

A

ACJACHEMEN

See JUANEÑOS

AFRICAN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES IN CALIFORNIA

From their time in slavery, African Americans have sought refuge and opportunity by migrating to places populated solely by their race. Various towns have been labeled *all-black towns*. Scholars have tried to distinguish areas that merit that label by establishing definitions for a black town as “a separate community containing a population at least 90 percent black in which the residents attempted to determine their own political destiny.” While the earliest all-black towns were set up during Reconstruction in the South, those in the West began with the migration of blacks from that region to Kansas in the 1870s. Other towns were efforts to secure remaining open land in the West, especially in Oklahoma in the late 1880s and 1890s. Behind some settlements were race leaders who envisioned all-black towns bringing political and economic independence and a chance for their race to prove its worth. In other cases, such “race men” were entrepreneurial promoters who used the desire for social equality for personal profit. In yet other cases, the main promoters were white men who often sold blacks marginal land. Finally, some communities that were in fact nearly all black became so without design, usually from black workers concentrating in

a place where they could obtain employment. Most 19th-century black towns were agricultural communities, and their leaders often agreed with Booker T. Washington’s view that African Americans could progress if they “cast their buckets where they were” occupationally in separate social settings.

Blacks sought California as a place of freedom and opportunity, but some associated that promise with separate race communities. The earliest concentrations of African Americans were several experiments at importing them as farm workers. Proposals to set up plantations with slaves before the Civil War never materialized, but at the end of the war, the idea was revived, and at least one small colony was set up in Tulare County. The most ambitious effort coincided with the establishment of cotton growing in the Bakersfield area in the late 1880s. A cotton growers’ association imported a colony of African American workers from the South and set up cabins for them. But many workers soon found better jobs elsewhere and left the colony. Within a short time, the whole plan had failed, as did a similar plan to import blacks to pick grapes around Fresno. Both of these were responses to the shortage of farm labor following the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882. With the arrival of Japanese and other immigrant farm labor, interest among white farmers in importing blacks ended for the rest of the century.

Efforts by African Americans to establish black settlements were also largely in agricultural areas, especially the San Joaquin Valley. Black farmers set up a colony in Fowler in 1890, and by the early 1900s, that town had between 30 and 40 black families. Most

2 African American Communities in California

were landowners and prospered into the 20th century. Four miles away was the small town of Bowles, where a “colored settlement” was established in the early 1900s. In the early 1920s, it was one of four California towns cited as “populated and governed entirely or almost entirely by Negroes.” Substantial numbers of black farmers also resided in Visalia, Hanford, and other valley cities. While none of these could be called a black town, their residents established churches, social clubs, even a black baseball team in Visalia. A different type of black community lived in Wasco, where white landowners formed a colony of black farm workers in 1907. That colony continued at least through the 1930s. In Yolo County, west of Sacramento, a group of blacks made one of the first uses of state homestead land, following the repeal of the restriction of such grants to white citizens. The area came to be known as “Nigger Hill,” and it attracted black ranchers from other parts of northern California. It eventually disappeared as a community, though it would be considered—and ultimately rejected—as the site of a state historic park in the 1970s.

While conditions in most of these towns were primitive in terms of technology, black newspapers emphasized the progress and prosperity of the “energetic class” of farmers who lived there and held them up as an example of the promise of rural life and land ownership. Isolated black rural settlements were also set up in the early 1900s in Paso Robles and the northern California community of Weed. The latter was a company lumber town established in 1907, and in 1916 the company offered to ship black workers there. By 1920, Weed had 447 blacks; by 1930, 541, nearly all clustered in one part of the town with separate businesses and social institutions that they set up.

Southern California was also the site of all-black communities. In the early 1900s, the black Los Angeles Forum learned that the federal government had opened homesteads in Sidewinder Valley, near the community of Victorville. A substantial colony, including prominent Los Angeles residents and Southern migrants, moved to the area, setting up farms and homes. By 1914, they had claimed 20,000 acres and were filing claims for more in nearby Victor Valley. But by 1920, many of the original settlers had left, discouraged by the shortage of water and the difficulty

of converting desert into profitable cropland. Other blacks were attracted to the colony through the 1910s by appeals from race newspapers to seize the opportunity for free land and ads from black realtors. Their numbers sustained chapters of both the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Garveyite United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) into the early 1920s. By the end of that decade, the distinct black colony had ended, and blacks simply became a portion of the population of Victorville.

Each of the other agricultural communities also became a black enclave within a predominantly non-black community. In none of them did African American settlers establish a framework of government or economy uniquely their own. Such informal black towns thus stand in contrast to the more long-lived effort to establish a formal all-black agricultural town: Allensworth. This colony was the vision of Colonel Allen Allensworth, an army chaplain who believed that inculcating moral values and economic self-sufficiency in black troops would lead to racial progress. When he retired in 1906, he envisioned establishing an agricultural colony that would be “a model colored community” and a “center for moral and civic education.” These ideals reflected those of Booker T. Washington, a friend of the colonel, and the colony was envisioned as a Tuskegee of the West. These goals took tangible form in 1908 when Allensworth, along with William Payne and other prominent blacks in Los Angeles, formed the California Colony and Home Promoting Association. Its purpose was to acquire land for an all-black colony, which would demonstrate blacks’ abilities at self-sufficiency and government and refute then widespread views of innate inferiority.

Colonel Allensworth and associates were unable to acquire land for their visions until a company run by white land speculators, Pacific Farming Company, entered the scene. This firm had already established the town of Alpaugh, in Tulare County, and offered 4,000 acres nearby at \$100 per acre (triple what it had charged whites for Alpaugh) on terms of \$5 per month. The site, renamed Allensworth, was arid, windswept, and alkaline in places. But it straddled a main rail line, raising hopes that it would be a center of local commerce. Initially, the colony association promoted the

land, but when it procured few buyers, Pacific Farming took over. It solicited black veterans with the idea of a home for themselves and their families. Two other white-run companies linked to Pacific Farming promised to develop water resources. By 1912, Colonel Allensworth hailed the officials of Pacific Farming for rescuing the colony when it seemed it might fail. But such praise soon turned sour, as these companies failed to provide water equipment, invited the Santa Fe railroad to build a line through Alpaugh that left Allensworth a mere whistle-stop, and tried to end sales of local land to blacks. After 1913, these companies faded from the scene.

Allensworth by the early 1910s had developed from an experimental colony to an apparently prosperous all-black town. Its legal status was recognized by Tulare County in 1910, when it helped settlers set up a public school. By 1914, the school population needed a larger building, and the original school became a branch of the Tulare County Library. These two institutions became hubs of town activity, serving as meeting halls for local civic groups. The town also became part of a new Justice of the Peace district, which in 1914 elected Oscar Overr as the first black justice west of the Rocky Mountains. The hope of making Allensworth a model of black government was implemented by setting up an advisory council of administrators consisting of seven departments and subsequently a board of trade that acted like a city council. The Allensworth Realty Company took over all sales of land on the argument that “a Negro community with a white man at the money end was not nor ever would be a success.” Allensworth had two established congregations, Baptist and AME, and one church building.

This town grew slowly through its first six years. In 1912, it had 85 families, all black and over one third of them veterans from the North and Midwest. The remaining two thirds were about equally from California or other states. By 1914, the population had grown to about 200. Thereafter, while new families continued to come to Allensworth, they were offset by a steady exodus of earlier residents. Most observers in the 1910s depicted these settlers as happy and prosperous. Several had established farms in alfalfa, sugar beets, grain, and poultry. Some worked in nearby businesses; some hired out to white-owned ranches and farms in the area. Businesses were established in the town, including a

hotel, grain warehouses, and storage bins, and a variety of artisans pursued their trades. These impressions of prosperity were reinforced in 1916, when Allensworth products nearly swept the prizes for both home and farm exhibits at the county fair. The school employed two black teachers—among the few hired anywhere in the state—and offered classes into high school.

Beneath appearances of prosperity, however, Allensworth had serious economic problems. Its population never grew to the critical mass needed to sustain an economic community. As a result, owning and managing personal farms became a secondary occupation for many. They gained their main income from working in white-owned enterprises, often as farm laborers. Professionals and artisans found insufficient work in Allensworth and were obliged to join the ranks of the laborers. This type of work often involved travel and weeks away from home. The consequent low amount of money in the community left its retail stores struggling. The largest businesses, such as the grain warehouse, were white-owned. All of these conditions ran counter to the ideals of Allensworth as a model of black self-sufficiency and community structure. Nor was the colony a haven from discrimination. Residents seeking work in other towns encountered signs stating “NO negroes, filipinos, mexicans, dogs,” much as they did elsewhere. The Santa Fe railroad hired almost no blacks. These conditions, coupled with the shortage of good water and the diversion of rail trade to Alpaugh left the community by the mid-1910s with one hope for developing into a prosperous community: becoming a center for black education.

Education was a central activity of some all-black towns and one of the most important to residents of Allensworth. They supported a local bond to construct the larger schoolhouse, supplemented state and county funds for teachers, and offered classes beyond the age limits required by state law. The idea of an industrial school was an ideal of many black educators and a growing movement in California. The state had mandated public high schools and opened the first state polytechnic school at San Luis Obispo at the turn of the century. Similar technical schools were established in other communities. Therefore, when in 1914, a state industrial school was proposed in Allensworth, it seemed to be a timely idea.

4 African American Communities in California

The racial composition of this school was ambiguous. Initially, town leaders proposed an agricultural and manual training school modeled after Tuskegee, where black students could secure technical training without the racially hostile climate of integrated schools. They emphasized that it would be the only industrial school for blacks west of the Rockies. Also race-oriented was the contention that California had more than 50,000 blacks who deserved such a school. But they also gained the support of local white school officials, who viewed the endeavor as training the general population in agriculture. The hope that private funds would cover most costs was dashed in 1914 by a recession, opposition from black leaders in urban communities, and the death of Colonel Allensworth, who was hit by a motorcycle in Los Angeles. Thereafter, the school was pursued as a state-sponsored institution. The bill to establish Allensworth Polytechnic Institute stated it would furnish manual arts education to “young people of both sexes” to fit them for “non-professional walks of life.” While the bill made no mention of race, it became a major test of basic principles of separate black communities.

Black leaders in Los Angeles feared that the establishment of such a school even implicitly for blacks would lead school districts to suggest they not attend other public schools, especially local polytechnic schools. Some were leery of the bill’s support in Tulare County, the scene of the last court suit against formal school segregation in California in 1890. This fear was underscored by a San Francisco newspaper story that the bill’s sponsor had stated that segregated schools might do more for blacks in California than the current system. Proponents of the school noted that state law forbade segregated schools, and they contrasted the difficulty proponents of integration had finding employment with Allensworth having the only black principal in the state. In the end, however, the school issue was settled not on lofty arguments of race policy but on mundane considerations of funding. The bill’s appropriation of \$50,000 was more than the Assembly Ways and Means Committee was willing to accept, and it killed the bill. With its death went hopes that Allensworth might become a vibrant community.

In the 1920s, the colony declined to the point of disintegration. The death of Colonel Allensworth took

away its most inspiring leader. Its agriculture had declined to a few hundred acres, and its population became so small that it was in danger of losing its post office. Water shortages became acute as the area suffered a multiyear drought. Its school, library, and some social groups remained, but its NAACP chapter was closed for lack of anyone to serve as its president. By mid-decade, the remaining residents were describing their stay as a “sacrifice” and pleading for other blacks to come to the town to keep its ideal alive. As residents moved away, many homes and buildings were occupied by itinerant workers, and the town became “sort of a camping ground.” This decline was especially striking because it was unique to the all-black town, not the whole area. The number of African Americans in Tulare County increased more than fourfold between 1910 and 1930 to 819, but only 44 of these resided in Allensworth.

The town made a partial recovery after World War II, largely by adopting new ways of farming. Most buildings remained standing, though many were abandoned. The problem of scarce water was worsened by discovery of unhealthy amounts of arsenic in the local supply. Only donations of water from federal agencies and neighboring communities enabled residents to remain. The town also began to lose its racial exclusiveness, as Mexican Americans moved in. By the 1960s, they constituted half of the students in the Allensworth school. The place seemed destined to become a ghost town until a state worker, Ed Pope, proposed making it a state historic park in 1969. This idea was formally adopted by the state legislature two years later, and in 1976, the state approved plans to develop Allensworth Historic Park and restore its buildings. The project proved costly and proceeded slowly, but today it is open as a monument to both its pioneer settlers and to the idea of all-black towns in California.

In sheer numbers, the most significant set of virtually all of the all-black communities sprang up in the Imperial Valley. Cotton became a popular crop there, spreading to 20,000 acres by 1912. Growers initially associated that crop with Southerners, particularly African Americans, so growers’ associations and labor contractors advertised for pickers in the South, particularly Texas. Wages rose to \$1.75 per hundred pounds

by 1916, much above those in the South, so black workers began streaming into the valley. Railroad agents encouraged the migration by using railroad facilities for job announcements and facilitating train travel. The onset of the "Great Migration" to northern cities slowed the black movement to the Imperial Valley. By the entry of the United States into World War I, Mexican and Filipino workers were providing most of the labor on Imperial Valley farms.

Because the earliest cotton ranches were mostly around the towns of Imperial and El Centro, black migrants concentrated in these communities. Their Southern culture, coupled with a similar background among many growers, established racial segregation as the norm, and those policies created de facto black communities in these towns. Black newspapers in Los Angeles periodically encouraged readers facing unemployment in that city to seek opportunities in the Imperial Valley. The greatest attraction of this area, as in other agricultural colonies, was the hope of becoming landowners and establishing farms. A black company, Calxico Investment Company, was formed in 1918 to organize blacks in the valley into a colony by acquiring land and establishing businesses. Los Angeles black employment agencies made special arrangements to procure cotton workers. By the 1920s, El Centro was being seen as a successor to Allensworth in the openings it offered to blacks, especially black teachers. This was epitomized by the move of William Payne from Allensworth to become principal of the all-black school in El Centro. Other prominent Los Angeles blacks would be drawn to that town to set up businesses or social and cultural organizations. A concentration of blacks begun by an influx of common laborers was molded into a community by a migration of elite blacks.

For many residents, however, these black communities were less than idyllic. The laborers were essentially transients, living in tents or nondescript shelters with dirt floors. Housing eventually improved to wooden shacks, with little in the way of improvements to their setting. Some black visitors to Imperial were struck by the proximity of houses of prostitution to homes with children, often with black women imported to work as prostitutes. Such conditions clashed with the ideal of blacks realizing moral and economic progress

by going back to the land, and this discouraged migration to Imperial Valley. Though the population in some towns grew through the 1920s, only El Centro had over 500 blacks by 1930. The deportation of many Mexicans in the 1930s rekindled demand for black workers, but that faded after the cotton workers strike of 1934. By the end of that decade, Imperial Valley towns had ceased to be regarded as distinctive African American communities.

As with Allensworth, black communities in the Imperial Valley became associated with school segregation. In this case, however, it was initially white prejudice rather than black visions that raised the issue. In 1913, the El Centro Elementary School District created a separate school for its black students. The initial rationale was that other schools were crowded, but school officials openly professed their belief in black inferiority. Imperial set up a separate school for blacks in 1923. In other towns with smaller black populations, school boundaries were drawn around the residential concentrations of blacks and Mexicans to produce separate schools from those attended by whites. As in the South, such "separate but equal" schools were notably inferior. The whole valley had no high school open to blacks until a makeshift addition was put on their elementary school in El Centro in 1924. That city's elementary school was next to houses of prostitution until the early 1920s. Black parents in Imperial protested the imposition of segregation and briefly reactivated the valley NAACP chapter. But this failed to change the policy of segregation, which remained intact through the 1930s.

That this separate school system drew praise from some African Americans illustrates one of the appeals of separate black towns. El Centro adopted a policy of hiring black teachers for its segregated school, and it became one of the few markets they had. Until the 1950s, California required teachers to have one year of experience in the state before securing a regular teaching appointment. With no major urban districts hiring blacks until the early 1920s (and then only a token number in elementary schools), El Centro and Imperial had two of the state's three black principals and all four of its high school teachers in 1925. This practice also mollified protests against Jim Crow schools. When William Payne tried to get his daughter

6 African American Communities in California

into El Centro's general high school, that school board set up a separate black high and named him its teacher. The transition of black teachers from one all-black town to another was completed when Margaret Prince left Allensworth to join Payne in El Centro.

These agricultural communities were promoted by the belief that they were an escape from racism and discrimination and that land ownership was the path to prosperity. Both of these hopes culminated south of the international border in the effort to establish an all-black colony in Baja California. In the period of the Mexican Revolution, southern California investors had shown great interest in that area, and blacks had historically viewed Mexico as a haven. This colony was the brainchild of a group of Los Angeles black businessmen and attorney Hugh Macbeth. They set up the Lower California Mexican Land and Development Company, which issued 250,000 shares of stock, bought 21,800 acres of land in the Santa Clara Valley, and in 1918 began a multiyear campaign to entice other African Americans to buy lots of 40 acres in what was called "Little Liberia." Their appeal was directed toward blacks who had been successful in business, not common laborers. It soon attracted people from several other black farming communities, especially Imperial Valley, Fowler, and Bowles, due to lower land costs and opportunities for acquiring substantial acreage. By 1922, wealthy residents of all-black towns in Oklahoma were also visiting the colony and considering investing in it.

The promoters of Little Liberia resembled those of Allensworth in their linking the colony to racial uplift. Blacks must become producers, and agriculture was the key to becoming self-supporting. But they could only do this in a country that respected all races. Mexico offered blacks a chance to get out of menial and service jobs and become landlords of the soil. A few leaders set themselves up in the colony in 1918, and by 1920 some began building houses and preparing to farm the land. While the colony initially was planned for only about 200 families, Hugh Macbeth made lofty predictions that Baja California would become the breadbasket of Los Angeles and the colony might evolve into a state of 20,000 within a decade.

These visions turned to dust in 1923, when the Mexican government halted any possibility of large-scale

migration to the colony. Concerned that blacks would aggravate the "ethnic problem" in Mexico and perhaps bothered by Macbeth's predictions, President Alvaro Obregon issued an order barring most African Americans from entering Mexico. The U.S. Department of the Interior circulated this order to its border offices, and a suit by the NAACP demanding that U.S. agencies reverse this action was rejected. The hope that blacks would go back to the soil also was unfulfilled. Only a handful of black families settled in the colony. The final blow came when an audit revealed that Hugh Macbeth was running up large debts and the colony was raising more drinking parties than crops. This led to suspicions that the company did not hold clear title to the land, which was borne out in 1928, when the Mexican government demanded the land be repatriated and most investors lost their holdings. These events ended the idea of settling Baja California and the era of black agricultural colonies.

Primarily black communities were also being formed in California's urban centers, especially Los Angeles, before their black residents were largely confined to ghettos. The earliest of these was Abila, located south of Watts. Originally a rancho of the Avila family, the area attracted blacks in the 1890s. Sometimes referred to as "Mudtown," this area attracted migrants who recreated traditional Southern life with small farms along dirt paths. Abila continued to be recognized as a distinct black town through the 1910s. In 1908, the first black old-folks home in the Los Angeles area was relocated there, and an enlarged building was erected in 1917. But Abila was soon overshadowed and semantically absorbed into a larger community of Watts. This area developed in 1902, when Charles Watts donated 10 acres to the Pacific Electric (PE) Company for a junction of its Los Angeles-San Pedro and Venice-Santa Ana lines. This site was called both Watts Junction and Abila Junction, adding to the ambiguity over their respective boundaries. Initially, it was a community of Mexican track workers. But their 1903 strike led PE to import blacks, and many of these settled in the Ramsaur Tract just south of the junction, creating a nearly all-black subdivision. Watts grew rapidly to an incorporated town in 1907, but its multiethnic population remained roughly divided into communities of blacks in the southwest,

Mexicans in the southeast, and whites to the north of the Watts Junction station.

Neither Abila nor Watts was promoted by African American companies or colonizers. But 12 of its 37 tracts, all in the southern area of the city, were open to blacks, and that, combined with lots as low as \$90 on terms of \$1 down and \$1 a week, attracted them. In 1914, a white Progressive lawyer, who believed that home ownership would uplift blacks, opened Dunbar Park in the northern part of Abila and advertised for buyers through black Realtors. By 1920, Watts alone had the seventh largest black population of any city in California—652 residents—and the highest percentage of its population composed of African Americans—14.4 percent.

Watts and Abila remained a mix of rural and suburban life. Some blacks accumulated farms of one or two acres, with hundreds of animals as well as crops. Most residential lots had generous backyards designated for chickens or agriculture. Besides various race businesses, Watts had a UNIA chapter, and Abila was the site of a proposed baseball and amusement park in the 1920s. In 1916, blacks in both communities organized a Colored Voters Independent League. This last organization illustrates considerable political activity on the part of blacks, inspired by the fact that Watts was an independent city in which they might be significant. Such activity in a city marked by political turmoil and frequent elections, coupled with the steady influx of African Americans into the city, has led to the view that the annexation of Watts into Los Angeles in 1926 was engineered by the Ku Klux Klan or other race-conscious groups to deny blacks a chance to govern a California city. However, Watts was only one of 34 areas that Los Angeles acquired in the 1920s, largely because it offered Owens Valley water. Blacks favored annexation by more than two to one in the election. They would continue to become a growing percentage of that area's population through the 1930s but remained heavily concentrated in its southwest section and excluded from schools outside it. Watts' future notoriety would come after World War II as the epitome of impoverished areas of the Los Angeles ghetto, though it was then more nearly all black than when Abila was cited as a distinctive black town.

Another separate African American community in Los Angeles was formed in 1905, the Furlong Tract.

An Irish landowner, James Furlong, sold acreage south of Los Angeles to black families, augmenting some who had already moved in. Most early residents were businessmen or sufficiently well off to own homes. In 1910, the Holmes Avenue Elementary School was built, and the following year it hired the first black teacher in the Los Angeles school system. It also had a black principal of the evening school and was long the only public school in the city to hire blacks. Furlong Tract also was the site of the city's first black baseball and amusement park. By the 1920s, this once isolated community became linked with the growing black population along Central Avenue, and both its elite population and its distinctiveness as a community disappeared. By the 1930s, it was a slum, inhabited largely by poorer blacks.

The last effort at a separate all-black town was Val Verde, a community near present-day Valencia. It was established in the 1920s at a time when housing restrictions were confining blacks to a few areas of Los Angeles and they were increasingly excluded from public recreational facilities such as beaches and swimming pools. African Americans tried to establish separate recreational centers at Manhattan Beach, Huntington Beach, and Lake Elsinore, but the first two were thwarted, and the third proved too remote for extensive use. So, in 1924 a group of prominent Los Angeles blacks led by Realtor Sidney P. Dones secured 30 acres of land in the Santa Clarita Valley to form the colony of Eureka Villa, though part of it was always known as Val Verde. It was to become the "black Palm Springs," a place where African Americans could escape for a day or a week and enjoy various recreational facilities, or in some cases live permanently.

The Eureka Villa Improvement Association offered 700 lots early in 1925 and promoted them by parades and exhortations that investment in this "race community center" was a way of showing pride in being black. By the end of that year, however, lowered prices and efforts to lease some of the land to oil companies suggest that only a small number of people bought lots. The area did become a favorite vacation place for middle-class blacks who had the means to make the 100 mile round trip for the next three decades. In 1939, it received a boost when a white businessman donated 50 acres adjacent to it to Los Angeles County,

8 African American Communities in California

and Works' Progress Administration workers built a clubhouse and park, which were christened Val Verde. The community center developed churches, a beauty contest, and a wide range of activities into the 1950s. But when recreational facilities were opened up in the 1960s, most blacks abandoned the long drive to Val Verde, and many of its homes were taken over by whites and Mexicans, ending the community's ethnic uniqueness.

California's separate black communities did not attract a large number of migrants, and in many cases the black residents were from other parts of California. The economic pursuits of these communities' black residents and their transition to multiethnic towns reflected the fallacy of the idea that a race could completely separate its activities from the broader world around it. Despite promotions that these colonies would be models of black progress, the rapid turnover in their populations suggests that the vast majority of African Americans found life in large heterogeneous cities much more attractive.

All-black towns failed to attract African Americans because most were located in rural areas and centered on agriculture. Both of these features were contrary to trends from the late 19th through the 20th centuries, when millions of families left farms. For African Americans, farms carried memories of life in the South, especially in California, where most employment was as transient laborers. Rural life remained primitive and hard compared to the dazzling technology in cities. By 1930, more than 38,000 blacks lived in Los Angeles, less than 50 in Allensworth, testimony that dusty, dry fields were a sorry substitute for night clubs and jazz bands, especially when the latter seemed more indicative of black contributions to society than the former.

All-black towns also suffered from the efforts to promote them. Most rural colonies were located in remote places that had been regarded as undesirable. The realities of trying to make a living there contradicted the glowing images that black promoters had painted of these colonies. Because several towns were basically real estate ventures, investors came to suspect that only the promoters made money from them. In several places, the African American organizers had obtained the land from whites; in other cases, whites set up the residences or jobs. In both cases,

black residents sensed they were being exploited. These problems caused many prosperous blacks who had supported these ventures to become skeptical of such promotions, and the major dynamic for anything but a part-time getaway like Val Verde died.

The significance of California's all-black towns to migration in the American West lies in the appreciation that migration is more than the movement of people and the social, economic, and political factors that impel such movement. It is also appreciating the visions and ideals that can lead people to go to other places, the history of hopes and dreams, and why they are often dashed. California's earliest black colonies reflected the image of the Golden State as a haven from oppression and a land of opportunity; the ideals of Booker T. Washington that social separation and self-sufficiency in traditional occupations were the prescription for racial progress; and the populist view that agrarian life was a morally uplifting culture in contrast to the vices of urban society. By the 1920s, some of these ideals had lost their appeal, as rural areas became depressed and California became as much a reservoir of racial prejudice as many other areas. As blacks flocked into restricted areas in major cities during and after World War II, these ghettos became virtually all-black cities in themselves. Many African Americans then became less interested in creating black towns than in getting out of them.

—Lawrence B. de Graaf

See also HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA; LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; PITTMAN, TAREA HALL; SLAVES IN CALIFORNIA

Suggested Reading

- Adler, Patricia. "Watts: From Suburb to Black Ghetto." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1977.
- Beasley, Delilah. *Negro Trail Blazers of California*. Los Angeles, 1919. (Reprinted New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969)
- Flamming, Douglas. *Bound for Freedom: Black Los Angeles in Jim Crow America*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Hamilton, Kenneth M. *Black Towns and Profit: Promotion and Development in the Trans-Appalachian West*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- McBroome, Delores N. "African American Boosterism, Agriculture, and Investment in Allensworth and Little Liberia." In *Seeking El Dorado: African Americans in California*, edited by Lawrence B. de Graaf, Kevin Mulroy,

- and Quintard Taylor. Seattle: University of Washington Press & Autry Museum of Western Heritage, 2001.
- Ramsey, Eleanor M. "Allensworth: A Study in Social Change." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1977.
- Ramsey, Eleanor M., and Janice S. Lewis. "Black Americans in California." In *Five Views: An Ethnic Sites Survey for California*. Sacramento, CA: Office of Historic Preservation, 1988.
- Sides, Josh. *L.A. City Limits: African American Los Angeles From the Great Depression to the Present*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- Wheeler, B. Gordon. "Allensworth: California's All-Black Community." *Wild West*, February 2000. Available from <http://www.historynet.com/we/blallensworth>

☞ AFRICAN AMERICAN MIGRATION PATTERNS

See GOLDFIELD, NEVADA; HELENA, MONTANA;
NICODEMUS, KANSAS; TOPEKA, KANSAS;
WICHITA, KANSAS

☞ ALIEN LAND LAW OF 1913

The Alien Land Law of 1913 made it illegal for aliens (immigrants), who were not eligible for citizenship, to own land in California. In addition, the aliens could not lease any agricultural land for more than three years. Although the language of the law applied to all such aliens, Japanese immigrants were the targeted group. Governor Hiram Johnson signed the bill into law on May 19, 1913.

The impetus for the bill resulted from the prejudice against the Japanese that started in the 1880s. The intensity increased after 1907, as the Japanese began to move from being farm laborers to farm owners. This shift brought the Japanese into a more direct conflict with the white growers. Also, more Japanese were immigrating to California. Before 1900, there were few Japanese immigrants, but by 1920, there were approximately 72,000 Japanese in California.

Many white Californians expressed fears that the Japanese would not assimilate due to their style of clothing, their religion, the fact that they spoke a

non-European language, and generally did not blend into society.

As an example of Californian's prejudice against the Japanese, in 1906 the San Francisco school board passed rules segregating the Japanese students (some of whom were born in the United States) from the rest of the students. This in spite of the fact the city of San Francisco had received \$100,000 from the government of Japan in earthquake-emergency aid. The Japanese government lodged a formal complaint against this discrimination. The severity of the diplomatic note caused a brief war scare in Washington and led to the intervention of the federal government into the school situation. The U.S. government caused the San Francisco school board to modify its policies to readmit Japanese children so long as they could speak some English and were not too old. As a follow-up to this incident, the United States and Japan entered into a gentleman's agreement whereby Japan agreed to only issue passports to nonlaborers.

To circumvent the Alien Land Law of 1913, many Japanese immigrants bought land and placed it in the names of their native-born children. The Japanese devised this and other ingenious mechanisms to artfully maneuver around the repressive law.

Anti-Japanese forces came to view the 1913 act as ineffective and submitted a ballot proposition during the 1920 elections. This measure, the Webb-Haney Act, passed by a three-to-one margin. The provisions of the 1920 act denied aliens ineligible for citizenship the right to lease farmland or even to sharecrop.

In 1952, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *Fujii Sei v. State of California*, found the Alien Land Law to be unconstitutional.

—Kenneth McMullen

See also GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT

Suggested Reading

- "Alien Land Laws." Available from <http://www.santacruzpl.org/history/ww2/9066/land.shtml>
- Chuman, Frank F. *The Bamboo People: The Law and Japanese-Americans*. Del Mar, CA: Publisher's Inc., 1976.
- Matsumoto, Valarie. *Farming the Home Place: A Japanese American Community in California, 1919–1982*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Morris, Edmund. *Theodore Rex*. New York: Random House, 2001.

Niiya, Brian, ed. *Encyclopedia of Japanese-American History: An A-to-Z Reference From 1868 to Present*. Rev. ed. Los Angeles: Japanese American National Museum, 2000.

Sackman, David Cazaux. *Orange Empire: California and the Fruits of Eden*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

ALIEN REGISTRATION ACT OF 1940

See FORCED MIGRATION OF ITALIANS
DURING WORLD WAR II

AMERICAN INDIAN MIGRATION TO PHOENIX, ARIZONA

“Everything is connected to the past,” says Tohono O’odham Daniel Preston of the link of his people to the Huhugam. The Huhugam, Piman for “those who are gone,” inhabited the Salt River Valley in central Arizona long before the founding of Phoenix in 1870. They lived along major drainages, pioneering the building of extensive canal networks to irrigate their fields of corn, squash, beans, cotton, agave, and other native plants. Archaeological excavations reveal the story of a rich culture and complex social structure that peaked between 1150 and 1350. By 1400, the Huhugam had vacated their homes in the Phoenix Basin, but other Native peoples have made the area their home since the founding of the city of Phoenix in 1870.

Throughout the city’s history, Native people have represented only a small segment of the total population of Phoenix. In 2002, American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts numbered 57,498 persons, making up 1.8 percent of the population of the greater Phoenix area. Yet Phoenix is an “Indian city.” There are four reservations in the vicinity of Phoenix. It has also developed into a major administrative center for Indian Affairs. Besides the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS), the city houses the offices of several statewide Native American organizations. These agencies draw reservation residents to town on tribal business and provide employment

opportunities. The Phoenix Indian High School contributed to the city’s profile until its closure in 1990. Other educational facilities in the metropolitan area continue to bring Indian youth into the urban setting. Phoenix is also a focal point for southwestern Native culture. The nearby reservation communities and local Indian groups organize powwows and other cultural events throughout the year. The Heard Museum and the Pueblo Grande Museum not only promote Native arts and history, but they sponsor annual Indian markets, attracting artists and craftsmen from around the nation. In addition, there are numerous galleries specializing in Indian arts and crafts.

Early Phoenix was far less tolerant of Indian peoples and cultures. Local Pima and Maricopa people often traveled to the city to sell their handicrafts and firewood, to deliver grains to local mills, to acquire supplies on which they had come to depend, and occasionally to look for employment. Contemporary newspaper accounts suggest the aversion of local residents for Indians appearing in the city; especially offensive was their “scant” clothing and occasional intoxication. To regulate these visits and the behavior of Native Americans while in town, the city passed a series of ordinances requiring that Indians wear “proper” clothing and leave town before sundown, unless employed by a white person. Violators were subject to fines, even hard labor.

The presence of Native Americans in the city began to increase when the Phoenix Indian School opened its doors in 1891 with an initial class of 41 local Pima and Maricopa boys. When two leading citizens had suggested that the BIA establish its school in Phoenix, instead of the proposed site at Fort McDowell, they had more than the civilization of Indian children in mind. The building of the school would not only inject federal dollars into the economy and boost the growth of the city, it would also provide local businesses with a cheap labor force. Indian parents, on their part, often supported the education of their children, understanding its significance to their future livelihood. The school also started an active recruitment campaign, and by the end of the decade, over 700 pupils were enrolled at the school—almost all of them from tribes outside of central Arizona.

As the number of students at the school increased, so did their involvement in the local community when

Superintendent Wellington Rich decided to experiment with the outing system in 1893. Promoted as a way to accelerate the Americanization of Indian students by placing them in an Anglo work and living environment, the outing system quickly evolved into a method of providing local businesses with cheap labor. As Superintendent Harwood Hall noted in 1894, "The hiring of an Indian youth is not looked upon by the people of this valley from a philanthropic standpoint. It is simply a matter of business." Indian boys worked as laborers and field hands and in other menial jobs while the use of Indian girls as domestic help was even more widespread. By the late 1890s, nearly 200 young women had been placed with Phoenix families as domestics. Although these employment relationships were not permanent, they undoubtedly facilitated the integration of Native Americans into the city's workforce and encouraged further Indian migrations to Phoenix.

Phoenicians also came to see the value of the Indian School as a tourist attraction. With two major railroads and a favorable winter climate, the city attracted tourists in search of the "Wild West." At the core of this vision was the "vanishing" American Indian. Phoenix catered to this interest by incorporating "Native" elements to its parades, fairs, and carnivals. In this context, Phoenicians also developed more tolerance to reservation residents in their midst, as they seemed to represent the "wild" Indians better than the "civilized" Indian School children. "Quaint" Indians thus became a selling point for the emerging tourism industry. Without doubt, Indian people themselves realized the potential for income in the tourist trade as Native households increasingly faced the need to participate in the cash economy. Proximity to Phoenix—and its tourist trade—offered an opportunity to supplement their meager livelihood on reservations.

The BIA presence in Phoenix was also augmented when a sanatorium was established on the Indian School grounds in 1909. By the end of World War I, the sanatorium was caring for over 100 Indian patients from around the nation annually. Yet the number of Native Americans who permanently resided in the city remained small. The goal of Indian education was to turn Native children into Americans who would willingly leave their reservations and move into mainstream

America. Accordingly, the Phoenix Indian School encouraged students to establish homes and look for jobs in the city, but with little success. In 1910, only 10 Indian couples maintained households, totaling 43 persons, in the Phoenix area. At the same time, increasing numbers of reservation residents participated in the workforce as the growing urban center looked for cheap labor for its various construction projects. These projects reflected what became a pattern of labor force participation for Native American men. Because of low educational attainment, they performed mostly unskilled, seasonal labor in construction and agriculture. The irregular nature of employment further resulted in a back-and-forth migration pattern between the reservation and the city.

By the 1920 census, the number of Native Americans permanently residing in Phoenix had more than doubled to 105. The participation of Indian men in World War I undoubtedly influenced their decision to move to the city, while women stayed after completing their schooling to take advantage of employment opportunities. Prospects for men also increased when local agriculture began to recover from its postwar slump, prompting a demand for field hands and other laborers. In 1922, the Indian School began to coordinate the Native workforce in Phoenix, practically serving as an employment agency. Meanwhile, the depressed reservation economies boosted Indian enrollment in these efforts to locate—and eventually assimilate—in the city.

When the Institute for Government Research surveyed the conditions of the nation's Native population in 1926, the numbers of urban, or "migrated," Indians had grown sufficient enough to merit a chapter in the commission's final report. This document, known as the Meriam Report, estimated the number of Indians in Phoenix at 250. Pimas clearly constituted the largest group among the 42 Native families, while a few permanent Indian residents came from outside the state. Compared with those in Albuquerque and Santa Fe, the other major southwestern cities included in the report, Phoenix Indian households maintained the highest standard of living, owing to greater opportunities and the availability of reasonably priced housing. There was also greater occupational diversity in Phoenix than in the other two cities. These factors, coupled with Indian educational and health service facilities, helped

12 American Indian Migration to Phoenix, Arizona

establish the foundation of Indian Phoenix even though the Native population represented less than 1 percent of the city's total population. Further evidence of the permanence of Native Americans in the city was the emergence of Indian-oriented social and recreational activities, mainly in connection with the Young Women's Christian Association, the Cook Christian Bible School, and the Central Presbyterian Church. The latter became the key in creating a sense of community for the city's Indian population while maintaining connections to nearby reservations.

During the Great Depression, as jobs became scarce and employers favored Anglo workers, Phoenix reflected the national decline in Indian urban populations with a nearly 17 percent decrease by 1940. The Roosevelt administration provided a further incentive for back migration when it established the Indian Emergency Conservation Work Program, better known as the Indian CCC. This congressional appropriation funded conservation projects on 33 reservations, including those in Arizona; one of the five district field offices was also located in Phoenix. At the same time, the administration of the Wheeler-Howard Act, or the Indian New Deal, reinforced the BIA presence in the city. Together with the already existing institutions, the Indian New Deal thus helped create opportunities for educated Indians while reservations beckoned the less-skilled workers.

American entry into World War II had a profound impact in Native American communities, as it did the nation as a whole. A higher percentage of Indian people served in the military during the war than any other ethnic group; 4,500 Navajos alone signed up for military service. The Navajo code talkers and Ira B. Hayes, a Pima from Gila River in Arizona who helped raise the flag on Iwo Jima, have become lasting symbols of Indian participation in the war effort. In addition, the war years witnessed the first large-scale exodus of women and men from reservations as they sought wartime employment. The western states benefited disproportionately as the federal government spent more than \$40 billion in the region, establishing new factories and awarding contracts for war materiel. While the war industries first drew on local sources of labor, they also attracted a flood of new migrants, including ethnic minorities who, for the first time, found opportunities on

a large scale in the industrial workforce. By 1943, some 46,000 Native Americans, approximately one fourth of them women, had left their reservations for work in agriculture and the war industries.

In Phoenix, World War II triggered an economic and population boom without precedent. The activation of military installations and the opening of several airfields were followed by the establishment of defense industries. Pushed by depressed reservation economies and pulled by these wartime prospects, many Arizona Indians recognized the opportunity for advancing their economic fortunes by moving to Phoenix and Tucson. Agriculture and other war projects in the rural areas also drew large numbers of Indian workers. For example, more than 10,000 Navajos engaged in off-reservation employment, including defense work as well as positions with railroads, construction companies, and agricultural operations.

While men continued to toil in unskilled jobs, census records from 1940 and 1950 reveal a significant occupational redistribution among urban Indian women in Arizona. Domestic and other service work certainly dominated Native women's employment patterns, but there was a noteworthy shift toward clerical and sales work as well as professional employment. These changes tell the story of wartime opportunity while they also reflect the growth of BIA bureaucracy during the war years. Women specifically were able to find employment in the reorganized BIA as they had acquired necessary skills in clerical work while in school.

The optimism about the future, created by positive Indian experiences during the war, quickly subsided in the postwar era. Demobilization abated the need for labor, while the returning veterans, especially Anglo men, received priority in hiring. Among the last hired, Native American war workers often became the first fired and returned to reservations where they encountered a stark reality of diminishing land bases, growing populations, housing shortages, lack of services, and few economic opportunities. Returning to the city seemed the logical solution to reservation poverty. In the years between 1940 and 1950, Indian urban populations nationwide nearly doubled. Phoenix experienced an even more phenomenal growth as the number of Native residents increased from 249 in 1940 to 789 in 1950.

The Navajo and Hopi case best illustrates the post-war economic crisis on reservations that prompted so many to leave and served as an impetus for a new federal policy of assimilation, labeled *relocation*. In the winter of 1947, severe weather compounded the dire economies on the reservations and threatened the Navajos and Hopis with starvation, prompting Congress to act. As part of the solution, the BIA initiated a job placement service in 1948 to ease pressure on reservation resources and create opportunity by assisting Navajos and Hopis to find employment off the reservation. This assistance became part of the 1950 Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act, and served as the model for the national relocation program that gained full force under Commissioner of Indian Affairs Dillon S. Myer. He created the Branch of Placement and Relocation within the BIA in 1951, and the first relocatees moved in February 1952.

Commissioner Glenn Emmons continued to vigorously support and expand the relocation program. Yet the low educational levels and lack of specific skills hampered the employment program as the demand for unskilled labor steadily declined in the economic growth years of the Cold War. Vocational training thus assumed importance as part of relocation. In 1956, Congress passed legislation to assist Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 to attend vocational institutions and to participate in on-the-job training or apprenticeship programs. By the end of the decade, the BIA replaced the term *relocation* with *employment assistance* to reflect this new emphasis. The new terminology also sought to shift attention away from the negative connotations of relocation as part of the policy of termination.

While Phoenix was not a destination city for relocation, BIA employment assistance and vocational training programs did influence Indian migrations to the city. The Arizona State Employment Service (ASES) stepped up its efforts, in collaboration with the BIA, to place Phoenix Indian High School students as early as 1949. Adult vocational training in the city began in 1958, with ASES assuming major responsibility for trainee selection. Although not as successful as anticipated, these programs brought young Indian people, especially single women, to the Phoenix area to participate in popular courses in welding, nursing,

beauty and barber work, and business administration. Graduates and dropouts alike often opted to stay in Phoenix or another urban area. Their stories traveled back home and attracted new migrants, while the perennial economic problems on reservations served as the major push factor. Meanwhile, the explosive growth of Phoenix in the 1950s provided increasing opportunities in the workforce.

The BIA's efforts on reservations to encourage urban relocation undoubtedly played a role in many a decision to move to Phoenix. The city offered the same opportunities as the major relocation centers of San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Chicago. An added advantage was the city's proximity to home. Relocation often meant a radical severing of ties to the home reservation. The move to Phoenix, however, allowed for families and individuals to return to their reservation communities for weekends and holidays, resulting in frequent travel back and forth. Such ties guaranteed the persistence of cultural practices in the urban environment and served as an important mechanism of adjustment.

Educational opportunities in the Phoenix area served as an important pull factor for Indian youth. The extensive Native involvement in the war effort had prompted recognition of the value of education, and many tribes began to set aside funds for scholarships. The National Indian Education Center, founded in 1948 at Arizona State University, brought in youth for teacher training while providing increasing opportunities for professional employment. Native American students also attended the region's community colleges. Phoenix College especially drew a large number of Indian students, helping them adjust to the demands of higher education. The ASES continued to facilitate the transfer of Indian High School students into the world of higher education and employment.

While educational opportunities widened, so did openings in the workforce for educated Indians. The 1949 reorganization of the BIA, its relocation activities, and Indian preference in hiring increased the number of Native Americans working for the Phoenix-area BIA office. In 1955, the Public Health Service assumed responsibility for Indian health care, and operations in the Phoenix area were streamlined. The Phoenix Indian hospital also cared for an increasing number of reservation residents, creating new jobs.

14 American Indian Migration to Phoenix, Arizona

The net result of all these changes—training, education, and employment—was an increase in the Indian population. By 1960, 1,164 American Indians declared Phoenix their permanent residence and 1,337 Native Americans lived in the metropolitan area. It is, of course, worth noting that the 1960 census was the first to use self-identification in determining ethnicity.

Because Phoenix was not a relocation center, the BIA did not keep records of who moved there. However, the relocation records prove helpful in constructing a profile of who tended to leave a reservation and move to an urban area. It appears that men were more likely to leave than women. The BIA recruitment campaigns emphasized “traditional” family households and focused on male employment, recruiting both single and married men. Yet there were few guarantees of success, and heads of families often relocated alone and only sent for their families once they had established themselves in the city. Because Phoenix is situated so close to many reservation communities, it is also likely that many Indian men worked in the city during the week and traveled home to their families for the weekends and holidays. Indeed, most of the Native American population in the metropolitan area consisted of members of Arizona tribes.

Reports of the ASES on assistance to reservation Indians also helps shed light on the occupational patterns of these urban migrants. During the calendar year 1960, for instance, ASES placed over 24,000 Arizona Indians in employment. This figure represented an all-time high, reflecting the changing economic conditions on reservations and the growing significance of wage labor in Native American communities. The majority of these workers still found employment in the agricultural sector, with 48 percent placed in nonagricultural positions. Of these workers, the vast majority were employed in the service sector or in private households, accounting for 42 percent of the total nonagricultural placements. The growth of the tourism industry in Arizona undoubtedly influenced this high figure. Resorts and hotels employed especially women as maids and kitchen help while others worked as domestics. Government emerged as the second largest nonagricultural employer, with 31 percent of the ASES placements; yet the percentage of Indian employees in state agencies remained disproportionately small and

concentrated in the lower salary ranges. In fact, in all sectors of the economy, Indians continued to occupy the lowest skill levels.

Income statistics speak to the tangible result of these occupational patterns: persistent poverty. Although migration often translated into economic improvement over the reservation, urban life also meant added costs, including housing, transportation, and health care. Furthermore, Indian incomes lagged behind the national average. The 1970 census reveals that Native American incomes in Phoenix were even lower than the national average for the group. By now, 5,893 Indians lived in Phoenix proper, constituting less than 1 percent of the city’s population; the metropolitan area population had reached a total of 7,957 Native Americans. More than 30 percent of all Indian persons and 25 percent of families had incomes below the poverty level as compared to an 11.7 percent poverty rate for the county. Nearly 40 percent of the total Native population lived in the low-income inner-city area, while a cluster of middle-class residences had developed near the Indian High School. However, the school campus constituted the only area in the city with Indians as the numerical majority, housing nearly 1,000 students and staff. Its student body consisted largely of Arizona Indians, with Navajos, Apaches, and Hopis in the majority.

Arizona tribes also made up 71 percent of the city’s total Native American population, while nearly three fourths of the out-of-state population came from southern and western states. Census information further suggests that the population was overwhelmingly young, with 83 percent under 40 years of age. Forty-five percent of all Indians older than 25 years of age held high school diplomas, but only 16 percent had attended college, while less than 3 percent had more than four years of higher education. These statistics translated into an unemployment rate for inner-city Indian men higher than any other ethnic group in the city: 13.5 percent.

Although not specifically targeting Native American communities, President Johnson’s War on Poverty provided an opportunity to address some of the challenges facing inner-city Indians in Phoenix. The first efforts emerged from within the Central Presbyterian Church, which had come to be identified as the religious and

social center of the Phoenix Indian community; it also had a strong commitment to addressing the physical needs of its congregation. The city, too, took advantage of the poverty programs, but Native Americans remained less vocal than other ethnic groups about their specific concerns, resulting in less engagement by the city in improving Indian neighborhoods.

In the 1970s, the Phoenix Native American population clearly began to develop a sense of identity as members of an urban community. National Indian activism provided a backdrop to this emerging “sense of belonging,” while local advocates helped secure visibility for Native concerns in city politics. Funding from the municipal and federal governments propelled the Phoenix Indian Center to the forefront of promoting Indian welfare. The city also responded to the political energy in the community, expanding its funding to include a variety of Indian-oriented programs. The proliferation of such programs offered further opportunities for work, while federal educational initiatives brought new Indian students to the area. These new arrivals found a focus in a number of Indian student clubs, which, in addition to their social function, increasingly assumed political goals in the context of local leadership development and against the backdrop of national activism. The American Indian Movement (AIM) also established a chapter in Phoenix, although it never reached a very strong active following in the city. Yet AIM certainly played a role in raising consciousness of Indian affairs and concerns among Phoenicians—Indian and non-Indian alike.

By 1980, the U.S. Census Bureau reported that more than half of all American Indians in the nation lived in urban areas. Although this number certainly reflects the urbanization of reservations themselves, the change to a large degree resulted from the continuing out-migration of reservation residents. The Phoenix Indian community now amounted to 10,808 people; the number of metropolitan-area Indian residents had reached 16,781. Although tribal ties remained strong for many of these urban residents, the emergence of intertribal networks and Indian-oriented programs nurtured a sense of commonality that served as an adaptive mechanism in the urban environment. This sense of unity was undoubtedly strengthened by the fact that 61 percent of the population still consisted of

Arizona tribes; approximately one half of the out-of-state population came from western and southern states. Native Americans also remained a relatively young group, with median age at 21.6 years. Educational levels had increased considerably from a decade earlier: 65 percent of those over 25 now held high school diplomas while 9.5 percent had more than four years of college. These educational levels reflect the active recruiting of students and the increasing emphasis in Indian communities on education as the key to economic and social improvement.

Income statistics to some degree mirror these rising educational levels. Median incomes had increased among the Indian population as a whole, although women lagged behind men, earning only about one half of the average male income. This disparity also shows in the poverty rates. Indian families remained the least advantaged, with nearly 24 percent living below the poverty level; female-headed households made up nearly one half of these low-income families. Although almost 15 percent of Indian women in Phoenix now held managerial and professional positions, the overwhelming majority concentrated in low-paying jobs in the clerical and service sectors of the economy.

In the two decades since 1980, the Phoenix metropolitan area has experienced phenomenal population and economic growth. At the same time, employment has expanded along transportation corridors away from the central city, spurring the growth of the suburbs and the nearby cities. Between 1980 and 1990, the population grew by 39.9 percent to 2.2 million; the 1990s experienced an even more dramatic growth of 45.3 percent to a total of 3.2 million, making Phoenix the second-fastest growing metropolitan area in the nation after Las Vegas, Nevada. Furthermore, migrations account for more than two thirds of this growth.

As the city has grown, so has its Native American population. By the 2000 census, the greater Phoenix metropolitan area housed a total of 58,122 American Indians and Alaska Natives. The city of Phoenix had an Indian population of 35,093, or 2.7 percent of the total population. In analyzing these figures and comparing them to previous census data, however, it is important to keep in mind that the Census Bureau changed the definition on race for the 2000 census. Respondents were now asked to report *one or more* races

they considered themselves to be. Yet, even if we only consider the 26,696 people who listed themselves as “American Indian or Alaska Native alone,” the growth of this population has been significant in these last two decades. Nationally, Phoenix ranks third in the size of its Native population; only New York and Los Angeles have higher actual numbers of Indian residents.

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 2000 census data for Maricopa County—although inclusive of several reservation communities—also provides important insights into the economic profile of the growing urban Indian population. The evidence points to increasing educational levels and improved access to higher-paying jobs. More than 11 percent of the American Indian and Alaska Native population over 16 years of age in the civilian labor force held a bachelor’s, graduate, or other professional degree, while nearly another 40 percent had at least some college education. At the same time, however, 20 percent of the Native population had not finished high school. Occupationally, nearly one half of the American Indian labor force still concentrated in the lower-paying categories of service workers, laborers, operatives, administrative support personnel, and craft workers, but significant improvement had occurred in professional employment. Approximately 17 percent now found employment as health care practitioners; science, engineering, and computer professionals; management, business, and financial workers; and as other professionals. Clearly, though, Native Americans are underrepresented in each of these areas of employment vis-à-vis their percentage of the total population. Furthermore, unemployment remains high. While 4.7 percent of the Maricopa County population was unemployed, the percentage of Native Americans was 10.1. Even more alarming is the female unemployment rate: 11.3 percent among Native women as opposed to the 4 percent in the total workforce. These figures seem to suggest the continuing trend of female and child poverty.

The story of the United States is one of immigration and migration. The 2000 census figures clearly demonstrate that Native Americans increasingly participate in this larger story as they have, in the words of Zuni tribal member Cal Seciwa, Director of the American Indian Institute at Arizona State University, “grown and been able to navigate the dominant society

in areas such as education and employment.” Phoenix provides only one example of this trend. Yet, as more Indian people move to urban areas, learn trades, and become professionals, they also choose to only partially assimilate in the mainstream culture. “Our loyalties and our hearts are back home, where we have family, religious and other cultural ties,” continues Seciwa. Frequent visits to their homelands reinforce these cultural ties, while urban institutions, like the Phoenix Indian Center, provide venues to navigate the city environment. Everything continues to be connected to the past.

—Paivi Hoikkala

See also BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS; INDIAN REMOVAL ACT OF 1830; PHOENIX, ARIZONA; WORLD WAR II DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

Suggested Reading

- Chaudhuri, Joyotpaul. *Urban Indians of Arizona: Phoenix, Tucson, and Flagstaff*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974.
- Clark, Blue. “Bury My Heart in Smog: Urban Indians.” In *They Made Us Many Promises”: The American Indian Experience 1524 to the Present*. 2nd ed., edited by Philip Weeks. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 2002.
- Fixico, Donald L. *The Urban Indian Experience in America*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Lobo, Susan, and Kurt Peters, eds. *American Indians and the Urban Experience*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira, 2001.
- Weibel-Orlando, Joan. *Indian Country, L.A.: Maintaining Ethnic Community in Complex Society*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.

ANGLO MIGRATION TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BEFORE THE DEPRESSION

Between 1880 and 1930, southern California experienced a massive influx of white Protestant, interregional migrants. In that period, residents of the Midwest particularly chose to relocate to Los Angeles—the principal city in southern California—and the surrounding area over any other location west of the Rocky Mountains. Overwhelming in their numbers, midwestern migrants dwarfed other interregional

transplants. Although northeasterners initially accounted for the white population in southern California, their numbers dropped just after the turn of the century. Other regional migrants, such as those from the American South, made little numerical impact prior to the end of World War I. While many have attributed this significant flow of native midwesterners to the notion of an American proclivity toward westward movement, in real terms, multiple factors spurred this specific voluminous human stream. Some left the Midwest to escape the bitterly cold winters and take advantage of southern California's salubrious climate. Other midwesterners simply desired to break away from the farm and looked to Los Angeles as a place of greater leisure. Yet much of the story of Los Angeles and its unprecedented development is really the story of a small group of like-minded businessmen and women who advertised the virtues of the city and region in a series of massive but targeted advertising campaigns. Thus, in order to understand the pull of white migrants to southern California, it is necessary to acknowledge the role of those who initially advertised the region as a land of mild climate, healthy convalescence, and limited toil. In a number of ways, the success of Los Angeles as a population center was contingent upon the success of these regional boosters.

The growth of the area itself was astounding. From 1880 to 1930, the population of Los Angeles alone jumped from 11,183 to 1,238,048. In that period, the largest single interregional migrant group represented the states of the American Midwest. By 1930, there were nearly 370,000 former midwesterners in the city of Los Angeles alone, and twice as many in the entire county. Yet this growth and population composition was hardly an act of providence, but rather the result of a competition for white, midwestern migrants, and the want of regional development. Far from being blown by the wind to the Pacific, midwesterners were indeed lured to the West by promises of health, wealth, and leisure, as advertised by Los Angeles's boosters. Generally, boosters were businesspeople who invested in a city's potential for development and consequently profited in periods of growth or suffered in times of decline. Thus, boosters worked tirelessly to advertise their cities to the nation while at the same time attempting to bolster regional commerce. While

other far western cities, such as Seattle and Portland, attempted to lure the same midwesterners, Los Angeles succeeded to a much greater extent. Southern California's ambitious boosters (who were often principle figures in real estate, tourism, agriculture, and heavy industry) laid the foundation for a profitable metropolis. But in this region, as in many others, boosters also wanted to create a certain *type* of city, a city of character rather than just a large city of monetary returns. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, these boosters explicitly attempted to draw hardworking, conservative white migrants away from their small towns in the Midwest to southern California in order to build an orderly Anglo-Saxon haven on the shores of the Pacific Ocean.

Southern California boosterism as it relates to the peopling of the region evolved in successive stages. During the initial phase of Los Angeles boosterism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, businessmen attempted to attract white farmers (often using tourism as a lure) by advertising the agricultural abundance, natural beauty, and health benefits associated with southern California's mild but sunny climate. One 1888 publication proclaimed, "Los Angeles is THE MOST COMFORTABLE SUMMER RESORT IN THE WORLD. Sunstroke is unknown. There are no hot nights. In the shade it is always cool." Another pamphlet in 1904 effusively addressed the litany of the reasons migrants should consider relocating to the Los Angeles area:

May [this book's] message also pass to the seeker of health, of pleasure or an ideal home place and embody the invitation and welcome which is ever bespoke for those who journey to this glowing southland. . . . Here may be found picturesque old missions founded by the fathers; the varied mountain and ocean scenery; broad cultivated acres; orchards and vineyards burdened with rich harvests; gardens and parks of tropical luxuriance, while last and best, are the homes of our people—builded here where, amid smiling, fruitful valleys, the snow-capped mountains meet the peaceful sea and the glorious sunshine is an ever-present inspiration.

And, while many migrants responded to this style of advertising, most chose to abandon farming upon arrival.

18 Anglo Migration to Southern California Before the Depression

Soon after the turn of the 20th century, one particular booster organization rose to undisputed prominence and abandoned the relocation of white agriculturalists in favor of a more cosmopolitan campaign.

The next phase of boosterism coincides with the newfound prominence of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. The chamber, which was composed of leading area businessmen and local politicians, had worked for a number of years promoting the region, but gained real clout by 1910, when it was informally incorporated into the realm of city and county governments and given public funds to promote greater Los Angeles's social and industrial development. Concentrating on leisure and economic opportunity rather than health and farming, the chamber by the 1920s had saturated the nation with tens of millions of pamphlets and brochures aimed at tourists and would-be migrants looking to both relax and work.

By all indications, the chamber succeeded during the period at both drawing new residents and siphoning migrants from other potential western destinations. While the other emerging cities on the West Coast, such as Seattle and Portland, experienced rapid growth from 1900 to 1910, Los Angeles clearly outpaced them in its ability to attract a steady stream of migrants. For instance, Portland began the 20th century with a mere 10,000 people fewer than Los Angeles, but by 1920, that gap had risen to nearly 320,000. Though not quite as dramatically, this is also true of Seattle. By 1910, Seattle was the most populated city in the Pacific Northwest, and, although it held 80 percent of Los Angeles's total population at the turn of the century, by the next census Los Angeles outpaced Seattle by 82,000, and by 262,000 in 1920. From 1910, Los Angeles's population grew at a rate three times as high as Portland's and well over twice Seattle's rate. By 1920, Los Angeles surpassed San Francisco as the most populated city in the West. Additionally, while those other cities' rate of midwestern in-migration stagnated, Los Angeles's continued to grow.

Empowered by the city and county governments, Los Angeles boosters went far beyond simply trying to populate the region. They believed that they could design the region as an Anglo-Saxon haven and thus, in their opinion, control the character of the city itself. The Chamber of Commerce made no secret of its

desire to lure whites over other minorities, and it often contrasted southern California to the ghettoized cities of the eastern seaboard, with their foreign influences and immigrant masses. The chamber even went to the extent of studying the immigration and developing measures, if necessary, to reduce its impact. For example, in 1912, concerned about the ease with which immigrants might reach the area after the opening of the Panama Canal, the chamber commissioned a study to assess the adverse affects of eastern European immigrants on southern California. According to the report, the chamber wanted "to ascertain the best means of keeping out the undesirable aliens and attract the industrious and more desirable class of immigrants." In another chamber report, the group announced that it was "not in sympathy with the great throngs of Southern Europeans who of late years have formed the majority of our immigrants."

The Chamber of Commerce invested most of its energy not in keeping undesirables out, but in the courting of native-born white Americans. With the black, Latino, Asian, and eastern European population rapidly rising in the city despite efforts to dissuade immigration, area boosters were still able to maintain a steady midwestern white plurality. To ensure this statistical dominance, the organization deliberately targeted the white, middle-class, Protestant Midwest. This group was clearly the most valued demographic. The reasons for the particular midwestern preference are varied but rather straightforward. The Midwest represented the center of the country's population; its inhabitants were mobile, had benefited financially from the solid grain prices, and could contribute to southern California's economy. So, for these boosters, according to Carey McWilliams, "Every consideration was subordinated to the paramount concern of attracting church-going Middle Westerners to Southern California."

But there were also other cultural considerations. City boosters recognized midwesterners as similar to themselves; that is, the Midwest audience they wanted to appeal to was predominantly white, Protestant (but not southern Baptist or southern Methodist), and—more often than not—Republican. Often couched in terms of "class," boosters wanted to limit their promotional scope as to exclude people that they believed could not meet a minimum moral standard, and thus

they focused on this particular audience. For example, in 1910 the Chamber of Commerce participated in the Omaha Corn Show because it would be well attended by “a class of people desirable for us to reach.” The notion of a migrant’s “character” so intrigued the chamber that they even promoted southern California–topical lectures in Esperanto, in the hope that they might engender the migration of a more “intelligent class of people.” In its use of the term *class*, the chamber meant to attract not only a group that rose above a minimum economic standard, but to lure people with a similar worldview.

In practical terms, the Chamber of Commerce developed a promotional strategy that targeted particular areas in an effort to move white, middle-class residents into southern California. For example, the chamber extensively campaigned in Chicago, the entire state of Iowa, and Detroit and in the first two decades of the 20th century. Recognizing Chicago as the rail hub of the nation, the chamber committee on promotion saturated the area with brochures and other promotional materials. They also noted that the state of Illinois was the population center of the nation. As one Los Angeles booster claimed in 1909, “Immigration practically radiates from Chicago, and I am equally satisfied we will have to fight most of our battles there.”

Yet the attempt to transplant Illinois’ whites to the West also demanded a more interactive campaign, one modeled after national and international world’s fairs. Exceedingly popular in the 19th and early 20th centuries, these expositions pulled in mass audiences for brief but often spectacular occasions. From world’s fairs to industrial expos, these spectacles drew middle-class whites away from their small towns and afforded them the experience of witnessing the products of the globe in a single tent. Generally a method of advancing interregional commerce, expositions were funded by businesspeople and boosters and were for a decidedly middle-class audience. Boosters in their own regions, these promoters invited other cities and regions to display goods and information in an effort to form commercial relationships. For the Chamber of Commerce, the purpose of the expositions was to import a vision of southern California products to states and cities in certain regions not only to promote trade, but middle-class migration as well. The displays

of southern California agricultural abundance were a visual spectacle that included such sights as a life-size model of an elephant covered entirely in walnuts, or a 25-foot tower. These displays, however, were not intended for the working-class people who might find entertainment at places like Coney Island, but for the education and edification of the middle-class spectator.

Illinois, and Chicago in particular, became the exposition epicenter. As the chamber’s promotional efforts grew, so did its emphasis of expositions in the Midwest in general, and Chicago in particular. Early on, Los Angeles boosters specifically targeted the Midwest in their choice of expositions. Although the chamber occasionally engaged in expositions in outside of the Midwest in the first decade of the 20th century, by 1910 it focused exclusively on midwestern states, particularly Illinois. In the space of three years, the chamber participated in nine expositions. Of those, seven were held in the Midwest, with three in Chicago alone. The chamber’s desire for the model migrant limited its scope to an area where class and geography aligned in a manner that invited focused promotional saturation.

The same was true of Iowa. As one historian has shown, Los Angeles boosters made a special effort to draw Iowans off of their farms and out of their small towns to the shores of the Pacific. As a result, Iowa consistently ranked in the top 10 states contributing to Los Angeles’s population from 1910 to 1930. By 1930, there were over 40,000 Iowans in the city of Los Angeles alone. And, like the Chamber of Commerce itself, Iowa was a Republican stronghold where northern Protestantism dominated religious expression, and a state whose residents were overwhelmingly white. So successful was this push for Iowans in southern California that the region was nicknamed “Iowa by the Sea” and “Caliowa.”

Always uncomfortable with a Mexican, Chinese, Japanese nonagricultural workforce, Chamber of Commerce officials also sought to compel white midwestern industrial worker migration. Shortly after the implementation of an exclusively Midwest-focused strategy, the chamber targeted industrial workers and investors in Detroit by publishing a pamphlet specifically for distribution in that city entitled “Oil in California.” Three months later, it printed its annual “Los Angeles Today,” for distribution at expositions

and on train cars. The pamphlet illustrated the superiority of Los Angeles climate and working conditions relative to major midwestern cities. Indianapolis, Ft. Wayne, Chicago, Springfield, Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Columbus, and Dayton were all significantly colder, more difficult to navigate, and did not have the natural advantages that Los Angeles possessed. Only in Los Angeles, it appeared, could one toil less and enjoy the weather throughout the year. In one promotional tract, the chamber quoted a vacationing worker from Detroit who visited the Hotpoint appliance manufacturing plant in Ontario, California. The astonished midwesterner proclaimed that he had “never dreamt of finding, in the heart of fragrant orange groves, a thoroughly modern, splendidly equipped factory turning out goods with a national reputation.”

Overall, the strategy of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce appears to have (in the short term) succeeded. The principal targets of the promotional campaign responded to the publicity blitz. By 1920, midwestern states filled the ranks of states contributing to migrants to Los Angeles. Illinois, with 38,064, was followed by New York (the only non-midwestern state in the top five with 26,958), Ohio (25,511), Missouri (24,104), and Iowa (19,968). Other states with similar out-migration patterns as these midwestern states—such as Tennessee—but outside of the chamber’s promotional realm contributed far fewer migrants.

There is also evidence to suggest that the Chamber of Commerce’s goal of a white, socially conservative population was temporarily achieved. In 1915, writer Willard Huntington Wright observed that “the inhabitants of Los Angeles are culled largely from the smaller cities of the Midwest.” He went on to claim that the transplantation of “militant moralists” and their midwestern values had transformed southern California from a small pueblo to an oversized puritanical village in a brief but formative period. After the publication of Wright’s essay, a respondent in the Los Angeles *Examiner* claimed that Los Angeles “deliberately chooses to be dubbed ‘Puritan,’ ‘Middle-West Farmer,’ ‘Provincial,’ etc., and glories in the fact that she has been able to sweep away many of the flaunting indecencies that still disgrace older and more vice-complacent communities.” The sum of these assessments concerning midwestern cultural contribution to southern

California suggests that the Chamber of Commerce was indeed successful in its effort to import regionally influenced middle-class values.

—Dan Cady

See also LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; OKIES

Suggested Reading

- Davis, Clark. *Company Men: White Collar Life and Corporate Cultures in Los Angeles, 1892–1941*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Fogelson, Robert. *The Fragmented Metropolis, Los Angeles, 1850–1930*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Mayo, Morrow. *Los Angeles*. New York: Knopf, 1933.
- McWilliams, Carey. *Southern California Country: An Island on the Land*. New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearce. (Reprinted Santa Barbara, CA: Peregrine Smith, 1973)
- Nicolaides, Becky M. *My Blue Heaven: Life and Politics in the Working-Class Suburb of Los Angeles, 1920–1965*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Pitt, Leonard. “The Midwesternization of a Cowtown.” *California History* 60 (Spring 1981).
- Spooner, Denise. “A New Perspective on the Dream: Midwestern Images of Southern California in the Post–World War Decades.” *California History* 76 (Spring 1997).
- Starr, Kevin. *Material Dreams: Southern California through the 1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Woehlke, Walter V. “Angels in Overalls: Being a True and Veracious Account of Workaday Life in the Angelic Region, Together with a Exposition of the Manners and Methods by Which the Inhabitants of the Angel City Boosted the Demand for Junipers and Jeans, and an Attempt to Show That Bellboys, Millionaires, Hotel Clerks and Tourists Have No Exclusive Entry into the Aforesaid Realm.” *Sunset Magazine* (March 1912).
- Wright, Willard Huntington. “Los Angeles—The Chemically Pure.” In *The Smart Set Anthology*, edited by Burton Roscoe and Geoff Couklin. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1934.
- Zimmerman, Tom. “Paradise Promoted: Boosterism and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.” *California History* 64 (Winter 1985).

APACHE

The Apache people of today are a confederation of seven Athabascan- or Apachean-speaking tribes who once shared a common ancestor. Modern Apache people include the Chiricahua, Jicarilla, Mescalero, Navajo, Lipan, Western Apache, and the Kiowa-Apache. Because the Kiowa-Apache are culturally related to

the Plains Indians and especially the Kiowa people, they will not be included in this study.

Linguistic evidence indicates the original group formed as a distinct tribe or related group of tribes while living in the Mackenzie Basin of Canada. Within this region, the ancient Apache were linked to other linguistic groups that occupied the northern Pacific coast from Alaska to Oregon and inland to the basin. This would indicate an initial migratory history that crossed the Bering Strait and then divided into several groupings, some of which followed the west coast of America, while others moved inland. Around 1,000 years ago, the Apachean dialect broke from these related languages and for the next 300 years developed independently. Approximately 700–800 years ago, these ancient Apache people began to move south into what is now the United States. Questions abound as to whether the Apache people traveled into the Southwest via a western or an eastern route. Because the Apache have traditionally been a hunter-gatherer society, archaeological evidence of their passage through any region would be scant, if any evidence remained at all.

There is some question as to whether the ancient Apache lived for a time in the Salt Lake Basin, occupying caves in the region before continuing their southward journey. However, this presumption is not well accepted. The journey of more than 1,500 miles from the Mackenzie Basin to the Southwestern region of the United States ended for the Apache around 1300–1400. The reason for their move from Canada to the arid Southwest cannot be ascertained. Archeological evidence in the Gobernador Largo Canyon of southern Colorado and northern New Mexico would place the Navajo—who built more permanent structures than their brethren—in the latter years of the 15th century. However, even this tantalizing information about the ancient Apache is scant. Additional archeological evidence has been found in the Dismal River region of New Mexico, but this does not antedate 1650. Once the ancient Apache reached the Southwest, the linguistic and political differences that would come to characterize the seven distinct tribes would proceed rapidly, so that within 400 years of reaching the region they had formed into distinct tribes.

The ancestors of the Navajo, Western Apache, Mescalero, and Chiricahua were the first to move south

and westward, followed by the Lipan and Jicarilla. The Kiowa-Apache likely diverged from the Lipan and Jicarilla around 1500 and became more closely related to the plains culture than the Pueblo culture that would impact all other Apache tribes. Also, around the year 1500, the Navajo and Western Apache drifted further south and west until by 1600 the Lipan and Jicarilla no longer had any contact with either group. By the following century, even the Lipan and Jicarilla, who had remained a single band until this time, had become culturally and linguistically distinct from each other.

Eventually, each tribe would come to claim distinct lands that would further shape its worldview and culture. The Chiricahua established themselves west of the Rio Grande River in southwest New Mexico, southeast Arizona and into northern Mexico. The Mescalero held territory along the east of the Rio Grande River to the Pecos River in northwest Texas. The Lipan held land in central and southwest Texas, while the Jicarilla established themselves in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado. The Western Apache likely preceded the Navajo into the San Juan Basin of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Eventually, they would settle further south than the Navajo. Lastly, the Kiowa-Apache would eventually establish themselves in the southern plains.

Within their separate territories, the Apache people thrived and developed their own individual traits as cultural groups. However, their common ancestry provided for more similarities than dissimilarities. Central to Apache existence was the “family cluster,” a cohesive group of extended family whose members were dictated by matrilineal relationships. Each family within this cluster was related by marriage or blood but also had their own separate dwelling. Beyond the cluster, extended families lived in similar groups and together they constituted a band. Because of the vast territories among the Apache bands, no formal political authority developed. Among some Apache groups, such as the Mescalero and Lipan, band consciousness was weak, with the filial awareness diverted instead to the family cluster. Within the family groupings, no formal political authority existed, but a respected elder of the tribe served as spokesman for the group, and often the group was referred to by the name of this spokesman.

Female membership in the family cluster was decided by birth; as such, a woman was a lifetime member of the band. Unlike women, men gained their positions within the family cluster only through marriage. Once a man entered this matrilineal grouping, he was expected to work with the other members of the cluster to acquire food and to provide protection. The Apache were once thought to have had an agricultural tradition, but by the time they reached the U.S. Southwest, the aridity of the region made this tradition difficult to continue. Only the Navajo engaged in any significant form of planting and cultivating. At the opposite of this spectrum, the Kiowa-Apache refused to engage in any form of agriculture. Other Apache bands engaged in a passive form of planting, but primarily relied on hunting and gathering for their sustenance.

Cooperative work effort was so important to the continued survival of the group that when a man and woman divorced, if the man had been a good worker, other family members would attempt to reconcile the couple. Conversely, a man who was lazy could be run out of the family group by his wife's relatives. While work was most often divided along gender lines, the Apache culture still allowed for sufficient flexibility. At times women would assist in the hunt for small- or medium-sized game, and men—especially grandfathers and uncles—would assist in some child-rearing tasks or hide processing. Each man or woman owned the implements they used to meet the labor expectations of the group, and when a member of the band died, these implements would be destroyed so as not to encourage the dead to return.

In the Apache cosmology, the world was created from competing good and evil forces, many of which assumed the form of familiar animals, such as the coyote or owl. When an individual died, they traveled to a land of abundance or scarcity, depending on whether the person had been good or bad. In the Navajo religion, the dead returned to the original place where man had first appeared on the earth—an opening that led to a subterranean world where the ancients still lived. In a world where reminders of creation and good and evil abounded, Apache religious practice, as with those of all Native peoples, was expressed in daily rituals even though, to many, it may not have appeared to be formal worship.

In the harsh environment of the Southwest, food was often difficult to come by and defending resources was necessary. Often, groups engaged in raiding to acquire scarce goods. While raiding was preferable to war, bands would fight to avenge the loss of a family member or to defend territory. For the Apache, however, the practice of counting coup was not important as a means of distinguishing a warrior's bravery. Most Apache, rather pragmatically, felt it was better to kill an enemy than leave him alive. The fierce warrior of the Apache was likely the first individual European met when they attempted to colonize the Southwest.

However, the first European to enter the territory of the Apache was Father Marcos de Niza in 1539. In the journals he left, no mention of an aboriginal people appears. Because of this, the possibility that the Apache had not yet permanently settled into the land has been considered. It would be difficult to counter this contention because the Apache, as a nomadic tribe, have left few archaeological remnants. However, it is equally possible that explorers and the Apache simply did not encounter each other on the vast landscape. Greater weight must be given to the latter assumption, as in 1540–1541 Francisco Vasquez de Coronado in his exploration of the Southwest reported encountering what were most likely bands of Chiricahua Apache hunters. Coronado referred to the bands he encountered as Querechos and Tejas Indians, which might have added to the confusion as to when the Apache permanently took up residence in the region.

Regardless of whether the Apache arrived before de Niza or soon after, the Apache were solidly entrenched in the region by the time Spanish exploration evolved into settlement. Whereas previous encounters had passed with few difficulties, as the number of foreigners in their land increased, so did the hostility exhibited by the Apache. In 1583, attempts to explore the mountains near Acoma, New Mexico, for minerals was met with pitched resistance from numerous Indians—likely the Chiricahua. When the Spanish sought to establish permanent settlements in Apache territory, the resistance exhibited by the Indians accelerated. In 1598, Juan de Onate attempted to establish a capital for the territory of New Mexico at the confluence of the Chama and Rio Grande Rivers, but the Apache launched so many attacks that the

original settlement of San Gabriel had to be moved to modern-day Santa Fe in 1610.

For the rest of the 17th century, the Apache and the Spanish settled into an uneasy existence. The Apache continued to staunchly defend their territory against incursions by Europeans, who sought land, slaves, or converts. The contact that did occur between these two factions, besides identifying a clash of cultures, also provides a further summation of the migratory pattern of the Apache. As the Spanish priests scoured the region in search of converts and laborers, many noted the similarities and distinctions among the bands they encountered. In 1626, Father Alonzo de Benavides identified the distinction between the Chiricahua Apache, who lived west of the Rio Grande, and the Mescalero Apache, who lived to the east of the river. Benavides would also later note the similarities in their languages, which would imply that these two bands of Apache had only recently divided into their distinct tribes. The migratory patterns of the Apache people were aided immeasurably by the coming of the Spanish. As the Spanish established missions and presidios in the Southwest, they imported livestock, cattle, sheep, and especially horses. Like all native cultures that adopted the horse, the acquisition would forever change their culture and their previous migratory and settlement patterns.

By the end of the 17th century, Spanish reports record Apache warriors riding into battles on horseback, in some cases on horses that wore Spanish armor. The Indians became so proficient in using the horse to attack the Spanish that by the middle of the 17th century the Chiricahua were routinely attacking Sonora from a stronghold in the Datil Mountains 125 miles to the north. The Western Apache may have also aided the Chiricahua in these attacks. By 1718, San Antonio, Texas, was founded; almost from the inception of the settlement, the Lipan Apache repeated the same pattern of raiding the horse herds and randomly attacking the colonists. As the settlement pattern of the Spanish slowed by the 18th century, the territorial boundaries of the Apache were fixed, and the individual tribes refused to yield ground to the Spanish upstarts. Because most of the Spanish settlement centered around the Rio Grande, the tribes most often encountered by the Europeans were the Chiricahua

and the Mescalero. Holding the central position within the territory claimed by all the Apache, they retained contact with the other bands the longest and undoubtedly enlisted the aid of those tribes that were geographically closest to them.

By the 19th century, the war for control of the Spanish crown and her possessions resulted in an open revolt in Mexico and eventually culminated in Mexico's independence in 1821. Faced with trouble at home, Spain focused the attention of her military might on subduing rebellion, not on attacking the Apache. Through a series of treaties, a fractured peace settled over the region. That peace would be broken when the United States and Mexico went to war in 1846. By the time this lopsided war was over, most of Mexico's possessions in the Southwest had been annexed by the United States. Texas, which had proclaimed its independence from Mexico a decade earlier, had this declaration formalized in the treaty that ended the hostilities and established much of the territorial boundaries that still exist between the United States and Mexico. The change from Mexican to American ownership would have a profound impact on the Apache.

The brunt of the initial action against the Apache people was borne by the Navajo. By the turn of the 19th century, the Navajo had completed their 300-year exodus, breaking from the Chiricahua along the San Juan Mountains in New Mexico and moving toward the Colorado River. When Mexico broke off relations with Spain, the Navajo held territory from the Chama River in New Mexico to the Colorado and San Juan Rivers in Arizona. Like their Apache brethren, the Navajo fiercely protected their lands from incursion. Unfortunately, the transition from Mexican to American control would infuse the region with a larger and more determined military force than the Apache had previously encountered.

Conflict with the new settlers initially followed the same pattern previously established by the Spanish. The Navajo fought any who claimed their lands or attempted to steal their women and children to sell as slaves. So fierce was their opposition that, by 1850, the United States had entered into three peace treaties with the Navajo. Army forts were established within the Navajo's land, and Indian agents were called upon to ensure peace. Theirs would be a futile effort. As settlers

into the Southwest increased, violence between the whites and the Apache accelerated. To keep the peace, the army patrolled the region, but instead of keeping peace, the soldiers were often the instigators of the violence. Additional attacks against Indian strongholds came from slave traders, who scoured the Southwest attacking villages and seizing Apache women and children. The military did little to curtail this activity. The army also did little to prevent settlers from running off or killing the livestock owned by the Indians. Finally, the discovery of gold and silver on Apache lands resulted in further encroachment. These attacks against the Navajo and other Apache bands reached their peak in 1858, when the U.S. Army declared war on the Navajo.

Only half-hearted attempts to negotiate peace were attempted, and the depredations continued on both sides. In 1859, some consideration was given to establishing a reservation for the Mescalero and the Lipan in northern New Mexico, but the government preferred instead to deal with the Apache with violence. In 1862, the secretary of war formalized the army's war declaration and ordered the army to strike and subdue the Navajo. A plan was devised to attack first the Mescalero Apache and by extension the Lipan, who were closely allied but lived in the mountains to their north, and then the Navajo. From 1862 to 1863, the Mescalero withered under the brunt of the army's forces, and after a campaign that lasted less than half a year, they were defeated. The army created a reserve for the Mescalero near Fort Sumner and named it Bosque Redondo; there, they installed the remaining Mescalero and Lipan Apache before turning their attention to the Navajo.

While the Navajo were attacked next, their defeat was not achieved as quickly as that of the Mescalero. Their numbers were larger and they were able to rely on this strength and the agricultural stores they had accumulated. These advantages, however, would not last indefinitely. The army, led by Colonel Christopher Carson, embarked on a scorched-earth campaign, killing Navajo livestock, burning crops, and allowing other groups to continue their harassment of the tribe. By 1864, most of the Navajo were starving, dead, or had been captured. Those captured Navajos were moved to the Bosque Redondo Reservation, but their

numbers quickly overwhelmed the limited resources of the reserve. In May 1868, another treaty was negotiated with the Navajo, and they were provided lands back in their original territory. Since that time, the Navajo Reservation has expanded several times to accommodate the growing tribe, and they are now the largest tribe in the Southwest.

With the Navajo and the Mescalero subdued, the U.S. Army was able to turn its attention to the remaining bands of the Apache. The Chiricahua would prove to be one of the most intractable to remove from their native lands. In 1852, copper mines were reopened in eastern Chiricahua territory, and then later gold was discovered in Pinos Altos; both areas are near Santa Rita, in western New Mexico. The discovery of mineral wealth accelerated the number of settlers to the region, and the Chiricahua were forced to defend their homeland. For the next 35 years, government treatment of the Chiricahua would vary dramatically. Military conquests alternated with attempts to settle the Chiricahua on a reservation that had been established in the foothills of the Mogollon Mountains along the Gila River in 1860. This attempt was met with little success. While the Apache acted in good faith, the U.S. Army often broke its agreements and assassinated tribal leaders who had come in peacefully to talk. It would take another decade of fighting before tribal members agreed in any number to settle on reservation lands. While the Chiricahua insisted on remaining on lands that had traditionally been theirs, settlers to the region prevented this from happening, and land was set aside along the Arizona–New Mexico border. By 1872, the Chiricahua began to settle into the new Tularosa Valley Reservation and a second Chiricahua Reservation further south along the border between Arizona and Mexico. By 1874, these reservations would be abandoned in preference for the Hot Springs Reservation, which was established along the Rio Grande River in southeastern New Mexico. However, complaints of theft from across the border in Mexico and raiding in the region resulted in the forced removal of the Chiricahua from the Hot Springs Reservation in 1877 to the San Carlos Reservation in southeastern Arizona.

At this new reservation, the Chiricahua were forced to live with bands of the Western Apache; despite their

common ancestry, each tribe felt the other was an intrusion. Many fled the San Carlos Reserve and either joined other bands of Apache on established reservations or fled back into the mountains that had been their home. Attempts to resettle the Chiricahua were hampered by the continued aggression of the military and new hostilities between the Western Apache and the army. By 1882, the Chiricahua had decided to remove themselves to Mexico and established a village in the Sierra Madre Mountains in northern Mexico. The U.S. Army pursued the Chiricahua, and in 1883 they were persuaded to return to the San Carlos Reservation. The unhappy conditions on the reservation eventually resulted in a small exodus led by Geronimo back to the Sierra Madre Mountains in 1885. Relentlessly pursued by both U.S. and Mexican forces, this tiny band eventually surrendered in 1886 but were not allowed to return to the reservation as had been promised. Instead, they were arrested and most sent to Fort Marion in Florida. Geronimo and about half the men of the band were incarcerated at Fort Pickens, which was also in Florida. Living conditions rapidly deteriorated, and within a year 20 percent of the Chiricahua were dead. The army determined to move the tribe to improve conditions, and by 1888 both groups of captives had been moved to the Mount Vernon Barracks in Alabama. Despite the move, the Chiricahua continued to perish at an alarming rate, and in 1894 they were again moved to a new location, this time to the Fort Sill Reservation in Oklahoma, where they continued to be considered prisoners of the U.S. Army until 1913. In 1913, the Chiricahua Apache were granted amnesty and given the choice of returning to the Mescalero Reservation in southeast New Mexico or accepting allotments of land in Oklahoma. Eighty-four Chiricahua Apache chose to accept the allotments; that area still is inhabited by the band today. The remaining 187 members of the band moved to the Mescalero Reservation. By the late 20th century, the Mescalero, Lipan, and Chiricahua Apache Indians assimilated to each other's culture and an amalgamated group now lives in the same reserve that they have occupied for almost 100 years.

The Jicarilla band of Apache fared better than the Chiricahua during the early American period. In part,

this is likely because the Jicarilla were a smaller band and occupied lands less favored by whites. However, the same pattern of raiding and retribution that characterized American contact with the Apache was evident. In 1851, the Jicarilla entered into an agreement with the U.S. government in which they agreed to observe territorial boundaries and cease all hostilities, but the U.S. Senate never ratified this treaty. By the following year, the territorial government in New Mexico, independent of federal oversight, began encouraging the Jicarilla to settle on lands west of the Rio Grande River in order to quell the escalating violence between the Apache and settlers. Their effort was not supported by the federal government and within two years was ordered shut down. The Jicarilla left the makeshift reservation and returned to raiding. Instead of reestablishing the reservation, the army declared war on the tribe. By 1855, the Jicarilla sued for peace and another agreement was reached whereby the Indians agreed to occupy a set territory and cease all hostility. As with the previous treaty, this one was not ratified by the U.S. Senate, which left the status of the Jicarilla in limbo. Several Indian agencies were created over the years and food rations were distributed, but no land was set aside for the Jicarilla to occupy. While all other Indian tribes in the New Mexico territory had been provided with land, only the Jicarilla were denied this basic provision. Twenty years after agreeing to cease hostilities with white settlers in their territory and after signing two treaties, neither of which was honored by the federal government, the Jicarilla were finally provided with a permanent reservation.

In 1874, the Jicarilla Apache Reservation was established along the San Juan River in northwest New Mexico. However, the life of the reservation would be short lived, and two years later it was abandoned in favor of white settlement. Bureaucratic bungling continued for another decade before the Jicarilla were finally settled on the Mescalero Apache Reservation in 1883. Forced into inadequate and unfamiliar territory, the Jicarilla Apache petitioned the federal government for a reservation of their own in territory familiar to their people. By 1887, now more than 30 years since they had agreed to cease all hostility with the whites, the Jicarilla had their reservation. Located west of the

Charma River in the San Juan Mountains, the reserve initially encompassed more than 400,000 acres at an altitude of between 6,000 and 8,000 feet. Unfortunately, for the Jicarilla, many whites had already homesteaded the land and title disputes would not be resolved until the first decade of the 20th century. Additionally, the elevation of the land made agriculture nearly impossible and livestock raising tenuous at best because of the lack of winter pasturage at lower elevations.

Despite these hardships, the federal government did not act to relieve the living conditions of the Jicarilla. Funds that had been earmarked for livestock purchases often sat in accounts that were mismanaged or ignored by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Unable to sustain themselves, the Jicarilla Apache population dropped by more than 20 percent from 1900 to 1920, from 815 to 588 members. Their deaths were largely attributed to disease, especially tuberculosis and malnutrition. By 1920, with the tribe on the brink of extinction, the federal government acted. It began to provide health care and distributed livestock to tribal members. This change in policy assisted the Jicarilla in reestablishing their tribe as a viable culture. By the following decade, their population increased to 647 members and the incidence of disease declined. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 allowed the tribe to officially form its own government and oversee the affairs of the tribe. The Jicarilla took advantage of this provision, and in 1937 established a formal Jicarilla tribal government to oversee the affairs of the tribe. The result was an improvement in the lives of the Jicarilla Apache and continued growth of the tribe.

The Western Apache engaged in the same raiding and retaliation warfare that their brethren in the east prosecuted during the Spanish and Mexican periods. However, the relative equality among foes would change following the Mexican War. Sporadic incidents of violence continued between white settlers and the Western Apache through the first decade of U.S. control, but accelerated wildly after Arizona became a territory in 1863 and gold was discovered in the San Francisco Mountains. The rush of gold seekers into their territory was followed by the U.S. military. In 1864, the Western Apache agreed to a treaty of peace with the army, but no reserves were established

for their exclusive use. As the white population increased and pressures on the limited resources of the land were exhausted, raiding and retaliation increased on both sides. The federal government designated three reservations for the Western Apache between 1871 and 1872: Fort Apache Reservation, Camp Verde Reservation, and the San Carlos Apache Reservation.

Despite the creation of the reserves, raiding continued, and the army launched a campaign to subdue the Western Apache. Faced with a seemingly inexhaustible foe with extensive resources at their command, the Western Apache withered against the onslaught and most were removed to the reservations. However, by 1874, the federal government decided to close Camp Verde, the northernmost of the reservations, and concentrate all the Apache in one central location—the San Carlos Reservation. The unfortunate outcome of this policy was to overtax the limited resources of the land and to mix divergent groups of Apache, including several bands of the Western Apache and the Chiricahua. Many of these tribes did not see eye to eye. The result was mass evacuations from the reservation and a sharp increase in hostility between settlers and the Apache. By 1884, the decision to close Camp Verde had been reversed and calm had been restored to the region in large part because of the aid offered by Western Apache Indians, who assisted in the defeat of truculent Chiricahua Indians such as Geronimo. Because of the aid provided by the Indian scouts, the Western Apache were able to remain principally on the lands they had traditionally claimed. The northern bands suffered the greatest displacement when they were relocated into central Arizona reservations of Fort Apache or San Carlos. The Western Apache continued their relationship with the army into the 20th century as guides and laborers. Eventually, livestock raising and lumber harvesting would serve as the economic mainstays of the tribe. Despite the relative wealth associated with these industries, they are not enough to sustain the growing needs of the Western Apache people and many have been forced to abandon the lands of their ancestors in order to find work off the reservation.

Today, the Apache Indians continue to be as fiercely independent as the bands that first encountered the Spanish colonists 400 years ago. While some social

disintegration has occurred, especially among the Lipan, the Apache continue to support viable, cohesive cultures that represent a worldview that is not governed by the accumulation of possessions. Tribal unity and cultural preservation form the core beliefs of the tribal governments, beliefs that will undoubtedly serve the Apache people far into the future.

—Vanessa Ann Gunther

See also SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Suggested Reading

- Benedek, Emily. *The Wind Won't Know Me: A History of the Navajo-Hopi Land Dispute*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.
- Griffen, William B. *Apaches at War and Peace: The Janos Presidio, 1750–1858*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.
- Ogle, Ralph H. *Federal Control of the Western Apaches, 1848–1886*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.
- Roberts, David. *Once They Moved Like the Wind: Cochise, Geronimo and the Apache Wars*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993.
- Sonnichsen, C. L. *The Mescalero Apaches*. 2nd ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1973.
- Steele, Ian K. *Warpaths: Invasions of North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Sweeny, Edwin R. *Cochise: Chiricahua Apache Chief*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.
- Worcester, Donald E. *The Apache: Eagles of the Southwest*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.

APACHE PASS TRAIL

See EURO-AMERICAN MIGRATION
ON THE OVERLAND TRAILS

ARAPAHO

The Arapaho originated in what is now the northeastern United States before immigrating onto the Great Plains in the 1600s and 1700s. Although pressure from English and French settlers forced them west, it was through trade with Europeans that many tribes were able to acquire firearms, and this combined with horses obtained directly or indirectly from the Spanish helped

create the nomadic lifestyle of the plains. This also enabled newly arriving tribes to drive preexisting plains tribes such as the Shoshone farther toward the Rocky Mountains. After reaching the plains, the Arapaho divided into two main groups: the Northern Arapaho remaining near the North Platte River in Wyoming and the Southern Arapaho settling near the Arkansas River in Colorado.

In the middle of the 1800s, the Arapaho abandoned their homelands and traditional nomadic way of life for two reasons. The first was the near extinction of the buffalo. As Arapaho elder Dr. Pius Moss recounts,

Indians depended on the buffalo that roamed the vast North American plains area. That was his way of life . . . the buffalo. Complete dependency on this animal. Wherever the animal was, that's where the Arapaho was. If the animal moved, he moved. . . . Because of the buffalo's migration, the Arapaho had to be nomadic, in quest of the buffalo from time to time. Now, the Arapahos moved all over the plains area, eastern slope of the Rockies, into Canada, . . . east to the Mississippi River and south to the Mexican border, . . . wherever the grass allowed the buffalo to roam in. . . . Now, after the animal was annihilated—rubbed off by the buffalo hunters from the face of the plains area—the Arapahos and the Plains Indians were at a loss. Their area of living, . . . their way of life . . . was taken away. They had to go into another area to find a way of life that would take care of them and when that began, there were changes coming in quite regular.

Led by Chief Black Coal, the Northern Arapaho began moving through Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas partly in search of buffalo and partly to avoid being forced into the Oklahoma territory by the U.S. Army. After concluding that his people needed a home, Chief Black Coal decided to meet with the Shoshone Chief Washakie in Wyoming to see if the Arapaho could live there. The two chiefs were friends, but their tribes were anything but, according to Dr. Moss:

He [Chief Black Coal] left his gun, he left his knife, everything that concerned being on the warpath. . . . He went down to the camp clean. He walked down. He left his horse. When he got to the camp, very close no one noticed him. When he got within the bounds of the

camp, that's when the young people noticed him . . . that he was not one of them. So right away they got around him and they wanted to kill him. But he kept making the sign that meant, "I want to see my friend the Chief." So one of the young people took note of that and summoned Chief Washakie. About that time, the [threat] to Chief Black Coal was just about to be exercised . . . to kill him. Chief Washakie, realizing this, told the young people, "Whoever touches this man will have to answer to me." So then, the young people, hearing that, dispersed. That's when the treaty began between these two friends . . . two Chiefs.

According to the agreement, the Shoshone would occupy the part of the reservation that was west of the spring, and the Arapaho would occupy the eastern portion. Members of either tribe were free to go into the other's territory. Thus, in 1876, the Northern Arapaho began living near Yellowstone National Park on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, where they remain today alongside the Shoshone.

The Sand Creek Massacre of 1864 was the other cause for Arapaho migration. The Arapaho, along with the Comanche, Kiowa, Cheyenne, and some Sioux had been making emigration difficult for pioneers over the route to Denver and further south along the Santa Fe Trail. Colonel J. M. Chivington led a state militia of Colorado Volunteers in a retaliatory strike that became a massacre at Sand Creek. The Arapaho left Colorado, because of their custom that "wherever death occurs, they do not go back." Again, in the words of Arapaho elder Dr. Moss,

As far as history tells us and what the Arapahos say, . . . the women, children old men and those men that were in camp were just about completely wiped out. The U.S. Army opening fire on a camp that had the American flag and flag of truce flying in camp. Now, just whatever happened, why it happened that way has not been actually or really determined. Because of that happening, the Arapahos did leave and never return . . . but that was their home country.

War resulted for the next few years until the Arapaho and the United States signed treaties in 1867 and 1869. One of these, the Medicine Lodge Treaty was signed near Fort Dodge, Kansas, in October of 1867 and included among the signers the Arapaho

Chief Little Raven. Attacks on pioneers stopped for a time, but intertribal warfare continued as the Arapaho and Cheyenne fought the Osage and Kaw tribes. Eventually, the Arapaho were forced onto the Indian Territory, where several other tribes had been removed. The Indian Territory later became the state of Oklahoma, where the Southern Arapaho now reside with the Cheyenne. A third Arapaho group, the Gros Ventre, calls Fort Belknap, Montana, home and shares it with the Assiniboine.

Life on the Wind River Reservation brought Christianity, farming, ranching, log cabins, mission schools, and private property to the Northern Arapaho in the late 1800s and early 1900s. The Bureau of Indian Affairs replaced the traditional leadership of chiefs with tribal councils. During World War II, many Arapaho served in the armed forces, and as a result of this integration, assimilation, including the increased use of English, intensified. The introduction and influence of television beginning in the 1950s was also significant. A natural reaction against these changes occurred in the 1960s and 1970s as the Arapaho created schools to teach traditional language and culture, and in 1999 the tribe started the Wind River Tribal College. The Arapaho have also established Tribal Resource Centers and Language and Cultural Commissions that seek to preserve and pass on Arapaho traditions. Despite these efforts, a loss of linguistic and cultural identity among the younger Arapaho remains a problem. A lack of elders who speak Arapaho as well as limited funds for teachers and programs are among the causes. Historic and cultural traditions such as storytelling are becoming extinct, and even those such as the Sun Dance that are still performed are done in English.

The tribal headquarters of the Northern Arapaho is in Fort Washakie on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming. A council headed by Chairman Burton Hutchinson and Co-Chairman Carlton Underwood—and including Samuel J. Dresser, Theodore "Lionel" Bell, Allison Sage, Jr., and Dean Goggles—currently governs the tribe.

The Northern Arapaho tribe has recently been involved in numerous activities intended to not only preserve the past but also improve reservation life by adapting to modern times. The tribe has undertaken an

Arapaho-language revitalization program, which emphasizes immersion to help young tribal members learn the language of their ancestors. In addition, the Wind River Tribal College awarded bilingual certificates to 13 students in June of 2004. The tribe has also recently started an information technology department, and construction of a \$7.2 million casino with 400 gaming machines began in June of 2004.

The Southern Arapaho in Oklahoma are governed by a constitution that they share with the Cheyenne. The constitution, which was ratified in 1975, states,

We, the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, in order to promote more unified tribal economic progress, to better transact our tribal business and industrial affairs, to protect our religious rights, . . . to negotiate with the representatives of federal, state, and local governments in regard to all matters affecting the tribes now or in the future, and to further the general welfare of ourselves and our posterity, do hereby adopt the following constitution and by-laws pursuant to the Thomas-Rogers Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of June 26, 1936, which shall replace as our governing document that constitution and by-laws ratified September 18, 1937, and all amendments thereto.

A tribal council governs the Southern Arapaho and Cheyenne and is made up of all tribal members who are 18 years of age or older. A Cheyenne-Arapaho business committee made up of eight members acts for the tribe and oversees expenditures. The proportion of Cheyenne-Arapaho Indian blood one possesses determines membership in the tribe. The usual requirement is that a person has at least one-fourth blood of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

The influence of western concepts such as individual rights and private property can be seen in the tribal constitution, which bears several similarities to the American Constitution. Article 3, Section 1 of the Constitution of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma states,

No person shall be denied by the tribes . . . those rights . . . including freedom of speech, conscience, worship and assembly. . . . Individual rights in allotted and inherited lands shall not be disturbed by anything contained in this constitution and by-laws.

An election board sets elections for business committee members. Each committee member has a four-year term, but there is a term limit: no member may serve more than three terms consecutively. Tribal members who are 21 or older are eligible to serve on the committee.

In recent years, the Arapaho have had to revisit one of the worst events in their history. Colorado Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell introduced legislation in 1998 to authorize the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Study Act. A location study subsequently identified the exact location and size of a potential historic site using “oral history, archived sources and other historical documentation, archeology and remote imagery, geomorphology, aerial photography, and traditional tribal methods.” This involved a collaboration of the National Park Service, the Colorado Historical Society, property owners, volunteers, the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes in Oklahoma, the Northern Cheyenne Tribe in Montana, and the Northern Arapaho Tribe in Wyoming.

After two years of site study, Congress issued the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Act in 2000. According to the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site Web site, the law authorizes the National Park Service to buy as much property as possible

to adequately protect, interpret, memorialize, and commemorate the site, . . . [and it] confirms the site’s national significance, and provides an opportunity for tribes, the State of Colorado, and other entities to be involved in its support and development . . . [as well as] provides enhanced cultural understanding and defines the conditions of descendant and tribal access for traditional, cultural, or historical observance.

The new historic site also includes several specific locations related to the Sand Creek Massacre. The site’s Web page includes the following catalog:

the location of the Cheyenne village and several Arapaho lodges; the point(s) from which the Colorado Regiments first spotted the encampment; the location of Indian pony herds; the area of flight, bordering Sand Creek, that the Indians took during and after the initial attack; the general path of battalion advancements, individual skirmishing and other collateral action; the military bivouac area for the nights of

November 29 and 30; spots in the creek and along its [sic] banks where the Cheyenne dug sandpits/survival pits, and the points from which battery salvos were launched into the camp and later into the sandpits.

Another recent issue facing the Arapaho is Indian gaming in the form of casinos on reservation land. While the Arapaho have had casinos for years on the reservation that they share with the Cheyenne in Oklahoma, the effort to create a reservation and build casinos on ancestral Arapaho land in Colorado has brought promise and controversy. Council Tree Communications, an investment group, calls the proposal the “Cheyenne-Arapaho Homecoming Project.” The project would include purchasing land near Denver and then having it declared a reservation, which would then be donated to the tribes along with any casino profits. In this way, the Cheyenne and Arapaho would be compensated for the Sand Creek Massacre of 1864. The group says the \$100 million casino would result in various benefits for the tribes, including money (\$2 million of which would go to help establish the Sand Creek Memorial at the National Park Site in the southeastern part of the state), jobs, and a Plains Indian Cultural & Media Center.

As in other states with Indian casinos, Colorado could potentially benefit from gaming. Council Tree Communications estimates billions could flow into the state as well as 3,000-plus jobs and more than 50,000 visitors. Polling sponsored by Council Tree shows broad bipartisan support among Colorado voters for both the reservation and the casino. However, support for the proposal is not unanimous. Besides Coloradoans in rural areas who are opposed to the development and traffic that would inevitably come as a result of the casino, some members of the Cheyenne and Arapaho are opposed despite the financial benefits. In addition to Colorado being the homeland of the Cheyenne and Arapaho, tribe members visit the Sand Creek site to pray. Colorado Governor Bill Owens and Senator Campbell also oppose the casino, but for different reasons. Owens does not want gaming to be expanded in the state because it takes money from families. The governor has said that he will not give his permission, as federal law requires, to create the reservation and casino. Campbell considers it sacrilege to include the

Sand Creek Memorial in the project, but will not support the casino even if it is not connected to the historic site for which he has been working. However, the chairman of the Cheyenne-Arapaho business committee, James Pedro, supports the project in part because it will clear up confusion about conflicting ownership claims in the 27 million acres of the proposed site. In addition, the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribal Council believes the project will lead to a return to ancestral lands and numerous economic opportunities.

In June of 2004, the representative of Colorado’s Fourth Congressional District, Congresswoman Marilyn Musgrave, issued a press release in which she urged Congress to not approve the new reservation. Citing past voter and legislative action, Musgrave asked Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert to respect the will of the people of Colorado. The federal Indian Gaming Regulatory Act requires approval by either the governor of a state, the secretary of the Department of the Interior, or Congress. Nevertheless, Musgrave argued that the federal law should not take precedence over state and local will. She added that the *Oklahoman* newspaper had reported that the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma were being investigated for illegal use of casino profits by the federal government and expressed concern at the prospect of expanding their gaming activities into Colorado.

Today, the Arapaho people face the uphill challenge of preserving their history, language, and culture. They are divided across several states; live among an overwhelming majority in America that is unaware and in many cases uninterested in its own past, let alone anyone else’s; and struggle with how to adapt a traditional way of life to a seemingly incompatible modern one. Inevitably, some of the old ways have had to be abandoned, but through education and opportunity, the past can be remembered while providing for the future.

—Daniel S. Stackhouse, Jr.

See also GROS VENTRE

Suggested Reading

“Arapaho.” *Columbia Encyclopedia*. 6th ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.

“Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma Constitution and By-Laws.” Available from http://thorpe.ou.edu/constitution/Chyn_aph.html

- Frazier, Deborah. "Reservation, Casino in Works Near DIA." *Rocky Mountain News*, December 31, 2003. Available from <http://www.rockymountainnews.com>
- "Montana-Wyoming Tribal Leaders Council." Available from <http://tlc.wtp.net>
- Moss, Pius. "The Story of the Origin of the Arapaho People." A transcript of stories told by Dr. Pius Moss, as Elder of the Arapaho Tribe on the Wind River Reservation. *The Wyoming Companion*. Laramie, WY: High Country, 1994-2004. Available from <http://www.wyomingcompanion.com/wcwr.html>
- Musgrave, Marilyn. "Musgrave Urges Congress to Honor Colo Voters on Gaming." Press release, June 18, 2004. Available from <http://www.house.gov>
- National Park Service. "Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site." Available from <http://www.nps.gov/sand/sitestudy.htm>
- Northern Arapaho Tribal Web Site. Available from <http://www.northernarapaho.com>
- Taylor, Colin F. *The American Indian*. London: Salamander Books, 2004.
- "Tribe Will Deal for Casino." *Fort Collins Coloradoan Online*, January 16, 2004. Available from <http://www.coloradoan.com>
- "Tribe's Casino Delayed, but Still on Track." *Casper Star Tribune*, May 20, 2004. Available from <http://www.casperstartribune.net>
- University of Colorado at Boulder. "The Arapaho Project." Boulder: Colorado University Regents, 2000. Available from <http://www.colorado.edu/csilw/arapahoproject/index.html>

ARIZONA COPPER DISCOVERIES

Copper discoveries never created a rush, as did gold or silver strikes. World suppliers of this utilitarian metal concentrated in Cornwall, England, and Andalusia, Spain, but these places gave way to Michigan, Montana, and Arizona. Copper, employed in kitchenware and roofing materials, gained value with the advent of electricity. Antonio Espejo noted copper's presence near Jerome in 1582. Areas richest in copper concentrations were Mexican until after the Gadsden Purchase of 1854. Lack of cheap rail transportation for importing needed supplies and exporting metal made copper mining unprofitable until the 1870s. Apache presence compounded the problems of mining southern Arizona. Ultimately, the presence of copper brought a steady flow of different peoples into this arid region.

An early venture into copper extraction occurred during 1854 in Ajo, an area of southern Arizona that Mexico disputed as possessing. Surface copper removed and carted by mule from Ajo across to San Diego was shipped to Swansea, Wales, for smelting. The copper then sold at \$360 a ton. Crude extraction methods left most subterranean copper behind, but mining resumed in the early 20th century. Ajo had high numbers of Mexican laborers due to its proximity to the border. Ajo busted and now is a small town of 1,700 people with over half its population being white, a third Hispanic, and about 10 percent Indian.

The first successful region to extract copper was Clifton-Morenci. In July of 1870, Jim and Bob Metcalf discovered two major deposits at Clifton and Morenci. Apache hostility prevented the Metcalfs from laying claim to these deposits until 1872. Fear of Apache raids kept labor away. This prompted the Arizona Copper Company at Clifton to import both Chinese and Mexican labor. In the 1870s, Clifton Camp was only about 200 workers strong, mostly Mexican. Transportation problems lost the company money, but the company managed to stay afloat by employing a store system to sell supplies to the miners. The Arizona Company sold out to Scottish investors. They added transportation rails to this mining region. Fuel and market accessibility drove down production and transportation costs. By 1883, Clifton had a significantly larger labor force, including 400 Chinese. Mexicans and Anglo workers drove out the Chinese that year, making it a "white man's camp."

The Detroit Copper Company claimed Morenci. Morenci mirrored adjacent Clifton in its working force and problems. In 1882, this site suffered an Apache raid, forcing smelters near the San Francisco River to be relocated to Morenci. Though not as large as the Clifton site, these sites, combined, by 1911 had 3,500 miners, the second highest region in output, the lowest accident rate, and a workforce that was half Mexican.

Copper discoveries continued through the 1870s, as seen in Globe and Jerome. Globe, known for its silver "rush" in the 1870s, ignored copper until the Old Dominion Copper Mining Company operated in 1881. The Globe-Miami region by the 20th century hardly had any Mexican labor, but the Globe region had received immigrants from mining communities since

its inception. People from regions with mining history, such as Germany, Scotland, Ireland, Spain, and England, traveled to Michigan, Montana, and Arizona as their highly specialized mining skills were needed. Mining techniques simplified by machines allowed an influx of semiskilled labor in the form of Czechs, Serbs, Italians, Montenegrins, and Bohemians. Balkan encroachment by Austria forced some Slavic migration. Mining towns were melting pots for Europeans, though often camps were segregated.

Morris Andrew Ruffner first found copper deposits in Jerome in 1878. James S. Douglas, for whom the city of Douglas, Arizona, is named, told Ruffner the two rich sites at Jerome were worthless. A distance of 180 miles separated the great ore bodies and, without transportation, extraction seemed costly. In 1884, it had only 75 employees, some of whom were imported Chinese laborers. The coupling of low copper prices and high transportation costs shut this site down from 1885 to 1887. In 1890, the population grew to 250 and railroads brought in families, almost quadrupling the population to 800 by 1900. James Douglas proved his father wrong at Jerome with brief success: In 1917, a great deposit was found, which sprouted the town to 7,000 people, but by 1920 it dwindled to 4,000 miners. Jerome now contains roughly 330 people, 87 percent of whom are white.

Bisbee and Douglas, both just north of the Mexican border, developed a powerful copper extracting force. In 1877, Hugh Jones located the Copper Queen Mine but abandoned it after not finding silver. Edward Reilly wanted to investigate the Copper Queen without capital; he turned to Louis Zeckendorf and Albert Steinfeld, Tucson merchants. Reilly traveled to San Francisco to enlist metallurgists and mine developers. The first advanced smelters were standard in the Bisbee regions. The labor pool in Bisbee was largely Mexican, but also contained English, Irish, Finnish, Austrian, and Serbian workers, with Italians, Germans Swedes, and Swiss coming later.

In the fall of 1880, James Douglas urged the Copper Queen owners to buy the adjacent Atlanta mine claim; they did not listen, though the Phelps Dodge Company did. Unsuccessful at first, after investing \$80,000 in exploration, the company eventually found rich ore at 210 feet. The new finds assured mine success, but to

avoid litigation with the Copper Queen property, the Phelps Dodge Company bought the Copper Queen. Douglas turned into a smelting district, and transportation facilitated copper processing, which made this region dominant into the latter part of the 20th century.

Arizona produced half of the U.S. total of copper by 1920, with about a third of that produced by the old finds. All newer finds concentrated in these same regions. The 20th century saw the Mexican revolution, which drove labor into Arizona. Legislation to limit Mexican immigration arose during the early part of the 20th century, but copper companies fought this. In 1920, quota restrictions limiting Mexican workers to 20 percent of the workforce would have destroyed copper operations in the state where more than 60 percent of smeltermen were of Mexican origin. Mining persists in Arizona, though it is very limited. Most mining towns are virtual ghost towns, though some, such as Bisbee and Jerome, are now tourist attractions. Mining helped the population of Arizona expand from 88,000 people to more than 100,000 American-born residents by 1900. Now Arizona has a population of 5 million, mostly white but with Hispanic origin making up a quarter of the population.

—Eduardo Barrios

See also BISBEE AND DOUGLAS, ARIZONA

Suggested Reading

- Clements, Eric, L. *After the Boom in Tombstone and Jerome, Arizona*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2003.
- Hyde, Charles. *Copper for America: The United States Copper Industry From Colonial Times to the 1990s*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1998.
- Nugent, Walter. *Into the West: The Story of Its People*. New York: Knopf, 1999.
- Schwantes, Carlos. *Bisbee: Urban Outpost on the Frontier*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1992.
- Sheridan, Thomas. *Arizona: A History*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996.
- Trimble, Marshall. *Roadside History of Arizona*. Missoula, MT: Mountain Press, 1986.

ASIAN IMMIGRATION LAW

The advent of immigration from China and other parts of Asia that began in 1849 with the California gold

rush resulted in increased hostility by native-born Americans and immigrants from different cultural backgrounds. The hostility translated into significant legal efforts to curb or eliminate Asian immigration. In response to these legal attacks, Asians fought back in federal court. The resulting body of laws and legal decisions influenced more than just immigration law in the United States; many areas of American law have felt the touch of civil rights cases brought by Asian victims of abuse.

During the 1870s, a number of states began to adopt their own laws regulating immigration. The enactments came in response to public hostility to immigration brought on by economic troubles within the United States. However, in *Henderson v. Mayor of City of New York*, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that only Congress could regulate immigration. The decision struck down immigration laws in California, Louisiana, and New York. The Supreme Court had ruled in a similar manner in 1849 with the *Passenger Cases* that the federal government of the United States had sole authority to regulate immigration.

California, in particular, generated the greatest hostility toward Chinese immigration and, by no coincidence, had the greatest number of Chinese immigrants living within it. By 1879, the majority of Californians decided to rewrite the state's constitution in order to correct the "social problems" within the state, including the "Chinese Problem." In California, antipathy toward Asians exceeded that for Mexicans, another source of non-European labor, in large part because Mexicans were not perceived as a threat to the status quo. An inextricable link existed between the issue of Chinese immigrants and the primary source of "pull" for Chinese labor, the railroads. The two issues in combination bore the greatest responsibility for social violence at the time. Both of these issues, railroads and Chinese immigration, spurred specific measures within the new constitution. The economic dominance and the political favor shown to the railroads in the form of land grants along right of ways would lead to numerous conflicts between the railroads and settlers competing for the same lands, and a special provision in the new constitution creating a railroad commission. The conflict between the domineering railroads and

the settlers manifested itself most violently in the bloody Mussel Slough gunfight of May 11, 1880.

The friction over the issue of the Chinese residents of California had existed since the 1849 gold rush. The perpetration of several depredations against the Chinese occurred with the enactment of discriminatory taxes, codes, and regulations that were directed specifically at the Chinese. The enactment of racist legislation reached an acme of justification with the adoption of Section XIX of the California Constitution of 1879, which specifically authorized discriminatory legislation against Chinese. This section admonished the state government to deter the immigration of Chinese, prohibited the employment of Chinese by corporations or public entities, and empowered local authorities to enact ordinances to remove Chinese from within city limits.

Initial restrictions on immigration were not aimed specifically at Chinese but at people generally found to be socially undesirable. In 1882, restrictions became law and therefore prohibited the immigration of "idiots," lunatics, criminals, and public charges and authorized a \$0.50 head tax. An 1891 amendment expanded the list of undesirables to include anarchists and polygamists.

The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 came to Congress from California. John F. Miller, senator from California, referred to Chinese immigration as the "Chinese evil" and "Chinese invasion." Senator Miller, in describing the sentiment in California supporting the exclusion of Chinese, cited a vote taken in the state overwhelmingly supporting exclusion and stated that Californians were "the people of all others in the United States who know most of the Chinese evil." During the debate, Senator George F. Hoar of Massachusetts opposed Chinese exclusion and denied any ill effects of Chinese immigration. Senator Hoar used census figures to show negligible numbers of Chinese living in most of the United States, such as the five recorded in Massachusetts. On the other hand, Senator Hoar's figures also indicated nearly 80,000 Chinese in California and similarly disproportionately high numbers in other western states.

The Chinese community, in response to the hostility and legal attack, fought back in the courts. The first victory for the Chinese in court came with an

1862 case regarding taxes. A special police tax was imposed on the Chinese, and the ensuing court case decided in California Supreme Court, *Lin Sing v. Washburn*, overturned the tax. The decision relied heavily on *Brown v. Maryland* for precedent and on the commerce clause and federal jurisdiction over commerce to void the tax.

The railroads, also under attack by the 1879 California constitution, defended themselves by legal action at the same time as the Chinese. The case of *Southern Pacific Railroad Co. v. Orton*, pending at the time of the gunfight at Mussel Slough, affected both the railroads directly and the Chinese indirectly. The significance to the Chinese arose from the acceptance and application of substantive due process in the decision. Substantive due process, derived from the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause, was first argued in the dissent of Justices Stephen J. Field and Joseph P. Bradley in *The Slaughterhouse Cases* in 1873. The constitutional theory of substantive due process held that issues of personal liberty were subject to judicial review. In American jurisprudence, personal liberty and personal property are closely related; substantive due process implied judicial review of regulations related to personal property and hence of economic regulations. The majority opinion for *Munn v. Illinois*, written by Chief Justice Morrison R. Waite, also conceded that regulatory statutes might impinge on due process and thereby implied recognition of substantive due process.

Further reinforcement of *Orton* came with the decisions in *Southern Pacific Railroad Co. v. Doyle*, *Southern Pacific Railroad Co. v. Phillips*, and *Southern Pacific Railroad v. Cox*. All of these cases originated from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and demonstrated a pattern and disposition by the Ninth Circuit Court of exercising judicial review in accordance with the principle of substantive due process. These cases also constituted a body of jurisprudence that could be used later to support the application of substantive due process.

The first significant application of the Equal Protection Clause and substantive due process occurred in a Chinese civil rights case, *Ho Ah Kow v. Nunan*, also known as the "Queue Case." The decision came shortly after the adoption of the California Constitution of 1879. San Francisco passed an ordinance allowing for, as a

form of punishment, the cutting off of the queue of hair worn by Chinese, another manifestation of hostility toward Chinese. The ordinance was overturned pursuant to the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The court recognized that the ordinance was directed solely at the Chinese and was therefore discriminatory. The court interpreted the language of the equal protection clause to be broad in meaning, the use of "person" in the clause to include Chinese.

The next significant decision would come the following year, 1880. This case directly attacked Section XIX of the California Constitution of 1879 and further defined the meaning of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *In re Tiburcio Parrot*, also referred to as "the Parrot Case," overturned the prohibition on the employment of Chinese included in Section XIX of the California constitution. In addition to the reference to the equal protection clause, the Parrot Case decision by Justice Lorenzo Sawyer included the determination of the right of a person to contract to work. This case began the process of establishing the connection between substantive due process, contract law in relation to labor, and the status of Chinese immigrants.

The process continued with the 1882 case *In re Quong Woo* and the 1886 case *In re Wo Lee*. Both cases derived from San Francisco ordinances regarding the operation of laundries. *In re Quong Woo* determined that Chinese had freedom to apply their labor where they wished. *In re Wo Lee* found that the ordinance in question intended to drive the Chinese laundries out of business and therefore violated the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and, of equal importance, applied the term "person" not only to Chinese but also to a business entity. This allowed the application of civil liberty protection to business entities. Yet another San Francisco laundry case, *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court, firmly established the broad definition of the equal protection clause and the equally broad use of substantive due process. In its decision, the Supreme Court relied on the precedent set in the earlier decisions relating to the Chinese in California.

Finally, the Supreme Court ended the depredations of Section XIX of the California Constitution of 1879 with its *In re Lee Sing* ruling. In yet another attack on its Chinese population, San Francisco attempted to

expel all Chinese from its city limits. The Court found Section XIX unconstitutional and explicitly ruled that corporations held the same rights under the Fourteenth Amendment as individuals.

In 1905, substantive due process established by these precedents, the relationship of substantive due process to contract law and labor law, and subsequent reinforcement by additional railroad cases provided the legal justification in the majority decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Lochner v. New York* to restrict the ability of government to regulate a particular form of commerce in regards to labor, a cornerstone of laissez-faire constitutionalism. The Court reserved the ultimate determination of public need and the right to limit police authority as it related to commerce to the judiciary.

All of the litigation success by Chinese utilizing the Fourteenth Amendment and substantive due process provided a useful weapon in legally opposing the Chinese Exclusion Act. Many Chinese seeking admittance to the United States appealed their cases to the federal courts, almost all of the cases occurring within the Ninth Circuit Court. Of those Chinese who attempted to land and appealed to the courts, 85 percent succeeded in gaining admission during the 1880s and 1890s. Their success owed much to the courts allowing exceptions not provided for in the law, such as alternative proofs of prior residence or membership in other classes of exempted Chinese. These exceptions opened the door to fraud, only partially constrained by subsequent amendments.

In addition, the federal courts offered supplicants advantages not available during administrative exclusion proceedings. The first and foremost of these consisted of the availability and access to lawyers. Chinese contesting their cases could also call witnesses, the federal courts being far more tolerant and less critical of witnesses than the administrators handling exclusion proceedings. Finally, the judges and the lawyers handling the Chinese cases shared a commonality of procedural abilities and rules. Consequently, the formal nature of federal court resulted in the burden on the government in federal court greatly exceeding the burden necessary in an administrative hearing.

The litigation in the Chinese cases of the 19th century provided a foundation for immigration cases

in subsequent decades and up to the present. Strategy consisted of forcing the case into federal court. After going to court, government attorneys might choose to drop the case if they found they lacked resources or failed to meet the higher standard of judicial scrutiny in district court than that which exists in administrative proceedings.

A simple fraud took advantage of the exempted classes contained within the Chinese Exclusion Act, as noted above. A far more elaborate scheme developed later, referred to as the "Paper Sons" fraud. Children of legal resident Chinese could still immigrate to the United States. This scheme utilized altered documents to establish proof of birth with parentage connected to a legal Chinese resident of the United States. The scheme developed after the 1906 San Francisco earthquake and fire, which consumed the county birth records to that date.

Beginning in the 1890s and gaining momentum in the first decade of the 20th century, the government of the United States began to undermine and resist the efforts of Chinese to use substantive due process to force their cases into federal court. The success of the Chinese in court, as described above, directly contributed to the greater emphasis of the authority of the Bureau of Immigration. *In re Chae Chan Ping* helped establish that the United States had inherent sovereign powers to regulate immigration. In 1894, a rider to an appropriations bill established that exclusion cases did not require review in federal court. The Supreme Court affirmed the authority of the Bureau of Immigration in the case of *Nishimura Ekiu*, a Japanese facing expulsion for being a public charge. The Court deferred jurisdiction to the administrative procedure. By doing so, the Supreme Court essentially stated that substantive due process did not apply to immigration matters. The Supreme Court also rejected a direct attack on the constitutionality of the Chinese Exclusion Act. Interestingly, Justice Stephen J. Field wrote the majority opinion, the same justice who had championed substantive due process that had worked so well in favor of the Chinese community.

By 1924, other sources of immigration, primarily people from eastern and southern Europe, joined the Chinese in being severely restricted. In fact, the 1924 Immigration Act served to restrict all immigration to the United States. The act provided the basic structure

for all immigration, including Chinese, until 1965. The 1924 act established quotas with a heavy bias favoring immigration from northern European nations. The 1965 Immigration Act shifted the emphasis of immigration to the United States from adherence to the quotas to “family unity.” This policy granted priority status to applications for immigration to relatives of American citizens or legal resident aliens.

The final legal act that shifted Chinese immigration into mainstream immigration came in 1943 when Congress repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act. This change in the law came about in the midst of World War II. The United States found itself discriminating against an allied nation, China, in favor of immigrants from an enemy nation, Germany. Consequently, the United States repealed the law.

Likewise, the prohibition of Chinese naturalization was repealed in 1952. Some of the impetus to removing the bar to Chinese naturalization came from the recent communist takeover of China in 1947. Republicans, wishing to show support for Chinese nationalists and eliminate communist propaganda regarding American racism and hypocrisy, supported the repeal of the restriction. Democrats, beginning to show a nascent interest in civil rights and antidiscrimination legislation, also supported the repeal. The subsequent consensus resulted in removing the last exceptional legal differences between Chinese immigration and immigration from other parts of the world.

The repeal of the naturalization restrictions for Chinese in 1952 signaled the triumph of a legal struggle that began 80 years earlier as Chinese immigrants sought refuge from discrimination in American courts of law. Their efforts in protecting their own civil rights provided the legal foundation for the civil rights law that would follow in the 20th century. Not only did the Chinese reap the benefits of their struggle, but also American society has greatly benefited in the improvement in civil rights that owes so much to these earlier victims of discrimination.

—Lonnie Wilson

See also CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT, CHINESE IMMIGRATION, IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1965, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE (INS), IMMIGRATION REFORM AND CONTROL ACT OF 1986

Suggested Reading

- Bodnar, John. *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Daniels, Roger. *Not Like Us: Immigrants and Minorities in America, 1890–1924*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1997.
- Gyory, Andrew. *Closing the Gate: Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migration That Made the American People*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown, 1979.
- Hays, Samuel P. *The Response to Industrialism, 1885–1914*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Lee, Erika. *At America's Gates: Chinese Immigration During the Exclusion Era, 1882–1943*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.
- Salyer, Lucy E. *Laws Harsh as Tigers: Chinese Immigrants and the Shaping of Modern Immigration Law*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia, ed. *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

ASSINIBOINE

Like many Native peoples, the Assiniboine or Nakota population straddles both sides of the international border between the United States and Canada, making a discussion of their history only in the American West problematic. To truly appreciate the Assiniboine's westward migration, it is essential to consider their presence in both nations, as international borders were a European concept. Attempts to stem the fluidity of movement across this arbitrary line had little to do with Assiniboine history until the establishment of the reservations and reserves in the latter 19th century.

Many anthropologists conjecture that during the 16th century the Assiniboine split from the Yanktonai Sioux and became the northern vanguard of the large Siouan westward migration out of what is now the American Midwest. This division forced the Assiniboine to move in a northwesterly direction and in the process facilitated their long-term alliance with the Cree. The position of their traditional territory forced them into confrontations with numerous tribes, especially the Blackfoot, Ojibwe, and Dakota, and

coupled with smallpox outbreaks in 1737, 1780–1781, and 1837–1838 caused a dramatic reduction in their numbers forcing their population to diffuse over a large geographic area. Despite all of these difficulties, Assiniboine communities continued to support one another and maintained their cultural integrity. Over time, 31 bands developed, which today live in the American state of Montana on federally recognized reservations at Fort Belknap and Fort Peck. In Canada, Assiniboine live on various reserves in the provinces Saskatchewan and Alberta. More recent migrations have led many Assiniboine to settle in communities away from reservations and reserves.

The Assiniboine's ongoing movement across the prairie created a cultural dynamic emphasizing mobility. The root of most Native cultures is the creation story, which details not only a physical beginning, but also the outline for a total worldview. The Assiniboine's creation story emphasizes movement. After Ik-tomi, a legendary character, created the universe, animals, and seven men and seven women, he determined that this land was not appropriate for them. Ordering various animals, such as fowls, muskrats, mink, beaver, and the fisher, to bring mud from the bottom of a lake, he finally created a new land for the Assiniboine. Ik-tomi ordered the seven human couples to migrate to this new land and multiply. The Assiniboine creation story parallels the Earthdiver tradition of other Native peoples, illustrating the interconnectedness of those who settled on the plains. Unique to the Assiniboine was an emphasis on the number seven and the diversity of wildlife used in the final creation of their homeland.

The human movement prevalent in the creation story carries through to Assiniboine spiritual practices, in which entire bands would come together from long distances to participate in ceremonies, dances, and social gatherings. Especially important events, such as the longstanding Medicine Lodge Dance (Sun Dance), at times brought hundreds to thousands of participants and spectators together. Through fasting and piercing their breasts, male participants in the Medicine Lodge Dance induced visions in which they would travel in a hypnotic state and see future war glory or other positive life outcomes. When the ceremonies concluded, the Assiniboine bands would pack up their lodges and return home. An example of a

dance that came into vogue after European contact was the Grass Dance, a pan-Indian ceremony originating with the Lakota that taught traditional values and discipline. The Grass Dance illustrates the long-term contact through movement among diverse Native peoples of the Great Plains. The continuation of the Grass Dance among the Assiniboine to the present illustrates the strength of traditional culture despite living in disparate locations in two countries, while modifications of the costume demonstrate the continued interaction between Native peoples in the region.

The Assiniboine saw no difference between the spiritual and material worlds, which meant that daily movements for game or other commodities took on extreme importance and led to ritualization. Setting up and taking down camp provides one example into this phenomenon, where a precise ritual developed in order to maximize efficiency in movement. Once an Assiniboine band had made the decision to move its camp, women quickly prepared travois that were pulled by two dogs prior to the arrival of the horse. By necessity, Assiniboine teepee construction enabled a speedy dismantlement and a quick setup. Elders and children unable to walk rested on a travois until the day's journey ended. The inability of dogs to pull heavy loads with any speed hampered the Assiniboine economically and militarily, especially after other Native peoples on the northern plains began acquiring horses in the early 18th century.

The arrival of the horse enhanced the Assiniboine's ability to hunt game and rapidly move their camps. The first notation of the Assiniboine with horses occurred in 1754, when fur trader Anthony Hendry found a western band with horses. These horses had probably been stolen from the Blackfoot and enabled this particular band to compete economically and militarily with their neighbors in the area. The method of loading a horse travois followed the same pattern as when dogs had been used, but with the ability to ride a horse a band could move up to four times faster. Those Assiniboine with horses began hunting buffalo with bows, arrows, and rifles. Some Assiniboine that lacked horses continued to trap buffalo or drive them off buffalo jumps, while the northernmost bands lived beyond the bison's range. Despite the arrival of horses in the region, the Assiniboine, geographically distant from centers of

trade, often lacked the large horse herds found among the Crow, Lakota, and Cheyenne.

While the stereotype of Native Americans on the Great Plains after 1800 was that they were always on horseback, at times the terrain necessitated other means of transportation. When the Assiniboine traveled on rivers or streams, they used a bull boat constructed in a semicircular shape with a tree branch frame and lined with a buffalo hide. An individual could sit comfortably in the boat with a few necessities and watch the terrain unveil itself as it floated down the waterway. Much like drift boats seen on streams across the American West today, bull boats proved incredibly buoyant and, when constructed properly, were unlikely to capsize. When moving across perilous terrain, the Assiniboine proved highly adaptable at maximizing their chances of reaching their destination by using the material in their environment efficiently.

Even prior to the arrival of the horse, the Assiniboine's migration had led them over a great distance, and by the 17th century they had broken with the Yanktonai living in close proximity with the Cree in what would become the prairie provinces of Canada. Evidence of the early commencement of this split comes from the Jesuits, who considered the Assiniboine a distinct tribe by 1640. The Assiniboine quickly adapted to this new home territory by creating an alliance with the western Cree, who arrived shortly after them. This alliance began after a brief period of hostilities. Alexander McKenzie and other early traders during the 18th and 19th centuries believed the Cree migrated with the Assiniboine due to their close relationship. However, the oral tradition and recent archaeology disprove this assessment. The strength of this bond between these two Native peoples can be seen by the long duration of their alliance and the propensity for intermarriage that further cemented this friendship. Also, the farther north an Assiniboine band migrated, the closer their culture appeared to the Cree, while those whose migration stopped to the south took on cultural patterns closer to Plains Indians. Wherever the Assiniboine settled, their alliance with the Cree proved propitious, as nascent capitalism, through fur trading, entered their home territories during the 17th century. Working in conjunction with the Cree, the Assiniboine maximized their yields and created a niche in this ultracompetitive environment.

The fur trade revolutionized Native societies by introducing European tools, along with firearms and alcohol, which would have both negative and positive consequences. When permanent trading commenced at Hudson Bay through the Hudson Bay Company in 1682, the Assiniboine entered into relationships with fur traders immediately and entered the English sphere of influence. Fur traders and Jesuit missionaries began noting that their home territory centered in an area from Lake Winnipeg toward Saskatchewan and many had already participated in the fur trade prior to the establishment of permanent forts. The probability exists that the Assiniboine cut their teeth in the fur trade by traveling east to trade with individual French trappers on the northern bank of Lake Superior. The important Jesuit missionary Father Allouez recognized the imprint of the fur trade on the Assiniboine in 1656 by noting they had already been "discovered" by the French. Among the tribes that eventually resided in Montana, the Assiniboine had the longest relationship with Europeans because of their northerly migration. However, members of the large fur trading La Verendrye family commented in the 1740s that eastern Assiniboine bands who lived near woodlands knew how to trap, while their plains brethren had to be taught. The La Verendryes' statement illustrates that most Assiniboine participated in the fur trade to some degree during the 18th century. The wide geographic distribution of the Assiniboine explains different cultural and economic traits, accounting for seasonal wild rice cultivation among the eastern most bands and buffalo hunting among the western bands.

Once ensconced in the fur trade, mobility during trapping and visiting forts became exceedingly important to the economic well-being of the Assiniboine. The initial use of dog travois proved slow, placing Assiniboine trappers at risk as they moved to the north to trade with the Hudson Bay Company. After an initial period of hegemony against their Blackfoot and Ojibwe rivals, the Cree and Assiniboine began to face grave dangers as these two groups began to assert their own dominance. Attacks by Blackfoot or Ojibwe could prove cataclysmic because the loss of valuable furs, as well as young men in the prime of life, could prove devastating economically. Another threat came

from the Dakota to the south, who in alliance with the French chased a large number of English-allied Assiniboine in 1729 from southern Manitoba possibly as far north as the Churchill River. Southern bands that traveled farthest to trading posts faced the gravest threat due to the long distances traveled. Southern and western Assiniboine bands that acquired horses first could move to their destinations rapidly, forestalling many attacks that may have occurred in the past.

Goods acquired through trade to the north with the French and English facilitated annual movements to the south to trade with the Mandan each summer during the late 17th century and into the 18th. The Assiniboine received corn and other vegetables, while the Mandan received guns, axes, and tobacco. Southern trade with the Mandan corresponded with hunting and other activities that necessitated summer movement. The fur trade created wide-ranging movements by the Assiniboine from Hudson Bay in northern Canada to the Mandan Villages in North Dakota.

The 19th century introduced new power relations in the region as the United States emerged as the dominant power on the Great Plains. The Lewis and Clark expedition of 1804–1806 soon ushered in American fur traders, including individual trappers such as John Coulter. Small enterprises controlled by the likes of Manuel Lisa also existed during the early 19th century. These early forays into the fur trade lured some Assiniboine south, but John Jacob Astor and the American Fur Company consolidated American domination of the fur and hide trade by 1830. The construction of Fort Union at the confluence of the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in 1829 enabled numerous Native peoples from around the Great Plains to trade at one central location. Until its closure in 1861, Assiniboine regularly traded and visited other Native people at Fort Union. As a result of American economic dominance in the region, many Assiniboine joined southern bands living along the Missouri, swelling their American population. This phase of Assiniboine migration dramatically altered the population distribution, because previously a majority lived in Canada. However, from the 1840s onward a majority hunted, camped, and traded in the United States. The Assiniboine had primarily become a plains people and could be found hunting buffalo and warring

with the Crow, Blackfoot, and Gros Ventre along the upper Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers in Montana and North Dakota.

The United States first placed an agent among the Assiniboine in 1826, but little governmental interference existed due to the isolation of the upper Missouri region. From the 1850s onward, the Assiniboine began to feel the pernicious hand of government on both sides of the international border, as settlers and economic pressures necessitated the seclusion of Native peoples on reservations. The Fort Laramie Treaty of 1851 proved a watershed moment in Native American history on the Great Plains as, from this point forward, boundaries existed delineating tribal homelands. Chiefs First Fly and Crazy Bear negotiated and signed the treaty on behalf of all Assiniboine living in the United States creating a defined territory, soon called the Milk River Reservation, that included most of Northeastern Montana. The 1855 Isaac Stevens Treaty with the Blackfoot stipulated the establishment of a common hunting ground near the present-day Montana community of Havre. This dynamic area, located between the Assiniboine and Gros Ventre reservation to the east and the Blackfoot Reservation to the west, caused increasing conflict over resources. Not only the Assiniboine, but the Blackfoot, Gros Ventre, and River Crow prowled the area in pursuit of game.

The Fort Laramie and Isaac Stevens treaties initially did little to stop the migration and movements of the Assiniboine living in the United States, because they could still freely hunt, visit neighbors in Canada, and fight with rivals as they had for generations. However, the decades of the 1860s and 1870s saw dramatic changes that wrought havoc on Native peoples across the Northern Plains. The closure of Fort Union in 1861 eliminated the prime source of trade goods in the region, while the conclusion of the Civil War redirected American attention westward. Slowly, the U.S. government carved up Assiniboine territory into smaller parcels and forced a nomadic people to take up the plow.

The U.S. government subdivided the Milk River Reservation into two parts in 1873, creating the Fort Peck Reservation out of the eastern portion and the Fort Belknap from the western. Assiniboine who lived at Fort Peck now shared a reservation with the

Yanktonai Sioux, bringing the two back together after three centuries apart, while those at Fort Belknap cohabitated with their implacable enemy the Gros Ventre. These two reservations were many times smaller than the Milk River Reservation, and by the end of the decade the few remaining buffalo ventured too far south to hunt. The 1880s saw further land sales, particularly in 1888 when the U.S. government compelled tribal leaders to sell half of the Fort Belknap Reservation to enable white settlers to enter the region. By the end of the 1880s, traditional forms of annual migration, hunting, and even horse stealing had ceased, and the Assiniboine had become wards of the American government with their land largely leased to large cattle operators. Allotment did not occur until 1909 on Fort Peck and 1921 at Fort Belknap, leaving reservation residents in economic limbo for nearly 40 years.

Unlike the Southern Assiniboine living in the United States, little governmental attention had been paid the Northern Assiniboine by the Canadian government. It was not until the Cypress Hills Massacre in 1873, where whiskey runners and other ruffians massacred Assiniboine led by Little Soldier, that the Canadian government negotiated a series of treaties that gave them fixed territories in the area. Negotiated among bands from central Saskatchewan, southern Saskatchewan, and Alberta at Forts Carleton, Pitt, and McLeon, the treaties established a series of reserves for the Assiniboine in Saskatchewan and Alberta. However, during the 1890s the Canadians' desire to settle the prairies led to a constriction in the size of these reserves. Eventually, the Canadian Assiniboine scattered to numerous reserves including Carry the Kettle, Pheasant Rump, and Ocean Man in Saskatchewan and the Alexis, Paul, Wesley, Big Horn, and Eden Valley reserves in Alberta. While on each of these reserves the Assiniboine constitute a majority, on other reserves in both provinces their populations exist as a minority. With no reserves in Manitoba, the long migration westward left their traditional heartland around Lake Winnipeg largely devoid of an Assiniboine population.

By the beginning of the 20th century, the Assiniboine population had plummeted from 28,000 in 1823 to 1,217 in the United States and 873 in Canada by 1908.

Corralled on reservations, the surviving Assiniboine seemed to have completed their ceaseless migration, but in fact their movement continued throughout the 20th century. Young Assiniboine attended boarding schools from Carlisle in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to Sherman Indian Institute in Riverside, California. When Assiniboine students returned to their reservations, they brought a pan-Indian identity that integrated cultural elements from across "Indian Country."

Assiniboine moved frequently back and forth to various reserves and reservations, regardless of national borders, illustrating the strong bond between the American and Canadian bands. Movement also took place to towns, such as Havre and Glasgow, Montana, located near the Fort Peck and Fort Belknap reservations. Longer migrations to cities in Montana and Alberta, occurring primarily for wage labor and educational opportunities, eventually created lasting Assiniboine communities in Billings, Great Falls, and Lethbridge. Finally, the relocation project undertaken by the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the 1950s sent Assiniboine as far as the East Coast and California. The constant migrations by the Assiniboine over centuries created a resiliency that enabled them to survive in an environment where they faced hostile neighbors and an uncertain climate. Although the Assiniboine diffused over an immense geographic area and developed different economic pursuits, the strong cultural affiliation among the bands never diminished.

—Jon Ille

See also BLACKFOOT NATION, GROS VENTRE

Suggested Reading

- Fort Belknap Curriculum Development Project. *Assiniboine Memories: Legends of the Nakota People*. Hays, MT: Fort Belknap Education Department, 1983.
- Long, James L. *Land of Nakoda: The Story of the Assiniboine Indian*. Helena: Montana Historical Society Press, 2004.
- Lowie, Robert H. *The Assiniboine*. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1909.
- Rodnick, David. *The Fort Belknap Assiniboine of Montana: A Study in Culture Change*. Brooklyn, NY: AMS Press, 1978.
- Russell, Dale R. *The Eighteenth Century Western Cree and Their Neighbors*. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization, 1991.

⚡ ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE RAILWAY

See HARVEY, FREDERICK HENRY

⚡ AUSTIN, STEPHEN FULLER (1793–1836)

Whenever the term *father* is used to describe a man's contributions to society, invention, or country, one can be assured that the namesake has been applied in glowing recognition for the various achievements that have been accomplished. This moniker has been aptly applied to one such "father," Stephen Fuller Austin, also known as the Father of Texas. Throughout Austin's life, he was able to provide intense leadership in the face of dreaded opposition, which resulted in the successful launch of a nation. Without the vision of Stephen Austin, the state of Texas might never have been born as a republic and subsequently as an addition to the United States of America.

Stephen Fuller Austin was born on November 3, 1793, in present day Wythe County in southwestern Virginia, to Moses and Maria Brown Austin. Moses owned and operated a smelter in the lead mine region of Virginia and could be evaluated as generally successful. A few years after Stephen was born, the lead mines in Virginia had all but been bled dry, and Moses had to pull up stakes and look elsewhere for business. A few speculators had claimed that there were new and untapped deposits in the upper Louisiana region, also known as Missouri, and Moses decided to brave the unknown and ended up creating the first permanent settlement in Washington County, Missouri. As the furnaces were built and the lead extracted, the Austins found themselves doing quite well, and Moses became one of the founders of the First Bank of St. Louis.

Tragic times would soon befall the Austins, for in 1818 speculative land values crashed, causing the Bank of St. Louis to fail and all of Moses Austin's dreams to fail with it. With virtually nothing, Moses decided to brave the frontier again in search of wealth and traveled to Texas, entering San Antonio in August of 1820. During this time, his son Stephen served as a circuit

judge in Arkansas, followed by a trip to New Orleans to study law, where he became well attuned to frontier life and the various challenges associated with it. At 27 years of age, Stephen would have to take over the reigns of exploration from his father. As Moses was traveling back to Missouri from San Antonio with a Royal Commission in hand to settle 300 families in Texas, he was robbed and developed a bad cold. He died upon his return to Washington County, but Stephen was fully prepared to carry on his father's legacy.

Because his family had been ruined by land speculation on land purchased from the U.S. government, Stephen Austin felt that he had a significantly better chance of success on Spanish land as opposed to American soil. When he received the official papers from Monterrey, Mexico, and the Spanish commissioners, he was well aware that the resolution required "faith to the Catholic Church and to the King, as well as the new immigrants [will] introduce agriculture, industry, and arts." Austin and the Spanish commissioners realized that the colonists were Protestant, but as long as they were law-abiding and productive, a blind eye was turned.

As Austin was surveying possible territory for his colony, many factors had to be considered before deciding upon a permanent location. First and foremost was the incursion of hostile Indian tribes. Up and down the El Camino Real, or Royal Road, there existed many dangerous regions. After a lengthy journey, Austin concluded that the Brazos bottomland, with access to the Gulf of Mexico, would be just fine for the plantation model of the American economic system to thrive, plus it lay outside the region of dangerous Indian country. With the settlement in place, the next goal would be to attract settlers. Stephen Austin found that the second step would be much easier than the first.

When Austin returned to Louisiana, many letters and requests for settlement were waiting for him. Each prospective colonist was required to pay \$0.12 an acre and guaranteed 4,500 acres per family or 1,500 acres per man. All government was local and self-governing, with Austin as the acting head with the title of *empresario*. Whereas many settlers could not afford the sum for the entire 4,500 acres, Austin was unwilling

to turn away anyone based upon their ability to pay. Nevertheless, Stephen Austin was taking quite a substantial risk with this endeavor. After all was said and done, the “Old Three Hundred,” as the original settlers would come to be known, embarked upon their journey with some of the best farmland in all of Texas. With nothing but river bottoms, endless grass-covered prairies, and dreams these 300 men, women, and children braved the elements in the hope that their hard labor would soon, and hopefully very soon, pay off.

At this time, Stephen Austin realized that he was not going to become rich during the development of Texas; nevertheless, the colony was the most important thing in the world to him. Times were difficult in the first year of the colony, 1822–1823, as a severe drought hit the region and bands of Karankawa Indians raided many settlers’ homes. A number of frustrated families made the trek back to their points of origin. As far as law was concerned, all colonists were subject to the governance of Spain, then independent Mexico, and finally to the settlement itself. The economy developed upon the barter system, with a cow and calf equaling \$10. Cotton provided the basis for the Texas export system, and in 1825 the proportion of whites to slaves was 3 to 1.

As the colony began to grow at a rapid rate, Austin realized that he would have to separate governmental decisions to spread responsibility. The entirety of the colony was divided into two distinct districts, the Colorado and the Brazos, which each elected an *alcalde*, or magistrate, to handle matters of law within the district. While this may have seemed to present possible problems in interpreting the law, it did not, for there was little if any crime committed within the districts. In reality, it was Austin himself who possessed virtually all of the power within the colony. Essentially, Stephen Austin was the acting dictator of Texas, yet few would ever call him such or label him thus. He had the power of all appointments and the colony was exempt from all taxes, for its sole purpose in the eyes of Mexico was to defend the area and fend for itself. Austin acted as the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Texas government, all rolled into one, and he would essentially control all aspects of both “national” and local government until 1832.

As the years passed, the number of settlers increased in Texas. By 1825, 500 families were present,

another 100 more by 1827, and by 1828 more than 1,000 families and 1,200 homes had sprouted in the new colony. Something very special was happening in Texas, and many in the United States realized this as well, evidenced by an increasing movement to annex Texas and take advantage of its geography and vision. Presidents John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson offered Mexico \$1 million and \$5 million, respectively, for Texas, only to be soundly turned down both times.

During the 1820s, many other *empresarios* attempted to follow the sound foundation set down by Stephen Austin, and additional colonies were settled in and around Austin’s Colorado and Brazos regions. In 1825, immigration and the number of colonies grew, and in that year alone 25 *empresario* commissions were granted. In addition to American settlers, Mexicans began to get in on the action as well. While Mexicans could acquire land with a bit more ease than Americans, the greater proportion of settlers continued to arrive from the United States, with even a handful making the journey from Europe. This massive influx would cause the Mexican government to issue a few new laws to eventually hinder the great increase in population. A general colonization law was implemented in August of 1824, which stated that public lands be administered by the Mexican states, no person could possess more than 48,708 acres, and all immigrants were required to become Mexican citizens. Nevertheless, the population in and around the colony continued to increase, and Austin understood that when the population of Texas grew sufficiently, statehood status would not be that far behind.

Things changed dramatically for Stephen Austin and Texas in the year 1830. At this time, the Mexican government forbade any further immigration from the United States, hoping to seal off the ballooning American population. In order to enforce this, Mexico sent a number of troops north of the Rio Grande to stop all future settlers from crossing into Mexican territory. Austin was incensed and felt that the overall stability of Mexico was in question. It was then that Stephen Austin realized that a move of secession and independence might be more favorable than being annexed by the United States. After getting into an argument with the vice president of Mexico and claiming that Texas

would gain self-government with or without his help, Stephen Austin found himself in solitary confinement, charged with high treason. For three months, Austin could neither see nor speak to anyone, after which he was moved to a prison that allowed him visitors, where he would remain for another two years. Ironically, it was General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, the future president of Mexico and commander in chief of Mexican forces who defeated the Texan rebels at the Alamo, who set Austin free in 1832.

In a sense, the imprisonment of Stephen Austin provided the spark for Texan independence. For many years, the fundamental differences between white American settlers and those who lived south of the Rio Grande were simmering, eventually to boil over in a series of power struggles between the infant colonial settlements and the incompetent Mexican government. When Mexico flatly refused to grant Texas statehood status and imprisoned Austin, things were starting to spiral out of control. When Austin returned to Texas from prison, he and the colony witnessed a new set of leaders, ready to take up the flag of independence with a fury that would be impressive.

Leading the pack was the former governor of Tennessee, Sam Houston, who arrived in Texas in 1832 and would become commander in chief of the army in November of 1835. Next was James Bowie, a famous fighter and legendary personality in Louisiana and Mississippi who was known for his skill with the Bowie knife he made famous. Bowie arrived in Texas in 1828 and married into a wealthy Spanish family in Bexar, only to join the Texans a few years later. William B. Travis, William Wharton, Branch Archer, and a number of others would be included among the new breed in Texas, young lovers of self-government who settled for nothing less than either separation from the state of Coahuila or secession.

As the turbulent situation became more so, the new dictator of Mexico, Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, readied troops for the march northward to deal with the troublesome Texas contingent with the hope of quieting the simmering cauldron. Before his imprisonment, Stephen Austin was convinced that his Texas colony should remain a part of Mexico in order to foster continuous beneficial treatment, as well as an important cooperative spirit between the two nations. Upon his

return to Texas, those past feelings changed dramatically. Austin understood that in order for Texas to further exist, it must secede from Mexico, and at this time Stephen Austin joined up with the likes of Houston, Bowie, and Travis.

In December of 1835, Austin traveled to Washington, DC, to ask for credit, loans, and sympathy from the Jackson administration for their upcoming battle against the Mexican government. Unbeknownst to him, Austin was beginning to be upstaged by the other revolutionaries, most notably, Sam Houston. Stephen Austin was not the rabble-rousing type; rather, he focused on steadfast leadership of the simple mold—persuasion, discussion, and agreement. However, now it was time for Texas to experience some good, old-fashioned action in its struggle for independence.

Slowly but surely, the upstart band of Texans compiled victory after small victory against tremendous odds fighting the heavily armed and vastly superior Mexican army. Not all battles were victories, for Santa Anna overwhelmed a small Texan contingent at the Alamo in March of 1836, a story with which many are familiar. Nevertheless, after a series of advances and retreats, culminating with Houston's victory at the Battle of San Jacinto, the Texans would emerge victorious in their search for a truly independent identity.

Stephen Austin did not participate in any of the battles for independence, for it was Sam Houston who raised the torch as the new leader of the Texas people. Austin had been relegated to backup to the more revolutionary Houston. It seemed as if Houston had taken the groundwork that had been laid by Austin. After his return from Washington, DC, Austin realized that Houston had taken the spotlight, ready to bask in the glory of an independent Texas. There were still many Texans who appreciated and respected Austin for all the work he had done in the past, but it was evident that his time had passed, and it was now someone else's show.

During Texas's first presidential election in 1836, Austin was persuaded to run, but all knew he would be soundly defeated by the ever-popular Sam Houston, which he was. As a concession, Houston asked Austin to be his secretary of state, to which he agreed. Stephen Austin would fit perfectly in the role of diplomat, for diplomacy was his game, one at which he was

extremely skilled. Austin finished his career the way he started it, working toward the ultimate goal of cooperation between adversaries and ending with benefits to both.

Very shortly after the election, Stephen Austin fell ill, which developed into pneumonia. Austin's constitution was not able to handle the severe drain upon his system, and on December 28, 1836, at the age of 43, Austin passed away. Many Texans were truly shocked at his death, for Austin had paved the way for Texas's road to independence. Sam Houston would immortalize Austin by bequeathing the title "Father of Texas" upon him, and this moniker remains to this day. Austin was memorialized in a number of different ways, most notably as one of the state statues placed in Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol. Each state is allowed two statues to represent it in the hall, and the state of Texas chose Stephen Austin and Sam Houston.

Sculptor Elisabet Ney was commissioned to produce the marble statue of Austin, and when asked why Austin was such a deserving candidate for the honor,

she replied that while Austin was not the aggressive warrior that Houston was, his deeds, his courage, his sufferings, and his love for others entitled him to equal recognition. Perhaps no better qualities are possible for a father, most importantly a father of a republic.

—Charles Sedey

Suggested Reading

- Barker, Eugene. *The Life of Stephen F. Austin, Founder of Texas, 1793–1836. A Chapter of the Westward Movement of the Anglo-American People*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1968.
- Bechdolt, Frederick. *Giants of the Old West*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1930.
- Cantrell, Greg. *Stephen F. Austin, Empresario of Texas*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Fehrenbach, T. R. *Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans*. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRANTS

See IDAHO SILVER STRIKES