Simser, Interview by Harriet Haskell, 5 June 1981, transcript. Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project, Salt River Project Archives, Phoenix, AZ, 8.

^{xli}Wright, 3; Walt, 10-12; Rosalio Moises, *A Yaqui Life*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), 120.

^lSRP Annual History 1943.

^{li}"Vista del Camino: A Historical Perspective," Files, Yaqui Bedouin Project, Pascua Yaqui Reservation, Tucson, AZ.

^{lii}*The Current News*, 1940-46, Salt River Project Archives; Henry Shipley, Interview by Paul Weimann, April 2, 1986, transcript, Salt River Project, Phoenix, AZ, 29; Bud Simser, Interview by Harriet Haskell, 5 June 1981, transcript, Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project, 7-10; Walker, 88-89.

^{liii}Edward Spicer, *The Yaquis*, 243.

^{liv}Ragene Bishop, Interview by Harriet Haskell; Ruby Haigler Wood, Interview by Marjorie H. Wilson, 7 August 1968, typescript, Oral History Collection, Arizona Historical Foundation, Hayden Library, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, 22.

^{lv}The Mormons also built a church at the Northside camp for the Yaquis. However, I have been unable to find any documentation as to Mormon missionary efforts with the Yaqui Indians.

^{lvi}Edward Spicer, *People of Pascua* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988), 35, 102.

^{lvii}Spicer, "Yaqui," in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*, 77-80.

^{lviii}*Ibid*.

^{lix}Friendly House participated in Americanization efforts throughout the first half of the twentieth century. Bradford Luckingham, *Phoenix: The History of a Southwestern Metropolis* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1989), 96-97, 121-122; Todd Bensman, "Struggling: Scottsdale Yaquis Wrestle with their Past, Future," *Saturday Magazine of the Scottsdale Progress*, February 1988, 4; *The Current News*, (February 1946, December 1947).

^{lx}Letter to Governor Mouer from Angel Matuz and Joe Valencia, October 2, 1933, file 420.3, Salt

River Project Archives; Letter to “The President of the Water Users’ Association” from A. Matuz, J. Martinez, and J. Valencia, Nina Duncan Scrapbooks, Salt River Project Archives.

^{lxi} *The Current News* (March 1946), 13, (July 1946), 11; *The Current News*, (March 1949), 19.

^{lxii} Wright, 23.

^{lxiii} Bensman, 4; J.A. Jones, “Variables Influencing Behavior in Indigenous Non-Western Cultures.” (Department of Anthropology, Tempe: Army Medical Research and Development Command, July 1963-June 1968), 8.

^{lxiv} Rupperts, “The Yaqui,” 4; Simser, 10

^{lxv} Henry Shipley, Interview by Paul Weimann, April 2, 1986, transcript, Salt River Project Archives, Phoenix, AZ, 30-33.

^{lxvi} Board of Governors Minutes, Salt River Project.

^{lxvii} Rupperts, “The Yaqui” in *The Current News*, 4.

^{lxviii} Rupperts, “The Yaqui,” 4, *The Current News* 1956-1967; Simser, 8.

^{lxix} Bensman, 4; Pat H. Stein, “Archaeological Testing at AZ: U:9:111 (ASM), a Yaqui Laborers’ Camp at the Southside Water Services Center, Mesa, AZ, (Flagstaff: SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, 1992), Photocopied, 4; “Yaqui Life--A Look at Old and New,” Yaqui Vertical File, Scottsdale Public Library.

^{lxx} Simser, 10; Jones, 8.

^{lxxi} Tetreau, 312-327.

^{lxxii} David J. Weber, *Foreigners in their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973), 223.

^{lxxiii} Andrew W. Nichols, “Proposed Manner of Introduction of More Adequate Medical Care to a Semi-isolated Mexican-Indian Community.” (Stanford: Stanford School of Medicine, 1961), 12.

CHAPTER 4

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN PERIOD AND AUTONOMY

With the demise of the satellite communities, Guadalupe again became the primary Yaqui settlement in the Salt River Valley. Over the years, Yaquis abandoned the Indian traditions related to economic autonomy, political organization and those rituals connected with the sacred Yaqui River land and towns. Instead, they maintained their community through ceremonies, religious and social organization, and their Yaqui identity. When the Yaqui Indians from the Salt River Valley's work camps returned to Guadalupe to build a permanent community, it was no longer exclusively Yaqui. They had lost the luxury of economic stability, isolation, and homogeneity. Mexican immigrants had swelled Guadalupe well beyond its designated townsite boundaries.

When the Mexican government took their tribal lands and threatened the Yaqui people with genocide, Americans provided them with residence and employment. Yaqui and Mexican migrants in the Salt River Valley worked at the same types of jobs for years, but unlike other American Indian groups and many Mexican-Americans, the Yaquis had enjoyed cordial relations with Anglo-Americans as missionaries, administrators, health and social workers, or employers. The Catholic and Presbyterian Churches, SRVWUA, as well as the state and county governments, were prominent forces throughout Guadalupe's early development.ⁱ

Despite their historic antagonism, the Yaquis' new status was now similar to the plight of Mexican migrants and farm workers, and the formerly Yaqui settlement closely resembled Mexican-American labor towns and barrios. After World War II, Phoenix and

Tempe were expanding, and Central Arizona's population exploded. Industry replaced the need for a massive agricultural work force. With new machinery for tending crops and dredging canal banks, the SRVWUA and its members required less hand labor. The Yaqui Indians lost their place in the Salt River Valley's economic order. Their vague political status was no longer relevant because labor needs no longer protected or could sustain them.

ⁱⁱ Instead, contemporary Mexican-American issues and political action dictated Guadalupe's activities in subsequent years.

Motivated by both necessity and powerful contemporary political and social movements, a formerly politically passive townsite became active participants in its civic future. Amidst the War on Poverty, Civil Rights protests, and the Chicano Movement, the residents' fight to gain political power, economic relief, finally secure legal title to their land, and preserve both the Yaqui and Mexican way of life, splintered the community. Residents disagreed on how to enact changes and allied along various ethnic, religious, and political lines. Though Guadalupe's poverty and ethnic makeup attracted federal and local dollars, newcomers, students, Catholic Church officials, health and social workers, and activists aggravated latent internal tensions and strained ethnic relations. By the 1960s, Guadalupe's reputation was a confusing web of political turmoil, conflict, and factions. The original Guadalupe townsite and Biehn Colony trust lands served as one of the first battlegrounds.

In 1935, Works Progress Administration (WPA) writer Francis Sanita reported about 300 residents in Guadalupe, but no doubt an even larger transient laborer population existed.ⁱⁱⁱ Though most Yaqui settlement remained concentrated within the original 40 acres

throughout the 1930s, the village grew to almost 300 acres.^{iv} Over the next twenty years, many Mexican laborers migrated to the Guadalupe townsite. They primarily settled on the surrounding lands of Maximo Solares and Louis Gastello, and on the outskirts of the Biehn Colony as well. While much of the Salt River Valley's Yaqui population was at SRP's Northside and Southside camps, these migrant workers encroached upon the original townsite and Biehn Colony trust lands, the core of the original Yaqui settlement. Perhaps because the media emphasized Yaqui presence in Guadalupe by regularly publicizing the town's annual Yaqui Easter ceremonies, state officials did not recognize Guadalupe's expansion, nor the addition of Mexican and Mexican-American residents to its population.

As late as 1953, Governor John Howard Pyle continued to think of Guadalupe as an exclusively Yaqui settlement. In a letter addressed "To the Yaqui People of Guadalupe Village," he emphatically stated that, "Building Guadalupe as a village was permitted to the Yaqui people and only to the Yaqui. It was not intended that it should be open to anyone else."^v He also implied that outsiders had moved onto the forty acres and had brewed trouble and bad feelings. And like governors of the past, Pyle reiterated that even the Yaquis were only allowed to reside on the forty acre townsite as long as residents followed all Arizona laws and "that no trouble is caused by anyone."^{vi} Over the next decade, troubles in Guadalupe only became more complex and pronounced.

Still remote from other Salt River Valley cities, Guadalupe struggled with health care, education, living conditions, and extreme poverty. By the 1950s, the village was densely filled with homes which were extremely poor and dilapidated. Non-residential structures consisted of three grocery stores, one general store, a service station, garage, three

churches, and a school.^{vii} In addition, the uncertain legal status of Guadalupe's land base not only contributed to poor medical, sanitary, and economic conditions, but proved a barrier to their improvement. Despite repeated appeals for help, their lack of political definition as an American Indian tribe, an incorporated body, or as individual property owners, meant they qualified for little county, state, or federal aid. The Yaquis were the only tribe in Arizona not under government supervision. Not even census could figure out how to identify the inhabitants or address the ownership of their land.^{viii}

Though many residents were permanent settlers, most continued to earn their income on a seasonal basis as laborers. By the 1950s, 75 percent of the residents were eligible for some kind of aid or welfare, but few had cars to retrieve it. Horrendous sanitary conditions created severe medical problems. When Jennie Biehn died about 1930, retired medical missionary for the Salt River Pimas, Dr. C. H. Ellis, took over the Presbyterian mission's medical practice. The clinic, together with a \$5,000 government grant from the Farm Security Administration in the 1930s "to clean things up," had failed to provide significant relief.^{ix} Recreational outlets and police protection were well below standard. Even a water source was uncertain. The land itself could not be irrigated as it was below the highline. Wells remained shallow because most of the town lay over a plate of granite extending from South Mountain. People used SRP's Highline Canal, which irrigated lands to the east and north, to bathe and do laundry. Well water was brackish, and often toilet facilities lacked enough water to function. The village was forced to hire a carrier to deliver water to each house at five cents a bucket.^x

In February 1948, fourteen residents, some Yaquis, but mostly Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, formed a partnership to improve living facilities “for the purpose of conducting and operating home, industrial, commercial and social activities at Guadalupe, Arizona”^{xi} Membership in the Guadalupe Home Convenience Cooperative Association was open to any resident for twenty-five cents. School teacher and town advocate Ruby Wood managed the organization. One of their first orders of business was constructing a 153 foot community well equipped with a pump and tank. Some individual homes even got pipes. However, overall the plumbing system was badly designed and insufficient for growth and expansion. A few months later, the Guadalupe Co-op asked for the Salt River Valley Water Users’ Association’s aid. The SRVWUA tapped the Co-op’s well and piped it to its own pumping system on Salt River Project land. In 1950, however, SRVWUA officials discovered that five out of the six wells that provided domestic water to Guadalupe had high bacterial contamination.^{xii}

In 1954, the County Health department reported that the water quality had reached dangerous levels. Residents hired attorneys to complain, and county officials eventually responded by launching a sanitation drive. Still, the Guadalupe Co-op was unable to finance the continued improvements needed to the water delivery system. In 1955, they turned local operations over to the private Hancock Park Water Company to serve 205 customers.^{xiii} This solution soon proved unsatisfactory as well.

The following year, Guadalupe residents lodged another complaint to the county regarding the dearth and quality of their domestic water supply. A preliminary court investigation into the matter revealed that the community had other basic problems it needed

to settle before anything could be done. No one owned land plots in Guadalupe, and residents had no official representation. The judge refused to make any decisions until the community organized itself.^{xiv}

Meanwhile, Guadalupe's poverty and ethnic makeup attracted sociologists, anthropologists, and medical students. During the 1950s and 60s, researchers from Yale University, the Communicable Disease Center of the U. S. Public Health Service, and Arizona State University (ASU) descended on the village. ASU conducted a Mental Retardation Study as well as an army financed behavioral study by Dr. J. A. Jones. Jones' researchers spent ten years in the community, began social and housing programs, and allied with, or even helped to create, various factions.^{xv}

In 1959, Stanford University medical student Andrew Nichols, working independently, examined the medical, health, and county conditions in Guadalupe. He blamed their dire situation on isolation, ethnicity, cultural milieus, and particularly the physical and legal status of the land base. Recent events, however, had foreshadowed imminent changes. In September 1955, Guadalupe school teacher Ruby Wood wrote to Senator Carl Hayden asking him for help. Francisco Olivas, a Mexican from Baja, California, claimed to have title to the forty acres and had hired a lawyer. Wood asserted that he and his brother-in-law, Loretto Luna, had "caused trouble" for years. She expressed her frustration over the Yaquis' helpless predicament and their desire to hold deeds to the land. They were even willing to pay taxes, she said, if it would help the school district and improve Guadalupe's homes. Voicing common perceptions, Ms. Wood identified the land as a presidential grant to the Yaqui people, calling it the "Guadalupe Yaqui Indian Village."

In retrospect, she would later complain that the forty acres where the Yaquis mostly live should have been deeded out to the people and they didn't do it. We've tried two or three time and there's been somebody. . . They almost lost it then and that's the way it's been. Something happens all the time.^{xvi}

In response to Hayden's query, the Bureau of Land Management's Edward Wozzley wrote that there was nothing in the townsite patent language which would prevent the sale of any lots or any transfers of title. Back in 1915, Judge Phillips should have executed the trust according to state laws. The federal government was powerless to act in connection with such proceedings.^{xvii}

Thus, 94 percent of Guadalupe's families owned their home, but almost no one owned their land, much of which was still in trust to the Superior Court or the Presbyterian Church. Nichols predicted that "Within a few years, then, most of Guadalupe's citizens will not only own their own homes, but will be land-owning taxpayers as well. Whether this transition will be accompanied by an increased sense of responsibility and independence or will lead, as one informant predicted, to the dissolution of the community remains to be seen."^{xviii} Over the next decade, Nichol's observations linking land issues to political action and power would prove somewhat prophetic, but a bit naive as well.

The 1960 community of about 3,200 residents had virtually no political or social structure through which to solve its problems. The Maricopa County Board of Supervisors provided the village with limited services and administration. Tempe School District operated the local elementary school. As a local government, Yaqui residents selected a head man every two years. Six others, known as commissioners, assisted him in governing

the village and handling all tribal matters.^{xix} Yet outside of the Catholic and Presbyterian churches which controlled the townsite and Biehn Colony land respectively, residents paid no property taxes, received limited city services, had no official street addresses, no political voice, influence, or recognition in the surrounding communities.

Despite Jennie Biehn's early efforts, the Catholic Church maintained a much larger following than the Presbyterian. For years, priests from the Mount Carmel Parish in Tempe attended to the religious needs of the community.^{xx} Yaquis had helped build the Catholic Church in Guadalupe, but erected a Yaqui church alongside it. Recall that residents had built the structures on the model of the Yaqui River towns, emphasizing those traditions of religion, culture, and kinship that they chose to preserve in their Arizona settlements. So, although Yaquis consider themselves good Catholics, they retained many of their own unique religious beliefs and practices.

In 1955, the Catholic Bishop began to take an interest in Mexican and Indian laborers living in isolation and without direct spiritual guidance. Under the Bishop's development fund, the Diocese in Tucson established a trailer mission in Maricopa County to encompass the labor villages stretching from Casa Grande to Gila Bend. It was based at the Lady of Guadalupe Church and served Guadalupe and the nearby labor (*bracero*) camps. The Bishop appointed Father Gilbert Padilla as a full time priest at the Guadalupe mission. He provided religious instruction and heavily recruited parishioners.

In 1959, Bishop Green received a grant to remodel the Guadalupe Church. In order to do so, the Diocese first had to gain title to the church building and plaza land. This meant that the Catholic Church had to prove ownership by establishing itself as an original

occupant of the area. The churches and plaza land, together with the surrounding Yaqui households constituted the Yaqui community within the boundaries of the original townsite. On November 24, 1959, the Maricopa County Superior Court assigned Judge Lorna S. Lockwood as Phillips' successor to the Townsite of Guadalupe trust. She received a patent file on the original forty acre townsite "whereas the sale of lots, as contemplated by the provisions of Title 70 . . . have never been made to the occupants beneficially entitled to them."^{xxi} The following year, Church officials contacted the law firm of Ryley, Carlock, and Ralston to settle the matter. They hired Phoenix attorneys Frank Brophy and Lawrence Doyle in 1961 and launched a lawsuit against the town of Guadalupe as a formality. Since the residents had established homesites without regard to former survey lines, a new survey was completed on November 9, 1961 that barely resembled its 1910 predecessor (*compare map B to G*). A hearing was scheduled for November 10, 1964. The event ignited the power struggle for legal rights inherent to the ownership of not only the original forty acre townsite, but the Biehn Colony lands as well.

In 1963, the Maricopa County Superior Court ordered the Biehn Colony land into official trust status with the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church. The Board, however, was slow to assume their duties, most important of which was to assign and distribute long overdue property deeds to residents. Tensions between the Board and residents soon escalated. Interest groups spawned from both inside and outside the community and capitalized on the opportunities and movements that characterized the time.^{xxii}

In response to the activities of the Civil Rights Movement and on the heels of the Kennedy assassination, President Lyndon B. Johnson passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It guaranteed equal access to federally funded public accommodations and schools, and it prohibited discrimination by employers and unions on the basis of race, religion, national origin, or sex. In August of that same year, Johnson declared a “War on Poverty,” which led to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act. It provided one billion dollars in federal funds to alleviate conditions in disadvantaged communities and provide job training to create opportunities for economic mobility. Legislation also encouraged poor communities to participate in the decisions that affected them through “community action programs,” known as CAPs. The “invisible communities” targeted for relief included black urban ghettos, rural farmers, American Indians on reservations, and finally, Hispanics living in barrios and migrant labor camps.^{xxiii}

For the most part, the barrios that formed Mexican-American neighborhoods similar to Guadalupe were severely dilapidated. Migrant labor forced a generation into the lowest paying, unskilled jobs in the growing capitalist marketplace. Mexican and Mexican-American children achieved the lowest levels of education due to language barriers and urban segregation. Children were tracked for vocational work, rather than college-- a process that continued to perpetuate the idea that Mexican-Americans were merely a labor force and not equal citizens. In a racially divided nation that saw America as only black and white, Mexican-Americans were recognized as neither part of the white majority, nor as a minority.

With the rise of leaders like Martin Luther King, young Mexican-Americans claimed that they, like African- and Native Americans, were victims of European conquest, racial and cultural discrimination, and police abuse. Native Americans also organized during this time. They demanded the promises made to them through treaties and rights as American citizens. They sought reimbursement for lands that the United States had taken, retribution for cultural losses and discrimination caused by federal policies, and economic aid for the impoverished reservations to which they had been relegated. Similarly, Mexican- Americans also claimed that the loss of homeland (when parts of Mexico became the United States), broken treaties, economic stratification, educational disadvantage, and political powerlessness also denied them their civil rights. The experiences spurred political protest and social activism.

As laborers, Indians, and Mexicans, many of these issues resonated with Guadalupe residents. In the 1960s, young Mexican-Americans from the schools to the migrant camps organized around concepts of unity, nationalism, equality, and power. As a group, the protests eventually became known as the Chicano Movement. Activists revived the concept of “Aztlán,” their lost homeland now part of the United States. They reclaimed and emphasized their Indian heritage. New leaders like Jose Gutierrez, Rodolfo “Corky” Gonzales, and Reis Tijerina symbolized the cause. From 1962 to 1965, farm worker Cesar Chavez organized nationwide grape strikes and boycotts to protest poor migrant working conditions. Chavez learned many of his organizational tactics during the 1950s from Fred Ross, a protégé of the famed community organizer Saul Alinsky.

In the 1930s, Alinsky earned a reputation as a community organizer in Chicago's Polish neighborhood known as "Back of the Yards." His work was particularly notable because he capitalized on local networks and institutions, rather than social workers, and he believed in solving community problems from the inside. Alinsky followed his success by creating the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) to finance his work. Through nationwide publicity, lectures, and outreach, Alinsky became a mentor for community organizing. He taught aggressive strategies and political activism. Many of the activities were characterized by loud protests, confrontations, and targeting a common enemy. His tactics were most successful with stable working and lower middle class neighborhoods because of their strong group ties and viable local institutions such as the church. For similar reasons, Mexican-American communities, with their strong family and neighborhoods, were particularly receptive as well. IAF's philosophy and activities offered Mexican-Americans an outlet for their pride, anger, and desire for self-sufficiency.^{xxiv}

In April 1964, IAF employee Fred Ross, an activist and Hispanic community organizer for the West coast, brought his son to Arizona to spend the summer in Guadalupe by invitation of the Presbyterian Church to help organize the community to address the matter of the Biehn Colony Trust land. With his arrival, Guadalupe embarked on a new era of political participation, community organization, activism, and partisanship. Ironically, Ross decided that people living on the Biehn Colony's land were at a disadvantage and needed advocates in dealing with the Trust Board itself. He also determined that the entire Guadalupe community required unity and self-organization. Typical of Mexican barrios throughout the Southwest, Guadalupe suffered from high unemployment, limited job and

educational opportunity, racial discrimination, and lack of any political voice through which residents could advance their situation. After five months of training, Ross chose Lauro Garcia, the director of the Guadalupe Health Council, to head the Alinsky style anti-poverty agency.^{xxv}

The Garcias had moved to Guadalupe in 1960 and worked with the Catholic Church to provide religious instruction to residents.^{xxvi} They had founded the Guadalupe Health Council back in 1962 to improve the medical needs and facilities and increase Guadalupe's political power. The Council wanted to do more, but it had little knowledge or professional training for how to do so effectively.

Under Fred Ross' instruction, the Guadalupe Health Council officially incorporated as the Guadalupe Organization (GO) in 1964. Between 1963 and 1965, GO launched several social organizations, health services, and economic programs.^{xxvii} It was essentially the first vehicle through which the citizens of Guadalupe were able to wield political power, autonomy, and affect significant change and improvement in their community. Its wide outreach made it integral to the financial, medical, and professional life and growth of the town. In 1963, *Arizona Republic* reporter Mitzi Zipf echoed a view of Guadalupe no doubt shared by most people in the Salt River Valley. She described Guadalupe's poverty and dilapidation in vivid detail, but praised the community's cultural preservation, at least in the case of the Easter ceremonies-- an event that drew annual attention to the otherwise ignored community. She credited a new community anti-poverty group known as the Guadalupe Organization for fighting to improve things.^{xxviii} But unfortunately for the community, GO's aggressive tactics over culturally sensitive issues provided the catalyst for internal

factionalism and a heightened political climate in a formerly quiet and fairly cohesive community. Among GO's first acts were a series of lawsuits against the Protestant Biehn Colony Board, its original sponsor, over land ownership.

In response to the Economic Opportunity Act, Maricopa County had established its own antipoverty agency in Guadalupe in October 1965. The county received funds for the Maricopa County Community Action Program (CAP) from the San Francisco branch of the federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Their purpose was to develop reports about dealing with local poverty programs, provide consulting services, and lend personnel to initiate and administer their own programs. CAP was a government funded program usually run by professionally trained social workers. It worked within the federal system, in various local communities nationwide, to develop activities and organizations to relieve poverty and encourage community activity and political and economic participation. GO, on the other hand, spawned from Alinsky's politically radical philosophy that promoted community empowerment through aggressive programs and confrontational tactics, but the source of its funding shifted from the IAF to the federally funded Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) as well. In 1966, GO received additional funds from the Migrant Opportunity Program-- an annual federal grant of about \$150,000. Notably, the Ad Hoc committee formed to oversee the CAP's development recommended that the new agency sign a written agreement with the Guadalupe Organization and six other communities served by the Arizona Migrant and Indian Ministry stipulating that each entity would permit the others to operate without interference.^{xxix} The two agencies were continually clashed in philosophy and methodology about what should be done in Guadalupe, and how. Thus, when the question of the

ownership of the original forty acre Guadalupe townsite went to court, the rival poverty agencies took sides. And all the other players, including the Yaqui community, mobilized for the 1964 court hearing as well.^{xxx}

In opposition to the Catholic Church's land claims, the Guadalupe Community Association had incorporated in 1962 as a non-profit Yaqui organization. Its members secured legal representation from the law firm Gibson and Gibson. It was legally incorporated "to assist residents in the exercising of their interests and rights received pursuant to that certain deed recorded in the Maricopa County Recorder's Office, July 20, 1915."^{xxxi} The group restricted membership to the families of descendants of the Guadalupe townsite's original inhabitants.

Although many members had *bona fide* residential claims to 130 house lots on the forty acres, the Guadalupe Community Association insisted instead that the churches and plaza remain communal property.^{xxxii} When the surveyor arrived to re-plat the plaza for legal purposes, Yaquis reportedly kept removing the survey markers, which were no doubt perceived as a deliberate effort to claim the land. It was not until the county replaced the standard markers with crosses that they were able to complete the survey.^{xxxiii} The Community Association counter-sued. They felt if the Church owned the plaza land, it meant the Yaqui community had been robbed of its ceremonial territory. As medical student Andrew Nichols observed, "Those who know nothing else of Guadalupe or the Yaquis will know their religion."^{xxxiv}

Over the fifty years since its establishment, the forty acres (*La Cuarenta*), and especially the plaza land itself, had become quite culturally significant to Yaqui residents as

a community and religious center. The plaza continues to be the site of the fiestas and Easter ceremonies today. Since Guadalupe's founding, the ceremonies united the dispersed Yaqui community and helped retain continuity in their culture. Possession of the land by anyone outside the community meant losing control of the Yaqui culture's expression.

The Guadalupe Community Association argued that the term "occupants" in the 1867 townsite act legally meant residents, or individual occupants. The Church was legally considered a "corporate sole," and could not claim individual occupant status. Lawyer Frank Gibson argued that Congress intended the Townsite Act to encourage western settlement. Guadalupe resident Benito Quijade further expressed the Yaqui view of the situation in a letter to President Kennedy to whom he appealed for help. He insisted that "always, since 1910 lived as a Yaqui tribe, believing this land was set aside for the Yaqui Indians of Mexico through the good works of farmers, priests, and Carl Hayden."^{xxxv}

Church officials were naive about the Yaquis' priorities and concerns. They saw Guadalupe's church as Diocese property because, they argued, Roman Catholic Yaquis built it. The Church saw itself as an original occupant, who through Father Zittier, had made arrangements for the Indians and the Catholic Church to acquire land under the townsite act. The Church's lawyers provided numerous affidavits swearing its historic presence on the property.

Still, the intense reaction surprised Bishop Green. The Catholic Church had, since Father Zittier, taken a paternalistic role with Guadalupe residents. Having only visiting priests from local congregations, Guadalupe residents and the Yaquis living at the SRVWUA work camps had maintained their churches themselves for over thirty years. The

local priests who arrived in the 1960s, however, were not as intimate with the community or sensitive to its cultural issues. They led mass in Guadalupe, but were rarely present for Yaqui ceremonies.^{xxxvi} They and the Diocese saw the trailer missions as an opportunity to reclaim lost parishioners and introduce pure Catholicism in Guadalupe. Unwilling to risk alienating much of the congregation, Green capitulated that the Church was willing to allow continued use of the “pagan” Yaqui church and would improve the property and the Catholic church if given title.^{xxxvii}

A few months prior to the hearing, Governor Paul Fannin intervened to try and settle the matter of the plaza land. He contacted representatives of parties he considered relevant to mediate and settle the matter.^{xxxviii} When Bishop Green realized the magnitude of the Yaqui opposition, the Church bowed to the protests and dropped the civil suit.^{xxxix} Judge Kenneth Chatwin never made a final decision on the ownership of the plaza, though the Court distributed most of the lots in *La Cuarenta* to the general satisfaction of residents at ten dollars per every twenty-five feet to legitimate claimants. The plaza and church property remained in trust to the County Superior Court. Over the following years, people filed petitions through the court to hold ceremonies or establish trailer missions on the site. Still, no one forgot the issue of the plaza land and the active parties throughout this initial struggle remained intimately involved in Guadalupe politics.^{xl}

In 1967, the Presbyterian Church financed a professional land use study for the Biehn Colony trust land. The final report suggested the county’s Guadalupe based CAP agency draft a development plan for the town. But in 1968, GO led the court appeal to take the Biehn Colony land’s development plans away from the Presbyterian’s jurisdiction and

put it into the hands of the residents. The case similarly splintered the Guadalupe community.^{xli}

In another highly publicized case, GO fought educational discrimination. Teacher Socorro Bernasconi, GO advocated bilingual education and charged the Tempe School District with assigning Spanish-speaking Guadalupe children to classes for the mentally retarded based on IQ tests conducted in English. After numerous appeals, Bernasconi won the suit. In 1973, the US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ordered Tempe to desegregate the Frank School which was made up almost entirely of Mexican-American and Yaqui students. The issue of bussing Guadalupe children out to other schools again created disputes and antagonism between GO and anti-GO forces. Despite its activity and victories, internal and external charges of nepotism and allegations of impropriety plagued the organization.^{xlii}

By that time, Guadalupe was not as isolated as it had once been. Children attended schools in Tempe, and the distance from the other Salt River Valley communities no longer protected its autonomy. Though agricultural and desert lands still surrounded the village, Guadalupe's location would soon become quite strategic. The area's growth put Guadalupe adjacent to Interstate 10, the main artery from Tucson to Phoenix, and a five minute drive from Sky Harbor International Airport. Residents discovered that the unincorporated townsite of Guadalupe was in the path of Tempe's planned expansion and, according to its Master Plan, the City of Tempe planned to annex the village.^{xliii}

Guadalupe's reaction to the news was again divided. GO led the fight to preserve the status quo of the village. Organization leaders argued that 75 percent of the dwellings in

Guadalupe, closely associated with the Mexican-American and Yaqui Indian lifestyles, were not up to Tempe's building codes. In addition, many religious traditions, such as wood fires during fiestas and wakes, would also be outlawed. They claimed that it would cost \$3.8 million dollars to bring Guadalupe up to Tempe standards. Tempe, however, denied that any prohibitions would occur. In 1974, GO enlisted the Arizona Historical Society to determine if Guadalupe qualified as an historically significant site based on its Yaqui culture and thus gain protections as a designated cultural resource. GO's rival, the county's CAP agency, together with the Yaqui Council (heir to the Guadalupe Community Association), again opposed GO's suggestion. In addition to the representatives of these organizations, approximately 100 more people from Guadalupe arrived at the meeting. Most believed decisions had been made without them and were fearful and uninformed about the impact of designation on the community. CAP director Jimmy Molina and other community members voiced concerns that historical designation would invite tourists, and that Guadalupe residents valued their privacy and traditions too much to be a tourist attraction. The meeting turned so chaotic and hostile, the issue was tabled indefinitely.^{xliv}

Next, GO enlisted the services of Bank of America financial consultant James Chilton and Scottsdale lawyer Jerry Levine. Both men determined that incorporation was the most beneficial solution to Guadalupe's problems and gaining self-determination. In a feasibility study, Chilton calculated that out of the \$360,000 of county funds slated for Guadalupe, only \$100,000 made it to the village. Incorporation would provide the community a political platform and means to receive all their entitled funds, improve social, economic, and physical conditions, and give residents control over revenue. The Citizens

Committee to Incorporate Guadalupe, led a heavy educational campaign addressing the issue of what incorporation would mean.^{xliv}

However, another group of citizens began lobbying against incorporation. On September 18, 1974, representatives from Tempe and the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors met with several Guadalupe residents. At the meeting held at the Frank Elementary School in town, officials reiterated that Tempe would not annex Guadalupe without the residents' approval, and that if incorporated, they would have to pay higher taxes for city services. Opponents of incorporation, such as Anna Hernandez, suspected this whole process "was another move by GO to run the town."^{xlvi}

Other opponents argued over whether Guadalupe residents were prepared to run their own government, how the village could benefit from City of Tempe services, whether the town could finance the government, and finally just who would sit on the town council. The next day, Levine and Garcia held a meeting to answer questions about incorporation, and 50 people from town attended. According to Arizona law, a community's incorporation needs the approval of any other city within its three mile radius. After much debate, the Phoenix and Tempe city councils conceded. On February 4, 1975, Guadalupe voted to incorporate. Not surprisingly, the election was extremely close with 294 ballots in favor and 218 opposed.^{xlvii}

A town hall graced the main street of *Avenida del Yaqui* the following year. The new structure symbolized a single platform for all of Guadalupe's voices. The *Arizona Republic* reported on the town's rapid and impressive progress. The council soon created a fire station, library, youth club, and established zoning regulations. GO and CAP spawned

various service organizations. These auspicious beginnings may have been slightly misleading. Yet despite the highly publicized instances of infighting, controversy, and scandal, Guadalupe has now governed itself for twenty-one years. Today, Yaqui, Mexican, and American culture continue to thrive.

Guadalupe's persistence and preservation of the community has been a long and complex story of cultural maintenance and separatism, evolving social and legal identity, and economic need amidst a rapidly changing and encroaching environment. The town's first inhabitants were not only immigrants, but refugees. They were neither American Indian nor Mexican-American, but Indians from Mexico. In the United States, Yaquis were newcomers with no ties to property since the Mexican government had taken their own land on the Yaqui River in Sonora, Mexico. Instead, the United States was a place of refuge for Yaquis, rather than either a homeland, or an "escape-valve," for better wages and more freedom.

As refugees, Yaquis were more concerned with survival than with economic advancement. The city of Phoenix was founded on an agricultural base within which Yaqui Indian refugees were able to find a niche. Anglos were sympathetic to their plight. Employers and political officials viewed the former rebels as independent warriors, but more importantly as a highly dexterous and dependable work force.^{xlvi} While many corporations set up labor camps, or "company towns," the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association established an exclusively Yaqui village that lasted for over thirty years and ensured the community's stability, sustenance and persistence.

Both Catholic and Presbyterian missionaries, as well as local farmers supported the community. For years, the political status of the Yaquis in Arizona was vague. At times, this lack of clear a legal definition could be both a benefit and a hindrance. Yaquis were not heavily targeted for deportation along with thousands of Mexicans during the nation-wide repatriation movement of the 1930s. As Indians, Yaquis saw themselves distinctly separate from the Mexicans, and so did Anglos. Having accepted Catholic doctrines hundreds of years before, missionaries favored Yaquis, offered them religious direction and fostered an initial settlement with economic and political aid. Yaquis set up church-centered settlements and households on the models of their towns in Mexico and revived religious ceremonies and organization. Anglo society tolerated and even enjoyed many of their traditions and celebrations. Still, prominent employers, political officials, and paternalistic religious authorities institutionalized economic, political, and educational discrimination.

The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s brought both opportunity and more aggressive group action. After World War II, the increased Mexican population transformed the former Yaqui village into a Mexican-American community as well. When commercial development and municipal expansion destroyed and annexed barrios throughout the Phoenix and Tempe area, and farming corporations disbanded their labor camps, the Yaquis and Mexican residents of Guadalupe successfully took advantage of the economic programs and political movements. Whether by choice or by proximity, Yaquis joined Mexican-Americans in their fight for political voice and economic improvements.

Swift changes and aggressive activities brought historical relationships, antagonisms, and unsettled land claims directly to the surface. Yet in 1975, Guadalupe voted to

incorporate rather than allow the growing City of Tempe to annex it as an ethnic enclave. Incorporation transformed Guadalupe from an ethnic enclave to the status of a municipal body. The move ensured the Mexican-Yaqui community's separatism, autonomy, and preservation. Soon after, due to the efforts of those in Tucson, Yaqui residents legally qualified as American Indians.^{xlix}

Self identity, determination, and community consciousness combined with the Yaquis' preferred position as a labor force, vague political status, and ambiguous ethnic identification to place the Yaqui community in a promising position for sustenance and longevity. Although the Guadalupe's factions bicker like a close-knit family, and politics can become quite bitter and volatile, both Yaqui and Mexican residents remain committed to the community and the preservation of their culture and traditions. These factors have guided Guadalupe and its community through almost one hundred years of survival and contributed to its singular position as an ethnic island amidst the Phoenix metropolitan area.

ⁱ The case of Guadalupe follows a historical pattern among the Yaqui Indians in Mexico, who, after centuries of Catholic tutelage and labor on *haciendas* and in mines, fought repeatedly and militantly for their sacred land on the Yaqui River in Sonora. Ironically, Mexican immigrants had begun moving onto land adjacent to the Yaquis' original forty acres in the 1920s.

ⁱⁱ Years after much of the upheaval in Mexico had passed, some Yaquis had returned to the Yaqui River towns in Sonora.

ⁱⁱⁱ Frances Sanita, "Yaqui Indians," Works Progress Administration Writer's Program, Arizona State Archives.

^{iv} Aerial Photographs, Salt River Project Archives, 1934, 1949, 1961. This acreage included most of the eastern half of Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 4 East.

^v Governor John H. Pyle to "The Yaqui People of Guadalupe Village, 31 December 1953, Governor J. H. Pyle Papers, Governor's Office, Arizona State Archives.

^{vi} Ibid.

^{vii} Mitzi Zipf, "Struggle for a Better Life," *Arizona Republic*, 1 July 1963, 2-B.

^{viii} *Arizona Republic*, 21 April 1953, *Phoenix Gazette*, c. 1954, Newspaper Clippings, Krause Collection, Box 12, Folder 27, Arizona Historical Foundation.

^{ix} Ruby Wood, Interview by Marjorie H. Wilson, August 7, 1968, (Transcript. Arizona Historical Foundation), 9-17; Census Tracts, 1960; Andrew W. Nichols, "Proposed Manner of Introduction of More Adequate Medical Care to a Semi-isolated Mexican-Indian Community." (Stanford: Stanford School of Medicine, 1961), 2-6.

^x Nichols, 3.

^{xi} Certificate of Partnership, Book #2 of Partnerships, County Recorder's Office, Phoenix, Arizona, 324-325.

^{xii} "Guadalupe: A Unique Mix," *Phoenix Gazette*, c.1979, Krause Collection, Arizona Historical Foundation; Nichols, 12; Files re: Guadalupe Water Supply, 1948-1950, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xiii} Today, Guadalupe's water is provided by the City of Tempe. Nichols, 12; Agreement between Hancock Park Development Company and the Guadalupe Home Convenience Cooperative Association, 20 December 1955, Files of the Water Commissioner, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xiv} Thornton Jones, Court Water Commissioner, to Hon. Charles C. Bernstein, Superior Court Judge, 30 April 1958, Files of the Water Commissioner, Salt River Project Archives.

^{xv} Nichols, 19-21.

^{xvi} Ruby Wood, 32.

^{xvii} Edward Woosley to Carl Hayden, 22 December 1955, Patent Files, General Land Office, National Archives, Suitland, Maryland.

^{xviii} Nichols, 4.

^{xix} Frances Sanita, "Yaqui Indians," WPA Files, Arizona State Archives.

^{xx} Report, Diocese of Tucson, 1 January 1964, 16 December 1965; "Guadalupe Villagers' Participation In Church Activities Increased," *Arizona Register*, 8 August 1964.

^{xxi} "Order Appointing Court Commissioner," (Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson v. Guadalupe Community Association, No. 104499, Maricopa County Superior Court), 1964.

^{xxii} Lauro Garcia, Interview with Ella Varbel, 19 November, 1973, (Transcript. Chicano Collections, Arizona State University); Fred Ross, *Conquering Goliath: Cesar Chavez at the Beginning* (Keene, California: El Taller Grafico Press, 1989), "About the Author."

^{xxiii} *Economic Opportunity Act. Statutes at Large* 78, sec. 202, 516 (1964).

^{xxiv} Peter Skerry, *Mexican-Americans: The Ambivalent Minority*. New York: The Free Press, 1993), 163-167; Juan Gómez Quiñones, *Chicano Politics: Reality and Promise 1940-1990* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990) 49, 180; Benjamin Marquez, "Organizing the Mexican-American Community in Texas: The Legacy of Saul Alinsky," *Policy Studies Review* 9 (Winter 1990), 335-373; Also see Saul Alinsky, *Reveille for Radicals* (New York: Vintage Books), 1969.

^{xxv} Alinskian tactics included training full time organizers who were dependent on the local support, identifying issues by informal polling and selecting the one with the most potential and the lowest risk, flexibility, building a local committee, and within a non-ideological framework. During the Depression, Fred Ross ran the federal migratory labor camp on which John Steinbeck based his information

for *The Grapes of Wrath*. During World War II, he worked with the War Relocation Authority to transfer Japanese Americans out of the concentration camps. In 1947, Alinsky hired Fred Ross, a west coast activist and organizer, to form the Community Organized for Public Services (COPS) at the east side barrio in Los Angeles, California. In 1952, Ross met Chavez, then a farm worker, and persuaded Alinsky to hire him the following year. Ross and Chavez formed 22 Community Service Organizations (CSO) across California. Five years later, Chavez quit the CSO to devote full time to organizing migrant farm workers. Ross, 145; Robert A. Slayton, *Back of the Yards* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 196-198; Quiñones, 49, 53-56, 180.

^{xxvi} The Garcias moved into Guadalupe in 1960 when Lauro, a Korean War Veteran, attended Arizona State University for his Masters Degree. He and his wife gave religious instruction to some of the town residents from their trailer home. Soon after, Father Fidelis Kuban arrived as pastor at the Diocese's trailer mission, and in 1964, Father Elias Galves joined Kuban. The Garcias worked closely with the priests and attendance at Mass rose steadily. Lauro Garcia interview; Ross, 145; Barbara Cortright, "Scar City," 2 *Reveille Magazine* (Fall 1967), 13.

^{xxvii} GO established a credit union to perform a variety of banking functions including lending money and cashing checks. Additionally, the organization ran a food stamp distribution center and issued a weekly newsletter door-to-door delivery that allowed residents to learn where and when to register to vote. Guadalupe's registered voters increased from 180 to 800. A health clinic operated from the service center. It included family, maternity, and pediatric clinics. It also provided services from welfare case workers, issued driver's licenses, provided transportation services, initiated neighborhood youth groups, job training, a recreation program, and a book center. In 1967, funds helped rebuild the Yaqui temple and run an adult education school in conjunction with the Catholic Church. Until the mid-1970s, GO helped fund adult education, a Headstart program, job training and a dental clinic. The agency also launched several lawsuits involving education discrimination, land issues, and sanitary conditions. Raymond G. Zilla, "Guadalupe: Was Incorporation Best?" 1977, Arizona Collections.

^{xxviii} Mitzi Zipf, "Struggle for a Better Life," *Arizona Republic*, 1 September 1963; 2 September 1963; 3 September 1963.

^{xxix} "Chicanoism or Communism?" Arizona Collections. "Report on the Status of Maricopa County Community Action Agency," Arizona Historical Foundation; *Arizona Republic*, 25 January 1972; *Tempe Daily News*, 15 March 1971, 1.

^{xxx} The rivalry between community social organizations in Guadalupe was not unusual or unique. In his article "Chicago Influences on the War on Poverty," sociologist Noel A. Cazenave argues that the conflict dated back to 1930s Chicago when Alinsky's Back of the Yards Council competed with the Council of Social Agencies. Official alliances during this politically volatile period reflect the complexity of long-time racial and religious relationships in Guadalupe. The community split between these organizations was not along clear religious or ethnic lines. Noel A. Cazenave, "Chicago Influences on the War on Poverty," *Journal of Policy History* 5 (1993): 52-68.

^{xxxi} "Certificate of Incorporation," Guadalupe Community Association Articles of Incorporation, Arizona Corporation Commission, Phoenix, Arizona.

^{xxxii} Civil Case #104499; Ann Ramenofsky, "The Rise of Guadalupe Factions from Legal Claims to Plaza Land," (M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, June 1968), 46.

^{xxxiii} Frank Brophy interview.

^{xxxiv} Nichols, 9.

^{xxxv} Benito Quijade to President John F. Kennedy, August 18, 1962 from the Patent File for the Town of Guadalupe, #442696, Phoenix #011733, General Land Office Records, National Archives, Suitland, Maryland.

^{xxxvi} Spicer, *The Yaquis*, 5-50.

^{xxxvii} Ramenofsky, 45; Frank Brophy interview.

^{xxxviii} Fannin contacted Lauro Garcia, Director of the Guadalupe Organization, Robert A. Boessel, Director of the Indian Education Center, Arizona State University, Antonio Coronado, Guadalupe Community Association, Father Elias Galvez, Our Lady of Guadalupe Mission, Reverend Claude L. Morton, Office of the Presbyterian Church, Josiah Moore, and Judge R. C. Stanford, the Superior Court.

^{xxxix} Frank Brophy interview, 2 March 1995; Franklin K. Gibson interview, 28 February 1995.

^{xl} In April 1967, the Tucson Diocese used the Raskob Foundation funds to build a parish center to host various community projects off the original 40 acre townsite. The Yaqui Indians raised money by giving fiestas and remodeled the Guadalupe church themselves. In 1972, Bishop Edward A. McCarthy, from the newly established Diocese of Phoenix, declared Our Lady of Guadalupe Church a shrine. Soon after, McCarthy, tried again to get the deed to the plaza arguing that it was perfectly reasonable that the Catholic Church own the property on which one of its parishes was located. Again a Yaqui group objected on the basis that they feared it would preclude their religious services. This time they had the support of the local resident priests, Fathers Elias, David Myers, and Fidelis. The trustee of the plaza land, Superior Court Judge Jerry Glenn suggested the court deed the land to an elected group of ten Yaquis. In the end, the plaza land remained in trust to the court. Civil Case No. 104499; Bobby Morgan, "Church Remodeled," *Arizona Republic*; 25 June 1967; News Release, Diocese of Tucson Archives; Mark Wm. Nykanen, "The Guadalupe Land Grab, or Why Does the Catholic Church want the Yaqui's Land and What are They Willing to Do to Get It?" *The New Times*, 7 May 1975.

^{xli} In 1974, the OEO wanted to consolidate the rival anti-poverty agencies. "Guadalupe Plans Appeal of Church's Court Victory, *Arizona Republic*, 14 November 1968, Newspaper Clippings, Chicano Collection, University Libraries, Department of Archives and Manuscripts. "Guadalupe Group Seems in Line for Federal Grant," *Arizona Republic*, 25 January 1972; Albert J. Sitter, "Probe Fails to Discredit Poverty Agency," *Arizona Republic*, 23 March 1972.

^{xlii} The OEO investigated GO several times, probing into GO's activities and elections. In 1972, representative John J. Rhodes criticized GO for not allowing County or Tempe officials on the Board. The OEO threatened to pull GO's funding, a \$195,000 grant through the Migrant Opportunity Program funded by migrant opportunity program, but by 1972, Guadalupe was not a migrant settlement, and only 2% of the residents were actually farm workers. "Tempe Schools Adopt Integration Plan," *Arizona Republic*, 14 April 14, 28 June 1973; "Guadalupe Parents Divided on Bussing Issue," *Arizona Rerpublic*; August 10, 1973; Jerry Levine, "The Status and Direction of the Unincorporated Village of Guadalupe," 1 September 1974, Chicano Collections.

^{xliii} Tempe already had several ties to the Guadalupe village. The city provided schools, fire protection, some water service, shopping and recreational facilities. Aerial Photograph, 1969, Salt River Project Archives; Levine, "The Status and Direction of the Unincorporated Village of Guadalupe."

^{xliv} Larry Ross, "Moves Underway to Put Guadalupe on Historical List," *Tempe Daily News*; 1 August 1974; Bonnie Bartak, "Guadalupe Debates Historical Site Value," *Arizona Republic*, 14 August 1974, B1; Sharon Simpson, "Historical Meet Draw Ire From Local Residents," *Tempe Daily News*, 14 August 1974, 1; "Panel to Delay Designating Guadalupe as Historical Site," *Arizona Republic*, 11 October

1974; Minutes from the Historic Sites Review Committee, 13 August 1974, State Historic Preservation Office, Phoenix, AZ.

^{xlv} Bonnie Bartak, "Tempe Annexation Looms for Impoverished Village," *Arizona Republic*, 28 July 1974; "Guadalupe Petition Drive Starts," *Phoenix Gazette*, 9 September 1974, 7; Bonnie Bartak, "Panel Pushes Incorporation of Guadalupe," *Arizona Republic*, 9 September 1974, A1; Charles Kelly, "Few Back Guadalupe City Status," *Arizona Republic*, 19 September 1974; "Guadalupe, Arizona: Incorporation; 1974," Chicano Collections, Arizona State University.

^{xlvi} Linda Lawson, "Tempe To Ponder Guadalupe Proposal," *Tempe Daily News*, 9 September 1974, p.1

^{xlvii} Bonnie Bartak, "Incorporation Approved in Guadalupe," *Arizona Republic*, 5 February 1975; "Guadalupe, Arizona: Incorporation," Arizona Collections; "Guadalupeanos Nix Incorporation," *Tempe Daily News*, 19 September 1974.

^{xlviii} RG 91, Works Progress Administration, Phoenix, Arizona: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

^{xlix} In contrast, the Yaquis near Tucson, whose village was predominantly Yaqui, chose relief through federal recognition as Native Americans. With the aid and support of academics, lawyers, prominent politicians, and political maneuvering, President Carter signed Public Law 960375 declaring the Yaquis a tribe on September 18, 1978. For a detailed explanation of how the Yaquis achieved federal recognition see Mark E. Miller, "The Yaquis Become American Indians: The Process of Federal Tribal Recognition," *The Journal of Arizona History* 35 (Summer 1994), 183-204.

CHAPTER 5

EPILOGUE: HOW TO PRESERVE A COMMUNITY

Preservation practices have traditionally focused on the built environment, while the idea of preserving a community is less tangible. Guadalupe's story illustrates that it has done so without the help of preservation planning or policy. Still, as *Power of Place* author Dolores Hayden points out, "people invest places with social and cultural meaning, and urban landscape history can provide a framework for connecting those meanings into contemporary urban life."ⁱ Likewise, in her 1961 work *The Life and Death of Great American Cities*, Jane Jacobs slams city planners who hope to improve urban living by homogenizing the city with constant rebuilding and the destruction of "slumlike" urban areas. Instead, she advocated that diversity means vitality.

Guadalupe's very persistence and existence within the Phoenix metropolis attests to its significance in the city's history. Once located on barren and remote land, Guadalupe now occupies highly valued real estate with easy accessibility to almost anywhere in the Valley. As Phoenix and its surrounding municipalities continue to expand, the centers of activity have shifted and Guadalupe's few cultural resources are in jeopardy. In such a place, awareness of a shared heritage has provided fertile ground for cultural preservation and community survival. But increasingly, Guadalupe's identity and political status have been threatened, by both internal politics and external pressures.

Immediately following incorporation, Guadalupe's new self- government instituted numerous improvements, which aimed to both maintain cultural preservation and aid economic advancement. In addition to the town hall, a library brought classic literature and

ethnic reading materials to the community, a youth club and fire station were established, and the town council imposed zoning regulations.ⁱⁱ Four historic neighborhoods emerged: La Cuarenta, Biehn Colony, Solarez, and Gastello. More recently, Encinas, Projects, Ranchitos, and Sende Vista have joined the city.

Yet by 1987, Guadalupe's political squabbles, controversies, and in-fighting, even within the town council, had garnered harsh, negative publicity. Politics in Guadalupe are extremely complex, but the factions and animosities, along with the pride and commitment to the community have their roots in the town's heritage and development. Town council members and other community leaders have allied themselves with various community factions and organizations, such as the Presbyterian and Catholic churches, those of Yaqui or Mexican heritage, those who had been born in town, or those who had later moved there. Personal issues and kinship loyalties also contributed to the schisms. Disagreements about how to run the new town fueled charges of corruption and made it difficult to keep a police chief, town magistrate, or a town manager. Rather than for its exotic cultural ceremonies, Guadalupe gained notoriety for its high unemployment rate, severe poverty, alcoholism, drug abuse, delinquency, disease, illiteracy and corruption. One newspaper reporter went so far as to call Guadalupe an "ethical cesspool."ⁱⁱⁱ Another sarcastically compared the political leadership to Czarist Russia. Some Guadalupanos defended their achievements, while others accused the media of aiding a conspiracy to drive Guadalupe's residents off their land.

In February 1990, Guadalupe's historic poverty gained federal notoriety when Town Manager José Solarez invited then Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Jack

Kemp and Representative Jay Rhodes to visit the town. Shocked by the living conditions, Kemp declared Guadalupe in “chronic economic distress,” thus making residents eligible for low-interest loans to repair or rebuild homes. Improvements, however, were slow to materialize, and many residents complained that the government had failed to keep its promises.^{iv} Today, Guadalupe and its reputation as a troubled, run-down town persist.

Numerous social agencies work to improve conditions like drug abuse and alleviate poverty and illness. Though many are still agricultural laborers, many residents are craftsmen, technicians, and service workers. According to the 1992-2010 town plan, Guadalupe anticipates significant demographic growth. Already, the community has the highest population density in the state. Its long-term objectives include promoting orderly development, enhancing an economic base, improving the quality of life, and beautifying the city. The number one goal, however, is to “preserve the uniqueness of the town” by encouraging Mexican and Yaqui culture and traditions.^v Yet although incorporation succeeded in ensuring the community’s relative permanence, the same did not hold true for many of its historic and cultural properties-- its visual memory and identity.

Ten years ago, Guadalupe permanently lost other significant cultural sites. In 1986, the Gosnell Development Corporation built condominiums and a golf course at the base of South Mountain called “The South Mountain Pointe Resort” over protests from Guadalupe citizens. The area, separated from the town by the Interstate 10 since the early 1970s, was the site of sacred religious ceremonies and a cemetery, presumed to be the Protestant burial ground purchased by Jennie Biehn. A restaurant known as “Rustler’s Roost” perched atop a hill to which Yaquis had made annual pilgrimages for years.

Soon, a massive new shopping mall will threaten the unique character of the town and challenge Guadalupe's citizens to maintain their culture and community. There are significant traditional cultural properties attached to the community that become more endangered by future development. Meanwhile, despite almost thirty years of lawsuits and other legal activity, disputes over two of the town's most historically and culturally significant land parcels have not yet been resolved. The issues of ownership and use of the plaza land and churches continue to be contested through the courts and among Guadalupe's factions. The work camps of the Salt River Project and elsewhere have been destroyed, although mitigation reports, photographs, and documents survive.

Guadalupe still retains properties like the town's cemetery, which provides a place for living people to connect with their heritage and ancestors. Collective histories can bind a community together by allowing it to participate in reconstructing and interpreting its own past. And in the case of Guadalupe, the cemetery also marks the community's first settlement, about a mile and a half northeast of the present town.^{vi} Residents hold celebrations for *Dia de Los Muertos* (The Day of the Dead, or All Saints Day) there annually. And of course, as the sites of religious ceremony integral to both Yaqui and to Mexican culture, the Presbyterian, Catholic, and Yaqui churches, as well as the plaza land, are symbolic landmarks on the unique cultural landscape. Together, they recall the historical and cultural identity of the community.

Incorporating current preservation practice into town plans could not only offer physical and financial protection to these types of sites in the future, but also allow for both cultural continuity and economic improvement. Already, Guadalupe's town plan includes

zoning regulations. Listing on the National Register of Historic Places is another way to honor, recognize, and protect sites that the community values. In addition, National Register properties will always be considered before any federal undertaking and qualify for federal funds and tax benefits in preservation efforts.^{vii}

Unlike other neighborhoods and cities in the metropolitan area, places like Guadalupe have properties not normally considered eligible to the National Register. However, the category of a “traditional cultural property” is defined by its “association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that a) are rooted in that community’s history, and b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community.”^{viii} The Secretary of Interior also acknowledges that “traditional cultural values are often central to the way a community or group defines itself, and maintaining such values is often vital to maintaining a group’s identity and self-respect.”^{ix}

The search for personal identity often begins with family and community. Conversely, a community can discover itself in its past and in its people. Collective histories can bind a community together by allowing it to participate in reconstructing and interpreting its own past. Learning community and family history can help foster pride and identity especially among the young who, distracted by the influences of modern American popular culture that literally surrounds them, no longer sit at the feet of their grandparents to hear the old stories. Memories and images from the past should resonate the present. Photographic exhibits can evoke memories and stories. Genealogical discussions, recorded oral histories, and activities encourage personal research. Such activity is also eligible for grants from organizations like the Arizona Humanities Council, which gives preference to

small, isolated, and often overlooked communities. In a place like Guadalupe, Arizona, awareness of a shared heritage could provide fertile ground for continued cultural preservation and community survival.

No doubt, residents today remain determined as ever to maintain their town. Guadalupe's religious and cultural properties are eligible for historic site designation, subsequent tax benefits, funding, and other restoration and preservation incentives. Accompanied by community consciousness, pride, participation, and inter-generational dialogue, these sites can continue to preserve and illustrate the community's heritage and history. To survive the most recent onslaught of urban progress and popular culture, Guadalupe must learn from their past, and find practical new ways to adapt to new changes and challenges.

ⁱ Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1995), 78.

ⁱⁱ Bonnie Bartak, "Guadalupe is Advancing Rapidly After Incorporation," *Arizona Republic*, 5 September 1976, Section B, Page 1.

ⁱⁱⁱ Dennis Wagner, "Some Way of Life," *The Phoenix Gazette*, 19 January 1987, p. 3NA.

^{iv} "Who Weeps for Guadalupe?" *The Phoenix Gazette*, 19 February 1987, A16; Kerry Fehr, "Guadalupe to Receive Funds to Ease Economic Distress," *The Arizona Republic*, 12 March 1990; 6-1; Michael Murphy, "Aid Pledged for Guadalupe Living Conditions Likened to Results of Disasters," *The Phoenix Gazette*, 13 June 1990, A1; Mary J Pitzl, "HUD Chief Sees Perot in Race...," *The Arizona Republic*, 30 September 1992, A2; "Guadalupe and Mr. Kemp: No More Promises," *The Arizona Republic*, editorial, 3 June 1992, A8.

^v Almost one third of the population remains Yaqui, while approximately two-thirds is Hispanic. *Town of Guadalupe: Master Plans 1992-2010*, 2, 17, 21.

^{vi} The Guadalupe cemetery is located just south of the Western Canal, north of Baseline and west of Hardy Road.

^{vii} "How to Complete the National Register Registration Form," (Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, National Park Service 1991), i.

^{viii} Patricia L. Parker and Thomas F. King, "Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties," 38 *National Register Bulletin US Department of the Interior, National Park Service* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1992), 1.

^{ix} *Ibid.*, 2.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript and Archival Collections

Arizona Collections, University Libraries, Department of Archives and Manuscripts,
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

Papers of Carl T. Hayden, 1877-1972.

Ruby Haigler Wood Papers, 1903-65.

Arizona Historical Foundation, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

Cary McWilliams Collection, Haynes Foundation Library, UCLA.

Salt River Project Research Archives, Salt River Project, Tempe, Arizona.

Tempe Historical Society, Tempe, Arizona.

Oral Interviews

Bernasconi, Santino. Interview by the author. 28 October 1994.

Bishop, Ragene. Interview by Diane Matsch, 18 & 13 May 1987. Transcript. Tempe Oral
History Project, Tempe Historical Museum, Tempe, AZ.

Bishop, Ragene. Interview by Paul Weiman, Tape. Salt River Project Historical Research
and Archives Project. Research Archives, Salt River Project.

Brophy, Frank. Interview by the author. 2 March 1995.

Garcia, Lauro. Interview by Ella Varbel. 19 November 1973. Transcript. Chicano
Collections, Hayden Library, Arizona State University.

Gibson, Franklin K. Interview by the author. 28 February 1995.

Simser, W.L. "Bud." Interview by Harriet Haskall, 5 June 1981. Transcript. Salt River
Project Historical Research and Archives Project, Salt River Project Archives,
Phoenix, AZ.

Walker, Ted. Interview with Harriet Haskell. Transcript. Historical Research and Archives
Project, Salt River Project. Salt River Project Archives.

Walt, Walter. Interview by Harriet Haskell, 22 October 1980. Transcript. Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project, Research Archives, Salt River Project.

Wood, Ruby Haigler. Interview by Marjorie H. Wilson, 7 August 1968. Typescript. Oral History Collection, Arizona Historical Foundation, Hayden Library, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

Wright, Floyd. Interview by Harriet Haskell, 20 February 1981. Transcript. Salt River Project Historical Research and Archives Project, Research Archives, Salt River Project.

Newspapers

The Arizona Republic 1937-1992.

Los Angeles Times 1911.

The Phoenix Gazette 1954-1992.

The Tempe Daily News 1971-1975.

Maps

Aerial maps (1949, 1966, 1981, 1986), Tempe Historical Society, Tempe, AZ.

Property maps, Tempe (1931-2), Tempe Historical Society, Tempe, AZ.

U.S. Geological Survey Topographical Map, Guadalupe Quadrant, 1915.

Salt River Project, Phoenix, Arizona

Aerial maps (1934, 1949, 1961, 1969, 1986), Research Archives.

Property Assessments, Secretary's Office.

Salt River Project Annual Histories 1917-1945

The Current News, 1940-1957.

Federal Documents

Arizona, Phoenix. Bureau of Land Management.

Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Statutes at Large. Vol. 78 (1964).

Immigration Act, Statutes at Large. Vol. 43 (1924).

Immigration Act. Statutes at Large. Vol. 39 (1917).

Maryland, Suitland. National Archives. Records of the General Land Office, Record Group 49, Patent Files 04212, 442696.

Townsite Act. United States Statutes at Large 14 (1867).

State Records

Arizona. Townsite Act. Statutes. 1901.

RG 1, Governor's Office, SG 11, Governor Benjamin B. Mouer, 1933-1936. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

RG 1, Governor's Office, SG 16, Governor John H. Pyle, 1953. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

RG 1, Governor's Office, SG 18, Governor Paul J. Fannin, 196?. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

RG 1, Governor's Office, SG 20, Governor John R. Williams, 1932-1933. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

RG 1, Governor's Office, SG 8, Governor George W.P. Hunt, 1932-1933. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

RG 91, Works Progress Administration. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State Archives, Department of Library, Archives and Public Records.

County Records

Office of the Recorder, Maricopa County, Arizona. Guadalupe, 1910. Book 4 of Maps, 42.

_____. Guadalupe Replatted. Book 97 of Maps, 37.

Census, Maricopa County 1910. 244-246 Tempe Precinct-Indian Population. Microfilm. Arizona Collections, Hayden Library, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

Hurley v Abbott, District Court of the Third Judicial District of the Territory of Arizona, Case no.4564, County of Maricopa, Phoenix, AZ.

Superior Court of Maricopa County, Phoenix. Records Department. Sylvester Roche, Probate Case #1515, Recorded Book 8, 517.

. *Diocese of Tucson v Guadalupe Community Association*. Civil Case #104499, Reel 5929.

Unpublished Manuscripts

Alinsky, Saul D. *Reveille for Radicals* 2nd ed. New York:Vintage Books, 1968.

Andersen, Fred. "Western Canal, south side of Salt River: Salt River Project Archives-HAER No. AZ-22." Historic American Engineering Reports. San Francisco, CA: National Park Service, Western Region. Department of the Interior, 1990.

Hernandez, Salome. "Prelude to Exile: Conflict Aspects of Mexican-Yaqui Relationships which led to Tribal Deportation, 1887-1909." M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, 1975.

Houston, Frank, and Octaviana Salazar. "Culture: A Way of Reading: An Instrumental Guide for Use with Yaqui Students." Tempe Elementary School District, No. 3, ESRA Title IV-C, Guadalupe Library, Guadalupe, Arizona, 1980.

James, Becky. "Labor and Refuge in Arizona: The Yaquis of Guadalupe, 1880-1940." Thesis paper, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, 1993.

Nichols, Andrew W. "Proposed Manner of Introduction of More Adequate Medical Care to a Semi-isolated Mexican-Indian Community." Stanford: Stanford School of Medicine, 1961.

Ramanofsky, Ann. "The Rise of Guadalupe Factions from Legal Claims to PlazaLand." M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, June 1968.

Raymond G. Zilla, "Guadalupe: Was Incorporation Best?" 1977, Arizona Collections, Arizona State University.

Ruetinger, Wayne. "The Building of a Town: The Origin and Struggles of Guadalupe, AZ." History 401. May 10, 1974, Arizona Collection, Hayden Library Special Collections, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

- Simpson, William. "Guadalupe Yaquis and The Culture of Poverty," M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, 1968.
- Solliday, Scott "The Journey to Rio Salado: Hispanic Migrations to Tempe, Arizona," M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, 1993.
- Stein, Pat H. "Archaeological Testing at AZ: U:9:111 (ASM), a Yaqui Laborers' Camp at the Southside Water Services Center, Mesa, AZ. Flagstaff: SWCA, Inc. Environmental Consultants, 1992.
- Thompson, David. Historical Documentation of Henness Homestead, Tempe, AZ prepared for Ellis Suggs Construction Company, Southern Palms Community Development, Tempe Historical Society, September 1977.
- Ticknor, Joan. "Effecting Change on the Actions of the Biehn-Colony-Trust of Guadalupe," 1980, Arizona Collection, Hayden Library Special Collections, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.
- Wilcox, David R., Jerry B. Howard, and Rueben H. Nelson. "One Hundred Years of Archaeology at La Ciudad de Los Hornos." Soil Systems Publications, Archaeology No. 16, 1990.

Articles

- Benjamin Marquez, "Organizing the Mexican-American Community in Texas: The Legacy of Saul Alinsky," *Policy Studies Review* 9(Winter 1990), 335-373.
- Bensman, Todd "Struggling: Scottsdale Yaquis Wrestle with their Past, Future," *Saturday Magazine of the Scottsdale Progress*, February 1988.
- Cazenave, Noel A. "Chicago Influences on the War on Poverty." *Journal of Policy History* 5 (1993): 52-68.
- Coolidge, Dane. "The Yaqui in Exile," *Sunset: The Magazine of the Prairie and of all the Far West* 23 (September 1909): 299-302.
- Forbes, Jack Douglas. "Historical Survey of the Indians of Sonora, 1821-1910." *Ethnohistory* 4 (1957), 335-368.
- Hirabayashi, Lane Ryo and George Tanaka. "The Issei Community in Montana and the Gardena Valley 1900-1920." *Southern California Quarterly* 70, (1988): 127-158.

- Hu-DeHart, Evelyn. "Development and Rural Rebellion: Pacification of the Yaquis in the Late Profiriato," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 54 (February 1974), 72-93.
- Madden, John. "Yaqui Indians of Mexico. Once Proud and Defiant," *American Indian* 2, 1928.
- Mark E. Miller, "The Yaquis Become American Indians: The Process of Federal Tribal Recognition," *The Journal of Arizona History* 35 (Summer 1994), 183-204.
- Marquez, Benjamin. "Organizing the Mexican-American Community in Texas: The Legacy of Saul Alinsky." *Policy Studies Review* 9 (Winter 1990): 355-373.
- Mazur, Edward. "Jewish Chicago: From Diversity to Community." Edited by Melvin G. Holli and Peter d'A. Jones. *The Ethnic Frontier*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.
- Meredith, John D. "The Yaqui Rebellion of 1740: A Jesuit Account and its Implications." *Ethnohistory* 22 (Summer 1975), 223-261.
- Pomeroy, Earl "The West and New Nations in Other Continents." In *Reflections of Western Historians*, ed. John A. Carroll, 241. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969.
- Sheridan, Tom "How to Tell the Story of a People Without a History: Narrative vs. Ethnohistory Approaches to the Study of the Yaqui Indians through Time." *Journal of the Southwest* 30 (Summer 1988), 168-189.
- Tetreau, E.D. "Arizona's Farm Laborers." University of Arizona: College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, 1937.
- Warner, Ruth A. "Yaquis of Mexico and their Folk Literature." *Kiva* 8. March 1943, 18-22.
- Welsh, Michael "Community , the West, and the American Indian," *The Journal of the Southwest* 31 (Summer 1989), 141-158.

Books

- Balderamma, Francisco E. and Raymond Rodríguez. *Decade of Betrayal: Mexican Repatriation in the 1930s*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.
- Barrera, Mario. *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979.

- Berry, Brewton and Henry L. Tischler. *Race and Ethnic Relations* 4th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Bodnar, John. *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Bunte, Pamela Ann and Robert J. Franklin. *From the Sands to the Mountain: Change and Persistence in a Southern Paiute Community*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1987.
- Camarillo, Albert. *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1939*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Campisi, Jack. *The Mashpee Indians: Tribe on Trial*. Syracuse, NY: The Syracuse University Press, 1991.
- Cronon, William, George Miles, and Jay Gitlin ed. *Under an Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past*, New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1992.
- Deutsch, Sarah. *No Separate Refuge: Culture, Class, and Gender on an Anglo-Hispanic Frontier in the American Southwest, 1880-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Easterlin, Richard A., David Ward, William S. Bernard, Reed Ueda. *Immigration: Dimensions of Ethnicity* Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups Series. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Evers, Larry and Felipe Molina. *Yaqui Deer Songs: A Native American Poetry*. Tucson: Sun Tracks and the University of Arizona Press, 1990.
- Garcia, Mario T. *Desert Immigrants: the Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Halter, Marilyn. *Between Race and Ethnicity: Cape Verdean American Immigrants, 1860-1965* Chicago: The University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People* 2nd Ed., Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1973.
- Hayden, Dolores. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1995.
- Hu-DeHart, Evelyn. *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: the Struggle for Land and Autonomy, 1821-1910*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

-
- .Missionaries, Miners, and Indians: Spanish contact with the Yaqui Nation of Northwestern New Spain, 1533-1820.* Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1981.
- Hutchins, Francis G. *Mashpee: The Story of Cape Cod's Indian Town.* West Franklin, NH: Amarta Press, 1979.
- Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
- Johnston, Allan John. *Surviving Freedom: the Black Community of Washington, D.C., 1860-1880.* New York: Garland Pub., 1993.
- Kelly, Jane Holden. *Yaqui Women: Contemporary Life Histories.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.
- Knack, Martha C. and Omer Stewart. *As Long as the River Shall Run: an Ethnohistory of Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Limerick, Patricia Nelson, Clyde A. Milner II, and Charles E. Rankin ed. *Trails: Toward A New Western History* Lawrence, Kansas: The University of Kansas Press, 1991.
- Luckingham, Bradford. *Minorities in Phoenix* Tucson : University of Arizona Press, 1994.
-
- .Phoenix: The History of a Southwestern Metropolis* Tucson : University of Arizona Press, 1989.
- Luey, Beth and Noel J. Stowe ed. *Arizona At Seventy-Five: The Next Twenty-Five Years* Tempe: Arizona State University Public History Program and the Arizona Historical Society, 1987.
- Moises, Rosalio, Jane Holden Kelly, and William Curry Holden. *A Yaqui Life: The Personal Chronicle of a Yaqui Indians* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971.
- Nash, Gary B. *Forging Freedom: the Formation of Philadelphia's Black Community, 1720-1840.* Cambridge, Mass:Harvard University Press,1988.
- Quiñones, Juan Gómez. *Chicano Politics; Reality and Promise 1940-1990.* Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1990.
- Reisler, Marc. *By the Sweat of Their Brow* . Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1976.
- Rogge, A.J. D. Lorne McWatters, Melissa Keane, and Richard P. Emanuel. *Raising Arizona's Dams: Daily Life, Danger, and Discrimination in the Dam*

- Construction Camps of Central Arizona, 1890s-1940s* Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1995.
- Ross, Fred, *Conquering Goliath: Cesar Chacez at the Beginning*. Keene, CA: El Taller Grafico Press, 1989.
- Sánchez, George. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Sheridan, Thomas E. *Arizona : A History* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995.
- Sheridan, Thomas E. *Los Tucsonenses: The Mexican Community in Tucson, 1854-1941* 2nd ed. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1992.
- Skerry, Peter *Mexican-Americans: The Ambivalent Minority*. New York: The Free Press, 1993.
- Slayton, Robert A. *Back of the Yards: The Making of a Local Democracy* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Smith, Christine . "A History of Irrigation in the Tempe Area." M.A. Thesis, Arizona State University, June 1963.
- Smith, Dean. *Tempe: Arizona Crossroads*. Chatsworth, CA: Windsor Publications, Inc., 1990.
- Smith, Karen L. *The Magnificent Experiment: Building the Salt River Reclamation Project 1890-1917*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986.
- Spicer, Edward H. *Cycles of Conquest: the Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest*. Tuscon:University of Arizona Press, 1962.
- _____. *The Yaquis: A Cultural History* Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press, 1980.
- _____. *Missionaries, Miners, and Indians: Spanish contact with the Yaqui Nation of Northwestern New Spain, 1533-1820*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1981.
- _____. *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: The Struggle for Land and Autonomy, 1821-1910*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
- _____. *Pascua: A Yaqui Village in Arizona* Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1967.

_____, *People of Pascua* Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988.

Spicer, Edward H., ed. *Perspectives in American Indian Cultural Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Thompson, Richard H. *Toronto's Chinatown: the Changing Social Organization of an Ethnic Community*. New York: AMS Press, 1989.

Von Hoffman, Alexander. *Local Attachments: The Making of an American Urban Neighborhood, 1850-1920*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Voss, Stuart F. *On the Periphery of 19th Century Mexico: Sonora and Sinaloa 1810-1877*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1982.

Weber, David J. *Foreigners in their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press), 1973.