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Summary

This report reviews the historical and present-day connections that three Native American groups have had to the landscape now controlled by Tumacácori National Historical Park. These groups are the O’odham, Yaquis, and Western and Chiricahua Apaches. Rather than judging between claims, the focus here is on documenting relationships – both those reported in the academic historical literature and those expressed by members of these groups today in interviews and published works. This report does not attempt to recount the history of this land; Kessell (1970, 1976) and Sheridan (2006), especially, do an admirable job of this. Rather, it presents a thematic exploration of symbolic relationships between this landscape and members of these three groups.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Objectives

The main objective of this report is to delineate the historical and present-day ties that different groups have to the landscape that is now part of Tumacácori National Historical Park (TNHP), especially from the perspective of members of these groups. As part of this effort, I discuss different people’s sense of what constitutes a group, because this sense differs culturally and changes historically. The same is true for the feeling of connection to a place.

Because this landscape has been the subject of considerable previous research, this report assumes that the reader has a basic knowledge of the area’s history. Its focus is on broad patterns, key periods, areas of disagreement, and unanswered questions. The report strives to document a panoply of perspectives regarding connections to the TNHP landscape. It presents a wide range of interpretations of the issues that it raises – for example, raiding – and makes clear who has made each interpretation. This is especially important given that different observers have developed conflicting perspectives. Although I present my own interpretations, I have striven to avoid censoring or coloring any group’s outlook.

Another goal of this report is to make sources more accessible to future researchers. Written sources that I have consulted appear in the References Cited. And I specify some observations and interviews in the text.
Sources and Methodologies

This report integrates several sources. Despite considerable effort to rely more fully on interviews, I have had to depend mostly on published materials. Fortunately, I have found considerable written information produced directly by members of associated Native American groups or under the aegis of these groups.

Interviews

I have conducted several interviews with members of Native American groups regarding TNHP. However, my many contacts with tribal governments resulted in much less interaction than I had hoped for. Some possible reasons for this failure include:

• The decision-makers with whom I dealt felt that discussions of the topic should be kept secret from outsiders.

• The topic lacked importance to them compared to other activities in which they could engage.

• Perhaps I unknowingly alienated each of the many groups I contacted.

I do not have sufficient information to judge which reason(s) may be the basis for my paucity of interviews. However, some of my observations and readings tend to corroborate the second possibility as a factor.

I contacted the groups in the following list. In the case of each Native American group, I followed up my initial contact, usually through a different means; that is, if a letter did not attract a response, I sent an email or called to follow up. For the most proximate groups, I made quite a few attempts over several years, through different channels.
Arizona State Museum Southwest Native Nations Advisory Board, comprising representatives of most, if not all, of the Native American groups in Arizona

- Tohono O’odham
  - I conducted several interviews with O’odham from different jurisdictions during La Fiesta de Tumacácori in 2002. I also recorded a separate interview with an elder at San Xavier in 2005.

- Pascua Yaqui
  - I interviewed a Yaqui man from Mexico at La Fiesta in 2002. Also, I discussed my research with a panel of elders at the Pascua Yaqui Reservation in 2003.

- San Carlos Apache
- White Mountain Apache
- Yavapai Prescott Indian
- Hopi
- Zuni
- Fort Sill Apache
- Mescalero Apache
- Mexicans
  - I interviewed a group of women from Mexico at La Fiesta in 2002.

- Anglos
  - I interviewed a retired Anglo couple at La Fiesta in 2002.
I have engaged in many less-formal interviews, or conversations, with a wide array of people from different backgrounds regarding this topic. These interactions, while not cited, also have influenced my interpretations in this report.

**Note:** In each chapter, I have highlighted Native American perspectives by placing them in shaded boxes such as this. I have placed each box where it seems to fit best with my discussion of non-Indian sources. Native American comments might agree or disagree with my or other authors’ findings, and sometimes they raise additional issues. This formatting is an attempt to reduce my filtering of Native American voices.

When reporting interviews, “T:” (for Tracy) designates my speech. I have coded interviewees with letters, too. So “B:” refers to the same person’s speech in all quotes. All of the interviewees in a chapter are members of the Indian group on which the chapter focuses. Written sources will be set off in this way, too. For example, Erickson (1994) is a textbook created with tremendous cooperation and guidance from the Tohono O’odham Nation, and it is used in their schools. It provides an additional source of O’odham perspectives on issues in this report.

**Ethnographic observations**

I made a few formal observations of events at TNHP. During La Fiesta de Tumacácori on December 7-8, 2002, I recorded video and audio, took digital photographs, and typed notes, and I
participated in a Living History Tour on December 18, 2002, which took us to Guevavi and Calabazas. Less formally, I have visited the park several times.

**Texts**

Various sorts of text form the basis of this report. They include historical and present-day documents; academic works based on archival documents, interviews, and observations; websites; and museum displays. Because my task has been to document interpretations as well as “facts,” each of these is a primary source in a way. Indeed, in the absence of greater interaction with groups, I have used texts and images that they have produced for open consumption as a proxy for interviews with tribal experts. For example, I have relied somewhat on the San Carlos Apache Tribe’s museum and on a history textbook produced with and used by the Tohono O’odham Nation to understand their perspectives.

**Mission Records**

The staff of TNHP, along with other Park Service personnel, has produced a rich resource for researchers: the Mission 2000 database. Mission 2000 includes thousands of entries from mission records and other documentary sources, all containing information regarding the history of this region.

**Organization**

This report is organized mostly by group. This is because the ultimate goal is to document and understand each group’s connections to this landscape. Nonetheless, I have
endeavored to emphasize that most of these relations to the landscape are simultaneously relations with other human groups. I have ordered the groups mostly from a sense of what would make the exposition most efficient. As a result, I begin with the O’odham because they, today, are the widely recognized heirs of the people who had the longest, most permanent use of the land.

Other chapters address prehistory or several groups at once. For example, a key chapter at the beginning catalogs different sorts of connections to landscapes. A review of possible prehistoric connections follows. The body of the report concludes with a chapter of recommendations for the park and for future research.
Chapter 2

Connections: A Catalog

Tumacácori National Historical Park occupies, shapes, preserves, and helps people to identify a landscape. This report details varying historical and present-day affiliations of different groups with this landscape, including the park’s effect on these connections. As no one’s home, the park has a built-in effect of alienating everyone; at the same time, its universal welcome invites everybody to feel some type of affiliation with this landscape and to understand others’ connections.

The following list delineates different types of affiliation and illustrates some of them with examples from other domains. The order of items in the list is not related to their importance; that issue is open to debate and, even to a single observer, dependent on circumstances. For example, different observers likely would disagree whether a refugee’s descendents – who have never seen or possibly even heard of a particular place that their parents had to leave – have a more valid connection to the place than do the descendents of people who drove out the refugees and occupied it. For some the ‘right of return’ is absolute; for others, it is tempered by time and other considerations. Most of the groups discussed in this report have more than one type of affiliation with the TNHP landscape.

1 Except perhaps for some park personnel.
Ownership of the place

Ownership is established through custom. Sometimes, that custom is institutionalized as law. Owners need not even know that they own a place, much less live on it. Ownership can be divided further:

- **Group**: Villages or other political units claim resources as their own to administer.
- **Individual**: Individual humans or juridically individual organizations, such as business corporations, control the disposition of resources.

This category elides important distinctions between spiritually sanctioned stewardship of a landscape and legal control. But, in both cases, one group or individual exerts control and accepts responsibility within a customary framework.

Residence in or usufruct of it

Living on a landscape can occur outside of owning it. Different people might enjoy different types of usufruct, whether through rental, agreement, surreptitious activity, or some other arrangement. Residents might undergo significant events in a place that its owners do not undergo there, including birth and death, and they might rely on it more greatly than the owner does.

Visited it

Casual, one-time visits seem unlikely to create a lasting, intense sense of connection to a place. However, they can become eventful. When something of perceived significance occurs, such as an attack or an epiphany, a sense of connection is likely to deepen. Multiple visits make this and other types of connection more likely to develop.
Denied use of it

This geographic exclusion can prompt people to conjecture about how the exclusion has shaped the excluded people’s lives or those of their descendents. Also, this exclusion can come to symbolize unequal relations in other social domains.\(^2\)

In same political unit as it

Being owned by a political authority is distinct from forming part of its political unit and, thus, possibly being regulated by it. In the case of TNHP, the political authority (e.g., the U.S. federal government) owns the place and the place is part of the political unit (e.g., the United States). Thus, this place likely will interest all ‘citizens’ more directly than it would if it were owned privately.

Helped shape it

Being the cultural, geographic, or biological heir of whatever was ‘upstream’ from a place (literally or metaphorically) sometimes creates a sense of connection to the ‘downstream’ place. For example, present-day Irish might take some interest in the places to which their fellow Irish migrated long ago. And some consumers increasingly feel that they influence the place that, for instance, their food was produced. Indeed, being part of a politically influential group within the United States, from one perspective, can increase a person’s connection to any landscape controlled by the U.S. government.

---

\(^2\) This is an example of synecdoche, in which part of something (exclusion from a single place) stands for the larger thing (a broader pattern of exclusion). Cultural and historical landmarks often represent their specific landscape – e.g., a former mission and/or a stolen homeland – while simultaneously representing all similar places through synecdoche.
Shaped by events in it

Being the cultural, geographic, or biological heir of whatever was ‘downstream’ from a place (literally or metaphorically) sometimes creates a sense of connection to the ‘upstream’ place. For example, Irish Americans sometimes express particular interest in historical and present-day Ireland.

Part of same sociocultural complex as has developed in it

People commonly recognize affiliations with a place because they perceive that this place hosted part of the same, broader sociocultural complex that they are part of. They may feel ties by nationality, language family, spirituality, clan, occupation, history, or ethnicity, to name a few. For example, military veterans may feel a connection to any park commemorating any battle or, more specifically, any from a war in which they fought.

Perceive its future utility

An individual or organization might perceive a place to have either manifest potential or an unknown potential. This perception might motivate them to pursue or maintain other sorts of relationship with the landscape. For example, individuals or organizations might consider a place with certain natural resources to have future value to their society and encourage their local government to acquire or retain this place.

‘Intellectual’ interest in it

Peoples’ intellectual and emotional interest in a place can motivate them (or others for them) to make significant investments in maintaining or deepening this relationship. Indeed, tourists often travel great distances at great expense to visit particular sites for no other
reason. Members of environmental groups might work or pay to protect or simply learn about areas that they likely will never visit.

**Value it spiritually**

People might perceive a link to the spiritual value of a place regardless of the place’s established character within organized religions. For example, people have visited, maintained, and protected popular shrines – such as El Tira di to in Tucson and one for Jesús Malverde in Culiacán, Mexico – because of these places’ perceived spiritual character. Valuing places spiritually also might lead people to avoid them or to reserve them for specially qualified visitors, as McPherson (1992) has shown for Navajos’ sacred geography.

**Perceived to be associated**

Members of a group might perceive themselves or be perceived by others to have a strong relationship with a landscape, regardless of any other tie.

A discussion of workplaces can illustrate the way that these relations can coincide. Workers typically have partial usufruct of a workplace, visit it, help to shape it, and are shaped by their time in it. Other connections to the place might develop from, for instance, workers’ residence in the same political jurisdiction – perhaps they will lobby for laws that will affect it. Regarding TNHP, individuals who defended this landscape or found sanctuary from attacks there were thus combining multiple categories of affiliation listed above. Further considerations can increase the complexity of this incomplete list. For instance, it might matter whether an individual or group claims a genetic or a cultural relationship to the people who have had one of the affiliations listed above. As an example, many U.S. citizens have no
genetic relationship to participants in the Revolutionary War; nonetheless, many feel a vital affiliation with these cultural ancestors and thus with historical sites that commemorate them. Others, such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, seek to privilege “lineal, blood line descent” from those involved on the winning side.\(^3\) Also complicating judgments of affiliation – and especially its strength – is the difference between present-day ties and historical ones. Is there a ‘statute of limitations’ on claims to connection?

\(^3\) DAR: National Society (http://www.dar.org/natsociety/content.cfm?ID=145&hd=n&FO=Y); accessed 3/12/06.
Chapter 3
‘Prehistoric’ Connections

A conventional separation exists between prehistory and history. For many, ‘history’
begin in a region whenever people begin to produce written records in or about it. Thus,
regarding southern Arizona, ‘prehistory’ typically refers to the period before the arrival of
Europeans and their companions, who wrote about the region. This approach has many
epistemological limitations that weaken researchers’ periodization, methodology, and
imagination. Among other problems, it encourages researchers to overly emphasize rupture over
continuity and to focus on literate peoples’ relations with other groups. Instead, this chapter and
the next attempt to balance the continuities and epochal changes between the years preceding and
during direct European involvement along the Santa Cruz River.

Prehistory is important to any discussion of historical affiliations. In part, this is because
observers might consider the length of a group’s connection to be important in judging that
connection’s strength. It seems arbitrary to limit this concern a priori to the historical period.
Also, the means by which groups take control of a landscape could be key in judging
connections. In casual conversations, some people have expressed to me the sense that the
prehistory and history of southern Arizona consist of a series of conquests. Thus, they have
reasoned, no particular group can convincingly claim moral ownership of a place within this
region simply on the basis of someone else having taken the place from this group or its
ancestors, for the dispossessed group’s ancestors must have dispossessed another group earlier.
Paleoindian & Archaic Periods

Archaeologists have conventionally divided the earliest millennia of human occupation of the Southwest into the Paleoindian and Archaic periods. For our purposes, the most important aspects of these periods from an academic perspective are that: 1) people have inhabited this region for about twelve thousand years; 2) their method of establishing usufruct and their tenure in the area remain unknown or highly debatable; 3) their sense of group identity and their relationship to specific present-day groups is unknown; 4) this lengthy record of humans in the area and the Santa Cruz’ position within a corridor to and from Mesoamerica means that members of almost any Indian group throughout the Americas might have had genetic or cultural ancestors who lived within the TNHP landscape. Some Native American groups have explanations that address the early population of this region, and I will discuss those of the O’odham below.

Hohokam and Trincheras

Two interrelated questions of great importance to this inquiry are: 1) Who was occupying the TNHP landscape when Europeans arrived? 2) How did they come to control it? Incomplete data and conflicting interpretations have made these questions difficult to answer. However, a short response might be that mostly Upper Pimas, a branch of the O’odham, lived there and that they had taken control after the Hohokam and perhaps Trincheras cultural patterns had ceased to dominate along the upper Santa Cruz.

---

4 See Cordell (1997) and Reid and Whittlesey (1997) for overviews of Southwestern archaeology. Much of what is thought to have occurred in the upper Santa Cruz is based on extrapolations from archaeological sites in other parts of northern Mexico and, especially, southern Arizona.
One of the difficulties of addressing this issue is that little archaeological work on it has taken place in the upper Santa Cruz Valley. As a result, researchers have been prone to extending better-documented patterns from Tucson and points north to this area. Nonetheless, at least two excavations of prehistoric sites near the upper Santa Cruz have been completed:

- El Macayo lies a few miles southwest of TNHP, just north of the present border with Mexico.\(^5\) It was occupied from about 850 to 1150 CE. The material remains, including pottery and mortuary evidence, indicate that Hohokam and Trincheras patterns coincided there – side-by-side and/or integrated into individuals’ practices.

- Di Peso (1956) identified the Paloparado site as San Cayetano del Tumacácori. He believed that this was the original site of the village and mission *visita*. Schroeder (n.d.:2) convincingly questions this identification because, among other reasons, the site is located on the west side of the river, and Kino consistently identified its location as being on the east bank (see also Polzer 1998:146). DiPeso and Schroeder agree that Paloparado represents a prehistoric-to-historic site. Although not part of the park, Paloparado is within easy hiking distance of Guevavi, Calabazas, and Tumacácori. It is reasonable to think that some residents or their descendents moved from this site to one of the park’s sites. So its character has great bearing on issues of affiliation. Schroeder successfully discredits DiPeso’s study, but unfortunately his own reinterpretation needs reconsideration in light of more-recent developments in Southwestern archaeology; reference to the Trincheras tradition is particularly lacking.

\(^5\) This description is based on: “El Macayo Site, Vignettes in Time Exhibit, BLM”, http://www.statemuseum.arizona.edu/exhibits/blm_vignettes/nog_macayo.shtml, accessed 3/14/06.
Unfortunately, the Trincheras pattern, to the extent that it existed, has not been studied enough to make the same type of generalizations as archaeologists have made for the Hohokam. For example, one authority\(^6\) states that the dominant Trincheras mortuary practice was inhumation (burial without cremation), and another\(^7\) states that neither cremation nor inhumation dominated. We should also consider the influence of other traditions on the inhabitants of these sites and the possibility of local innovations.

In short, it seems likely that the prehistoric inhabitants of the upper Santa Cruz watershed were not simply “Hohokam.” The material evidence from Paloparado, combined with that from El Macayo, supports what one report notes: “Trincheras sites extend into southern Arizona. The area along the modern international border was a transition zone between the Hohokam and Trincheras cultures in the late prehistoric period (A.D. 800–1300), with sites characterized by elements of both traditions.”\(^8\) The following quote from the online exhibit on El Macayo might accurately describe all of the TNHP landscape during the Classic Hohokam period:

We will probably never know how the inhabitants of this village viewed themselves in relation to their neighbors, what they called themselves, or how they perceived the world. … The community was clearly involved with other groups through a complex network of exchange. … Regional research has demonstrated that the Santa Cruz River served as an active trade corridor

\(^{6}\)“El Macayo Conclusion, Vignettes in Time Exhibit, BLM,” http://www.statemuseum.arizona.edu/exhibits/blm_vignettes/nog_macayo_conclusion.shtml, accessed 3/15/06.


\(^{8}\)“The Trincheras Culture, Vignettes in Time Exhibit, BLM,” http://www.statemuseum.arizona.edu/exhibits/blm_vignettes/history_trincheras.shtml, accessed 3/15/06.
throughout prehistory. … Whether or not the local residents identified themselves with these other groups is uncertain. The concepts of “Hohokam” and “Trincheras” are largely constructs created by archaeologists,9 based on patterns of similarity and difference in material remains and excavated features. … All indications suggest that these people lived along an amorphous border region, and their material remains reflect a blending of traditions.10

Thus, the genetic and cultural heirs of the people who produced both the Hohokam and the Trincheras patterns appear to have a claim of affiliation to this landscape. The descendents of the other participants in the far-flung trade networks that included the upper Santa Cruz have a less direct connection. These networks probably extended at least from Mesoamerica to the Four Corners region. Indeed, the cultural and perhaps genetic mixing during the Classic Hohokam period might have extended beyond Hohokam and Trincheras, to include “Proto-Tepimans, Proto-River Yumans, and probably some Zunis” (Sheridan 2006:24, citing Shaul and Hill 1998). The extent to which this interaction took place along the upper Santa Cruz is unknown. But many lines of evidence indicate that the ancestry and inheritance of the ‘Hohokam’ period, here and throughout the Pimería Alta, is itself multilineral.

9 Actually, there are at least two, related “Hohokam” concepts: the one created by archaeologists and the other communicated by O’odham. I discuss the latter below.
Transition

At the end of the Classic Hohokam period, the Hohokam pattern of life ended. Former Hohokam sites were abandoned or used radically differently. This transition and the identity of the people who subsequently occupied the former Hohokam lands are the object of continuing inquiry and debate. The various explanatory scenarios present differences in the length and type of association that different groups have had with this landscape.

Sheridan (2006) provides an exhaustive review of research on who came to dominate the Hohokam area in general after the Hohokam collapse. I will summarize in a schematic fashion three of the different scenarios that researchers have developed:

- The Hohokam never left the Pimería Alta; they simply reorganized their society. Proponents of this scenario might point to the Mayan “collapse” as analogous.

- The ruling faction of the Hohokam left the Pimería Alta, but the mass of the populace remained and reorganized their society. Perhaps some outsiders came to help oust the elites or settled in the wake of their ouster.

In each of the above cases, the Piman-speaking people who greeted the first European visitors would be the genetic and cultural heirs to centuries of unbroken tenure in this region. In conversation, some Tohono O’odham have expressed support for these scenarios.

- All or a large portion of the Hohokam were forced out of the Pimería Alta. Upper Piman-speaking peoples migrated into the area to replace them. This scenario, which I find the
most convincing, unites strands of different types of evidence. These include: 1) the story told in 1935 by an Akimel O’odham, living near the Gila River, of how the O’odham’s ancestors overthrew the dominant Hohokam; 2) striking changes in architecture, scale of irrigation, and quotidian material culture; and 3) dialectal differences among Piman speakers. In the O’odham story of the expulsion of the Hohokam, some of the survivors “fled west to the Colorado River or north to Zuni country and the Hopi mesas. But others were incorporated into O’odham society, perhaps into the Buzzard moiety” (Sheridan 2006:21, citing Hayden 1970). As Sheridan traces it, the Upper Piman-speaking people who established a new pattern of life in the former Hohokam areas might (or might not) have had ancestors who had migrated away from this region centuries earlier. In either case, “the modern Akimel O’odham and Tohono O’odham do not appear to be the biological or cultural descendents of the Late Classic Hohokam elites” (Sheridan 2006:25). However, many observers consider it likely that some of the Upper Piman-speaking people who met the first European visitors were descendents of non-elite Hohokam who remained in the area and adapted to the newly dominant patterns. This question remains unresolved.

Did the same patterns occur along the upper Santa Cruz? The accounts summarized above focus on places significantly to the north of Tumacácori. I have not found any study that critically examines the applicability of this series of events so far south. Since the scant evidence available suggests that Paloparado was abandoned sometime during the Classic period, it seems reasonable to assume that its abandonment was related to either the consolidation or
abandonment of population centers throughout the Hohokam region. But, given the evidence of strong connections with both the Trincheras and Hohokam networks, the motivation and the fate of those who left Paloparado might differ from those of the Hohokam to the north. It seems more likely that people along the upper Santa Cruz would have sought refuge among their southwestern neighbors.

Probably the “Upper Pimas” replaced the Hohokam/Trincheras peoples in the area around TNHP, although it is possible that this region’s inhabitants were mostly descendents of the Hohokam. In either case, the ancestry and descent of this group has had strong implications for claims to affiliation with this landscape because they greeted the first Spanish speakers who arrived there.

“There is some debate regarding the Hohokam (or Huhugam) people … Although some people assume that the Hohokam were ancestors of the O’odham, others argue that the archaeological evidence does not support that theory” (Ibid.:16).

Summary

Because of its geographic position and millennia of human use, people in almost any Native American group might have some distant ancestor who lived in the TNHP landscape. However, we can make more-informed guesses regarding the identity of this small area’s
inhabitants starting about nine hundred years ago, as the Classic Hohokam period began. It seems most likely that people who mixed Trincheras and Hohokam influences inhabited the upper Santa Cruz. The Hohokam collapse is even more mysterious for this area than for others, because the people here seem to have participated in the Trincheras networks as well as the Hohokam ones and because the O’odham stories of this period focus on the Gila River. After the Hohokam pattern collapsed in this area, a branch of Upper Piman-speaking people, later known to non-O’odham as the Pimas, settled the valley in farming villages.

The next chapters discuss the connections that particular present-day Indian groups have had with Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas. Some of these discussions will refer back to the preceding overview of prehistorical affiliations, for different groups have had possible connections to this landscape during this period. These connections include genetic and cultural descent, but they also could include trade, exclusion, and any of the relations listed in the previous chapter.
Chapter 4

The O’odham

Group Identity

The question of ethnic and political group identity is key in assessing any group’s affiliation. For example, did Upper Piman-speaking people who never lived on what now are the Park’s lands feel that this territory was part of their group’s land? Did they, instead, see it as their rivals’ territory or simply as that of another group? Did they conceive of lands as being controlled by ethnic groups at all? Thus, in determining the affiliations of O’odham with the TNHP landscape, it is important to ask in which ways their ancestors – denominated Pimas, Pápagos, and Sobaipuris in historical documents – identified themselves as members of these or other groups.

The O’odham are the Native American people most obviously associated with the TNHP landscape. Today, many O’odham have the opportunity to make themselves members of the Tohono O’odham Nation or of other federally recognized tribal entities to the north (the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Gila River Indian Community), which administer territories and social relations on those territories under a legalistic framework. It is unknown but unlikely that a similar framework for political integration existed before U.S. hegemony in the Southwest. That is, there was no lasting tribal-level organization until the United States encouraged or required it. More debatable is the extent to which the different ancestors of today’s O’odham saw themselves as members of a single group – had tribal feeling or identification
instead of tribal organization. (A separate question is whether others treated them as a single group.)

**Note on names**

I use the term ‘O’odham’ to refer to all the people the Spanish called ‘Pimas’ and ‘Pápagos,’ collectively. Because the descendents of some Pimas, including Sobaipuris, have become members of the Tohono O’odham Nation (along with Hia C’ed O’odham), I have chosen to not use the term ‘Tohono O’odham’ except when referring to members of the twentieth-century tribal entity.

**The Mission Era**

As discussed in the previous chapter, Upper Piman-speaking people either persisted in or moved into the Pimería Alta, or both, after the Hohokam pattern of life ended. Historical evidence, discussed below, suggests that the people living along the upper Santa Cruz River, the Pimas, were distinct from their Pápago and Sobaipuri neighbors. However, as Spain established Roman Catholic missions along the Santa Cruz, the mix of O’odham peoples – among others – changed there. Perhaps the O’odham’s sense of identity changed, too.

**Sobaipuris?**

Some sources identify the inhabitants of the TNHP landscape, at the beginning of missionization, as Sobaipuris. For example, the Park’s website states: “The people who lived along the Santa Cruz River when first contact with the Spanish was made were called the
Sobaipuri, a branch of the O’odham or Pima people.” Early documentary sources do not clearly support this contention and provide reasons to question it.

The missionary priest Francisco Eusebio Kino and his military escort Captain Juan Matheo Mange first visited Tumacácori and Guevavi in succession on the same trip, and writings from this encounter provide the first reliable evidence produced by non-Indians regarding who lived in this area as Spanish speakers settled there. Kino (pub. 1985) and Mange (pub. 1926) each wrote an account of this meeting. Each identifies the inhabitants as “Pimas,” but neither furnishes a clear designation of a Piman subgroup, if any, to which they belonged. In particular, neither observer clearly identifies the inhabitants as Sobaipuris. This lack of evidence is all the more significant given that each supplied his account after further years of working in the region; this continuing experience would have allowed them to correct an initial misunderstanding.

Here is what Kino wrote regarding this matter. While in Tucubabia with Father Visitor Juan María Salvatierra, messengers came for them “from the Sobaipuris from San Xavier del Bac … and from San Cayetano del Tumacácori” (1985:23-24). I have translated this phrase in a way that preserves the original’s ambiguity concerning 1) whether some messengers came from the Sobaipuris and others came from Tumacácori or 2) whether Sobaipuri messengers came from both Tucson and Tumacácori. Later in the same entry Kino wrote: “we arrived at the ranchería of San Cayetano del Tumacácori, where some principal Sobaipuri figures were, who had come 20 and 25 leagues from the north.”

12 The Spanish reads: "nos vinieron a encontrar unos Propios o correos de Norte, de los sobai puris de San Javier del Bac … y de San Cayetano del Tumagacori … [L]egamos a la rancheria de San Cayetano del Tumagacori, adonde estaban algunos principales sobai puris, que habían venido 20 y 25 leguas del norte."
fuzzily suggests that the Sobaipuris were from elsewhere. For example, on the next page, in
describing Sobaipuri settlements he mentions only San Xavier del Bac on what is now called the
Santa Cruz River (Kino 1985:24). Later, he notes visiting Tumacácori and Guevavi without
identifying their inhabitants’ ethnicity; on the same page (and elsewhere), he specifies "San
Javier del Bac de los sobaipuris" (1985:50, my emphasis). Earlier, he had described the
Sobaipuris at Quíburi on the San Pedro River as Pimas (1985:40). In summary, the weight of the
ambiguous evidence from Kino is that the Sobaipuris lived near Tucson and along the San Pedro
watershed but not in the Tumacácori-Guevavi area.

The evidence from Mange is similar. He labels the Sobaipuris as “Pimas” (cf. 1926:23, 211, 246-247, 259), and he specifies certain places as Sobaipuri. For example, he refers to San
Xavier del Bac as “first of the Sobaipuri nation” (1926:291). He also specifies interactions with
other subgroups of Pimas, such as the Sobas to the southwest and Papabotas (Pápagos) to the
west. However, when mentioning visits to Tumacácori and Guevavi, he never identifies the
inhabitants’ ethnicity (cf. 1926:275). While it would be preferable to have direct evidence, Kino
and Mange’s writings strongly suggest that they could recognize similarities and differences
among Pimas and that they did not identify those of Tumacácori and Guevavi as Sobaipuris.

Maps from the period corroborate this tentative conclusion. For example, Montané Martí
(1989:vii) includes a French copy of a map by Kino from 1705 with the label “Sobaiporis”
between the San Pedro and Santa Cruz Rivers, but closer to the former and near its confluence
with the Gila River. Kessell (1976:6) shows a French copy of what appears to be a different map
by Kino, from 1710. This one places the label “Sobaipons” to the east of the San Pedro. In both
cases, no ethnic label clearly designates the upper Santa Cruz. While these maps are copies, they at least do not override the impression that Kino’s and Mange’s writing give.

Records from TNHP’s Mission 2000 database extend this pattern considerably past Kino and Mange’s era, since they come from the second half of the eighteenth century and especially beginning in the 1770s. All of the Sobaipurus listed in my copy of the database (made 10/27/04) resided in Suamca, Sonoitac, Babisi, or “Tierra adentro” (the hinterland). The records for Tumacácori include a considerable variety of ethnic distinctions among Native Americans, but no Sobaipuris. The same pattern holds true for Guevavi and Calabazas, even though this ethnic designation was in common currency among Spanish speakers. Throughout this period, writers referred to the Sobaipurus’ struggles against Apaches and their eventual relocation to and then from Sonoitac. Thus, their total absence from records for residents of Tumacácori and Guevavi probably does not result from record keepers’ ignorance. Instead, these records support the pattern observed in early accounts: that Sobaipuris did not commonly populate the area including Tumacácori and Guevavi.

Later mission records contain several mentions of Sobaipuris in Suamca. But I found only two examples of Sobaipuris in Tumacácori, Guevavi, or Calabazas. The first occurred in 1722, when a Sobaipuri messenger served as godfather at a baptism in Guevavi. Four days later, he did the same in San Xavier. It seems most probable that Father Campos meant that this man was a messenger from the Sobaipuris, who lived elsewhere. The second instance occurred in 1747, when “Catalina de los Sobaipuris” was baptized in Tumacácori. Father Garrucho wrote the phrase “de los Sobaipuris” on the record in the same position in which he wrote place names to help describe others – for example, “Inés de Tubac” and “María Catalina de Sonoitac.” He left

---

13 I found these records in an online search of Mission 2000 in June 2006.
some of the baptized people’s Christian names unmodified by a place name, seemingly to indicate that they were from Tumacácori. That is, he used the term more as a geographic descriptor than as an ethnic one. Thus, while it appears likely that Catalina and at least part of her family were Sobaipuris, Father Garrucho seemed to imply that the area with which he associated the Sobaipuris was elsewhere. Nonetheless, these rare mentions do provide evidence that some Sobaipuris lived in or visited these (mostly non-Sobaipuri) mission settlements, as some must have done before the mission period, too.\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{A:} Yeah, the Sobaipuris were along the San Pedro. They say that historically that they occupied the, and here again you know another name that archaeologists or ethnographers named the O'odham..they had names like that...the Sobaipuris were recorded that they you know vacated the area and uh, moved up along down towards where the present day Gila River is. That's one of the, the beliefs that uh where most of the Sobaipuri went to. But then also they went west, and here again they're all O'odham, not any particular um Sobaipuri or Tohono O'odham or Akimel O'odham.

A map in Erickson (1994:9) titled “O’dham groups, pre-1800,” lists Tubac, Tumacácori, and Calabasas as “Sobaipuri (One Villagers),” in contrast with, for example, Saric and Arivaca, which are labeled “Ak-Chin or Desert O’odham (Two Villagers).”

\textsuperscript{14} Seymour’s recent work on the Sobaipuris (2007) does not change this analysis.
“Some of the Sobaipuris may have copied the [irrigation structures of the Gila River] Pimas where conditions allowed” (p. 10). “[T]he O’odham did not consider them [the Gila Pimas] part of the same family. They were more like distant cousins” (Ibid.:13).

“With the exception of the Gila River Pimas, the Spanish considered all the northern Pimas ‘Papagos’” (Ibid.:51).

**Pimas instead**

I suggest two possible explanations for Spanish speakers’ early lack of identification of the people populating the TNHP landscape. The first, which I favor, is that these O’odham seemed to Kino and Mange to be like the Upper Pimas to the south, with whom these two had been dealing for some time. For them, these people would be the unmarked, default subset of Pimas, so they saw no need to identify them further. Castetter and Bell (1942:4-6) and Spicer (1962:119, 123) come to similar conclusions.

Another possibility, which I find less likely, is that the inhabitants were a mélange whom Spanish speakers found unidentifiable except as members of the Upper Piman tradition. Situated in the midst of the Sobaipuris, Pápagos, and other Upper Pimans to the south, this stretch of the Santa Cruz might have been the site of a heightened mixing that challenged classification, as it apparently was during prehistory. This seems relatively unlikely because I have not found historical comments to the effect. For example, Spanish-speaking observers after Kino and Mange made distinctions among the local inhabitants. The priests undoubtedly engaged in some inconsistencies, but the Mission 2000 records do refer to fairly even numbers of Pimas and
Pápagos, along with fewer Apaches, Yaquis, Yumas, and Níjoras, and occasional ‘mixes’ such as “Pima/Pápago.” If this diversity had existed upon Kino’s entrance, it seems likely that he or Mange would have noted it.

*Sobaipuri relocations*

I will now consider the Sobaipuris’ relocations during the eighteenth century. This discussion will address two issues: 1) the relationship of the O’odham living in Tumacácori, Calabazas, and Guevavi to the Sobaipuris and 2) the type of group feeling among O’odham.

Some confusion exists concerning the basics of one of these relocations. According to Donohue (1960, cited in Fontana 1996:13; see also DiPeso 1956:64), in 1762, struggles with Apaches led Sobaipuris to move en masse to Soamca, Tucson, and Bac. Nentvig (1980:73), writing in 1764, reports that they dispersed to Soamca, Guevavi, Sonoitac, Bac, and Tucson. Sheridan (2006:51) reports that, instead, the Spanish governor ordered the resettlement, which was to Soamca, Sonoitac, and Tucson. Given that Mission 2000 has no records of Sobaipuris living at Guevavi, I suspect that all or almost all relocated to sites that did not include Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas. That is, they appear to have moved to places identified already as “Sobaipuri,” rather than to those not identified as such. While incomplete, this evidence further supports the ideas that: a) the people residing around Tumacácori were not Sobaipuris and b) these differences were important enough among O’odham – at least among the Sobaipuris – to strongly affect among whom they wanted to live.
“[T]he Sobaipuris were removed or driven … to the villages of the Gila River Pimas or to the Santa Cruz River near Bac and Tucson” (Erickson 1994:51).

Sonoitac was a visita of Tumacácori-Guevavi inhabited mostly by Sobaipuris. It suffered a particularly violent attack by Apaches in 1770.\textsuperscript{15} Apparently, some inhabitants remained in 1773, and some either remained, returned, or moved there until the 1780s.\textsuperscript{16} However, in 1774-1775 and perhaps longer, all or part of the population lived as refugees around Calabazas. Likewise, a significant part (and perhaps all) of the population of Guevavi also relocated to Calabazas for fear of Apache attacks (Kessell 1976:89, 101). There, the people of Sonoitac, Guevavi, and Calabazas lived in separate rancherías, with separate Indian officials. Kessell (1976:89), in reporting this, writes, “Evidently they hoped to return home one day,” but it is unclear whether this is his inference or that of a contemporary observer.

What might be inferred from this separateness? Because the people of Guevavi and those of Sonoitac engaged in it, this division is unlikely to be based on ethnic difference: surely one or both were similar to the people of Calabazas. What it seems to highlight more is that group feelings and social divisions of different sorts did exist among the O’odham at that time. Perhaps, á la Kessell, place-based loyalties and organization were important.

Overall, then, it appears that the term ‘Sobáipuri’ referred to a distinct group of O’odham who did not populate or at least predominate at Tumacácori and Guevavi. The Sobaipuris felt enough kinship with other Sobaipuris to prefer to live among them, rather than among other O’odham subgroups.

\textsuperscript{16} Http://www.nps.gov/tuma/sonoitac.html, accessed 6/28/06.
O’odham divisions and organization

Perhaps the influence of O’odham leaders led their followers to maintain separate camps in Calabazas in the 1770s. Mange (1926:314) provided a description of O’odham political organization, explicitly for the purpose of correcting other Spanish-speakers’ reports: “They have no government or laws … and so each one lives in liberty, without knowing in each pueblo a higher ranked person than some Indian – he who talks most, incites him to fight most with the enemy nations, or indicates times to hunt to them.” Mange notes that some leaders have had many followers, such as Coro and then Turumisani among Sobaipuris and such as Soba to the southwest, for whom the Spanish named the Sobas. “But all this recognition is just talk, without more fealty, obedience, and subjection than each one doing what he wants.”

“Men … met in the evenings to plan the next day’s activities and make important decisions about important matters like farming, hunting, defense, and moving. … The elders of the village assembled to make decisions for the whole group.” (Erickson 1994:11)

“[S]omeone had to organize the war party and set it in motion, but such leadership and alliances were only temporary” (Ibid.:13).

17 My translation of: “Gobierno no tienen alguno, ni leyes … y asi cada uno vive en su libertad, sin conocer en cada pueblo mas superior que algum indio, el que mas habla, mas le incita a pelear con las naciones enemigas, o les senala tiempos de cazar. … mas todo este reconocimiento se queda en lo dicho, sin mas feudo, obediencia y sujeción que hacer cada uno lo que quiere”.
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“Because the various O’odham groups were not organized under a governing group or one leader, different bands or villages sometimes engaged in power struggles” (Ibid.:26).

Prestige

Mange describes similarities and differences among these people. For example, he recognizes that they share the same language, with slight differences (1926:259, 314). And he notes what are, to him, essential similarities (1926:259): “the Soba and Sobaipuri nation … although in different regions and factions, is one and the same”. However, he implies that the Sobaipuris and some other Pimas (although not the Sobas) looked down on the Pápagos: “those of the North … hold and esteem those of the West little, and truly the latter recognize in the former some superiority and look at them with special respect” (1926:313). Likewise, Nentvig (1980:99) reports that mission Indians at Bac (probably Sobáipuris) drew a similar distinction: “when urged to be obedient [they] reply, ‘Maybe you think we are Pápagos?’” If these writers accurately described widely held attitudes of Pápago inferiority, then perhaps we have a window into one of the reasons that Sobaipuris chose to live separately and/or that Pápagos joined the missions.

18 My translation: "la nación Pima, Soba y Sobaipuris, que aunque en distintas regiones y facciones es una misma
19 My translation: "los del Norte ... tienen y estiman en poco a los del Poniente y verdaderamente que estos ... reconocen en aquellos alguna superioridad ylos miran con especial respeto".
Another difference between the Pimas and Pápagos was economic. The river-dwelling Pimas relied more on agriculture, were more sedentary, and were wealthier than the Pápagos in material terms. The Pápagos, smaller-scale agriculturalists, moved seasonally. Both groups hunted and gathered, too. O’odham used the mission lands for each of these three subsistence activities.

At least by the early mission period, and likely before it, “periodically the Pápagos came in to trade with or work for the relatively better-off river Pimas” (Kessell 1970: 13; see also p. 140 and Di Peso 1956:58-59). Perhaps this difference in economic power led to or bolstered the different displays of attitudes toward each other that Mange and Nentvig noted. Perhaps it gave Pimas leverage over Pápagos’ allegiance in conflicts with other groups and motivated some Pápagos to adapt to mission discipline among the Pimas. At the least, it suggests that Pimas did not consider the land that they held to be generalized O’odham territory. However, their work in Pimas’ fields indicates that some Pápagos had vital connections to this landscape as part of their strategy for survival. And, because this difference helped to motivate an economic relationship between these O’odham subgroups, it probably also led to considerable mutual influence (Di Peso 1956:59), to ritual relationships including but not limited to marriage, and to occasional incorporation. Indeed, Nentvig (1980:72) averred in 1764 that, “because those who have been converted still have dealings with the unconverted of their tribe, the converts are unstable, more barbarous, and firmly attached to their heathen customs, superstitions, debaucheries, and indecent dances.”
Other divisions

In summary, the reasons for the divisions among O’odham in Calabazas are unclear. Their desire to live separately contradicts Mange’s assertion that the O’odham had almost no political organization, but the changes that the Spanish brought, especially missionization and the appointment of Indian officials, might have created or intensified reasons for solidarity and division among O’odham since he had written. Thus, it seems unlikely that O’odham in the eighteenth century felt that they shared usufruct as a single group over all of the Pimería Alta – and over the Upper Santa Cruz mission lands in particular. Nor does it seem, as some have claimed, that the O’odham were essentially one people, with no divisions.

“However, loyalty was bound more closely to local groups than to the region because even though the O’odham were unified by similar traditions and language, there were considerable differences among separate groups. The ancient O’odham had no tribal government and apparently no formal leadership positions beyond those in the village” (Erickson 1994:12).

“In addition to language divisions, different groups of O’odham also had their own origin legends. Other characteristics used to determine who belonged to which group were physical appearance, behavior, and personality, but the easier way to tell which group someone belonged to was to find out where he or she lived” (Ibid: 13).

“The O’odham were not a people in a political sense. Instead, their sense of belonging came from similar traditions and ways of life, language and related legends, and experiences shared in surviving in a beautiful but not entirely hospitable land” (Ibid: 18).

However, I have found no evidence to suggest that O’odham felt that particular agricultural lands or settlements belonged spiritually to a particular subset of them. They did move about considerably and live together when expedient. Thus, they seem to have felt that many places in the region could be a fit home for them and that the fate of other O’odham was linked to their own.

**Individual sites**

I will now discuss O’odham connections during the mission era to the three sites of visitas that the Park Service controls: Guevavi, Calabazas, and Tumacácori. I will focus mostly on demographic information. My purpose here is not to recount the detailed history of the mission system. Kessell (1970, 1976), among others listed in the bibliography, has done that. My purpose is to document the sorts of connections listed in the introduction to this report.

**Guevavi**

A note about the pronunciation of “Guevavi”

I have heard present-day speakers pronounce “Guevavi” as having either a ‘w’ sound after the ‘g’ – as in “agua” – or, more often, simply a ‘g’ sound, as in “guitarra.” Evidence supports each pronunciation as existent among Spanish speakers during colonial times and, thus,
among the O’odham from whom it originated. On the one hand, rarely I have encountered a text that refers to Guevavi as “Huevavi” (cf. Pedro Font in Montané Martí 2000:57). Since the vast majority of references are to “Guevavi,” these unusual references raise the question of whether some or all contemporaries pronounced the name as if the ‘u’ had an umlaut over it: ‘Güevavi.’ If that were the case, a significant number of original texts should include this diacritical mark, but none of the transcriptions of documents that I have consulted in this research have recorded this mark, nor did a sample of scanned documents available online through the Mission 2000 database. Thus, it seems likely that most speakers pronounced the first syllable of Guevavi much like the English word “gay”; however, the origins of the divergent spellings remain mysterious.

*Ethnic affiliations*

Little data has been published regarding the ethnic identity of Guevavi’s inhabitants. Already I have argued that it seems likely that there, as in Tumacácori, the inhabitants who greeted Kino and Mange were non-Sobaipuri Upper Pimas. I was unable to find a census that breaks down Guevavi’s population by ethnicity. However, Mission 2000 does have 95 records that specify an ethnicity for people associated with Guevavi either through their birth, death, residence, burial, or service there. Their numbers are as follows:
Table 4-1: Ethnic affiliations of people associated with Guevavi in Mission 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic grouping</th>
<th>Individual group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austriaco</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De razón</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Español/a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Español/a criollo/a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italiano</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mestizo/a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moraviano</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sardo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swiss</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tudesco</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vizcaíno</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vizcaíno Criollo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indio/a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nijora</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ópata</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pápago</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My goal here is to determine which ethnic groups – especially Native Americans – have had members affiliated with this landscape. The numbers, being dependent on missionaries’ practices and mission documents’ survival over centuries, are probably misleading regarding the relative strength of different groups’ associations. What this table does reveal is that important aspects of the lives of members of at least six Indian groups (discounting Nijoras and Indios as separate groups) took place in Guevavi. European connections to Guevavi are similarly varied.
This chapter focuses on the O’odham, and subsequent chapters will discuss other groups’ associations.

Unfortunately, only nineteen of these records specify dates for this association, and this is insufficient to identify trends with confidence. However, for the sake of completeness, the following table presents them. When an individual is reported to have more than one relationship to Guevavi, the dates included are for the first recorded relationship, such as birth. The periods are not meant to be comparable between groups; rather, they might aid in contemplating the relationship of a single group to Guevavi. I made the period divisions somewhat arbitrarily: whenever a gap of five years exists between records.

Table 4-2: Ethnic affiliations of people with dates of association with Guevavi in Mission 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Earliest mention, per individual</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indians</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1759</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijora</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pápago</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimas</td>
<td>1772-1773</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaquis</td>
<td>1814-1819</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meager data in the two tables above indicate, not surprisingly, that Pimas and Pápagos experienced important events in Guevavi. No mention is made of Sobaipuris, although they might be included as Pimas.
**Calabazas**

The evidence regarding the changing demographic profile of Calabazas is similarly sparse. Mission 2000 contains records of associations among the following groups:

**Table 4-3: Ethnic affiliations of people associated with Calabazas in Mission 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic grouping</th>
<th>Individual group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De razón</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indio</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pápago</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pima</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When limited to the twelve records with dates, I found:

**Table 4-4: Ethnic affiliations of people with dates of association with Calabazas in Mission 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Earliest mention, per individual</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indians</td>
<td>1810-1820</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pápago</td>
<td>1773-1774</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimas</td>
<td>1773-1774</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data also provide further evidence that both Pimas and Pápagos had significant associations with Calabazas and that, if Sobaipuris are recorded here, it is generically as Pimas.
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The four Pimas listed for 1773 and 1774 – two births and two deaths – call into question a visitor’s description that Calabazas in 1766 was “a small pueblo formerly of Pimas Altos, who all perished due to a severe epidemic, and repopulated with Pápagos” (quoted in Kessell 1976:37). I suspect that this was hyperbole, but perhaps some Pimas returned or moved to the village in the intervening years.

*Tumacácori*

Considerably more data has survived regarding the demographics of Tumacácori. This comparative abundance includes several published descriptions and 526 records in Mission 2000.
### Table 4-5: Ethnic affiliations of people associated with Tumacácori in Mission 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic grouping</th>
<th>Individual group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catalán</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De razón</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Español/{}'.format(a)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Español criollo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vizcaíno</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vizcaíno criollo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apache</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apache-Pima</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cristiano Pápago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indio/a</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nijora</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ópata</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papab’ootam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pápago/{}'.format(a)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pápago-Yaqui</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pima</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pima-Pápago/{}'.format(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yaqui</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma or Apache</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuma-Pima</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* One person was labeled “Ópata; De razón,” so he is listed under both.

Two hundred eight records contain dates:
Table 4-6: Ethnic affiliations of people with dates of association with Tumacácori in Mission 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Earliest mention, per individual</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Indians</strong></td>
<td>1772</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1777-1779</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1785-1787</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1792-1795</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1804-1810</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apaches</strong></td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1803-1808</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1813-1814</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indios</strong></td>
<td>1796-1811</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opata</strong></td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pápagos</strong></td>
<td>1771-1781</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1786-1805</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1812-1814</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pápago-Pima</strong></td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pápago-Yaqui</strong></td>
<td>1785-1792</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pimas</strong></td>
<td>1774-1780</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1790-1825</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pima-Yuma</strong></td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yaquis</strong></td>
<td>1789-1796</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1807-1819</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yumas</strong></td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1805</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Beginning in 1785, most non-Indians were born in this mission complex, especially in Tumacácori.
These tables reveal that both Pimas and Papagos experienced significant events in Tumacácori, as did at least two of their Papab’ootam relatives to the south. Moreover, the data hint that missions were places where people from different O’odham subgroups mated with each other or with people from other Indian groups. Once again, no records specify Sobáipuris.

Other sources, mostly Kessell (1976), provide further details regarding Tumacácori’s demographic history during the mission period. Perhaps the most important event was the relocation and repopulation of Tumacácori after the Pima Revolt of 1751. The mission was moved from the east to the west side of the Santa Cruz River, Papagos were recruited to live at the mission, and Spanish troops forced the O’odham who had resettled Tubac after the revolt to join the mission at Tumacácori (Kessell 1976:38). Nentvig (1980:126) wrote: “The [Pima] Indians were moved to Tumacácori where they lack the good land of Tubac and can only sow seasonally.”

As mentioned above, some Papagos – possibly adapting pre-mission patterns to new circumstances – were only seasonal residents at Tumacácori and, presumably, the other mission sites. As Kessell (1976:38-39) notes: “Transient Papagos would continue to show up at planting and harvesting times to work and fill their bellies … Some would stay.” Their seasonal visits took place from October to February and from May through July (Kessell 1976:185). However, they said that fear of fatal disease kept them from settling in the mission. Nonetheless, Father Ximeno reported in 1773 that “recently converted” Papagos made up three-fourths of the visitas’ residents (Kessell 1976:79). It is possible he was counting during a time when Papagos were visiting, but it is also possible that the percentage was so high because so many Pimas had died or moved away. Indeed, Guevavi was abandoned around this time. Because the Totokwan,
Koklolodi, and Himuris subgroups of the O’odham lived closest to these mission lands (Erickson 1994:14), it is likely that Pápago visitors and settlers came most often from them.

In 1797, the mission priest provided further evidence of these mixed indications regarding Pápago’s attitudes toward missionization. Pápago made up the largest subset of Tumacácori’s population – about half – and Pimas made up about one-third. However, the Pápago tended to be younger, less stable in their residence, and, perhaps as a result, less likely to hold an official position. The missionary reported that the mission had attracted no recent additions. He “had heard that five Pápago families who had come to work in the mission the previous year wanted to, but when their leader balked they went away.”

Moreover, an Indian told me that when this mission summons Pápago (for few come of their own will) to come and work, only the men come. They do not bring their women for fear that some will stay” (Kessell 1976:190). Kessell writes that the listing of Pápago married to Pima men in the 1797 census corroborated this fear. If this report is accurate, it would fit with the claim that Pimas had higher economic and perhaps social status, and it would provide a further reason, aside from fear of disease and spiritual independence, for Pápago’s oft-reported impermanence in the missions. Nonetheless, by this time Pápago had become the largest group of mission residents, even though they had not resided en masse along the Upper Santa Cruz before missionaries arrived.

A sign of the changing times was that, in 1801, Father Gutiérrez listed the native governor as Juan Legarra, a Pápago. However, Kessell points out that Gutiérrez changed some people’s ethnic designation from Pápago to Pima and vice versa. “Like Bordoy, he assigned the father’s tribal affiliation to the children, except in the case of Pápago couples, whose children he

---

21 This quote reinforces the sense that, at least at this point, some O’odham did have political leadership, despite Mange’s earlier claim to the contrary.
made Pimas” (Kessell 1976:201-202). These changes of label might have reflected both non-
Indians’ and O’odham’s sense of these divisions as behavioral rather than congenital.

**Becoming Pima**

Indeed, Juan Bautista de Anza, the Younger, provides support for the idea that the
difference between these two O’odham groups, at least from a Spanish viewpoint, was cultural.
First, he seemed to have difficulty distinguishing individuals’ group identity. The journal of his
1774 expedition to California contains scattered references such as “a Pápago, or Pima” (cf.
Montané Martí 1989:116). In one section, he discusses these groups’ similarities and differences
(Montané Martí 1989:61-63). First, he affirms that the only difference among O’odham was
behavioral – whether they had submitted to missionization: “Baipia or Aribaipia [Arivaipa]: In
this place we find two families from the Pápago nation, which in language and other customs is
the same as the Pima. There is no more difference than that the latter are more civilized due to
being reduced [i.e., concentrated] into Pueblos de Doctrina.” Then he writes that the majority of
O’odham who have submitted to missionization were Pápagos, which implies that they then
changed, in his eyes at least, into Pimas.

The majority who achieved this benefit have been the same Pápagos who, as
much due to their own will as due to the pressures from the political government,
have come down to the Pueblos [i.e., missions], with whom, since the year 1756, I
have seen them repopulate both the northern and the western Pimería, without
which circumstance both [regions] no longer would exist with such Pueblos as it
[the Pimería] has. …
Despite Spanish attempts to missionize the remaining Pápagos, some or most of the others visited only seasonally and refused to settle permanently. Thus, to Anza they remained Pápagos.

In order to be close to our settlements, they frequently live in them – both those of Spaniards and those of Indians – especially in the winter season, in which time they leave the country practically deserted.

…

Despite all the misery and disgraces that have always been noted in the land of the Papaguería, it has not been possible to reduce [i.e., concentrate] them so that they establish themselves in our lands, despite the many advantages and considerations that have been offered to them.\(^{22}\)

Consistent with this interpretation, Anza refers to the mission areas still as the Pimería and the non-missionized areas as the Papaguería.

---

\(^{22}\) My translation: “Baipia o Aribaipia: En este sitio encontramos con dos familias de la Nación Pápaga que en el idioma y demás costumbres es lo mismo que la Pima; no hay más diferencia que el que estos se hallan más civilizados por estar reducidos a Pueblos de Doctrina, los más que lograron este beneficio han sido de los mismos Pápagos, que tanto por su voluntad, como por las persecuciones del gobierno político se han vajado a los Pueblos con los quales desde el ano de 1756 al presente, he visto repoblan tanto, la Pimería de Norte, como la del Poniente, sin cuya circunstancia no existieran ya ambas con los tales quales Pueblos que tiene ... con el motivo de su inmediación a nuestras poblaciones viven frecuentemente en ellas tanto de Espanoles, como de Indios en especial la estación del Imbierno, en cuyo tiempo dejan casi desierto el País.

…

Con todas las desdichas e infelicidades que siempre se ha notado en el terreno de la Papaguería, no se ha podido conseguir reducirlos a que se establezcan en los nuestros…; por mas ventajas, y partidos que se le han ofrecido.”
O’odham demographic dominance?

In the census of 1801, Tumacácori had sixty-eight community members, sixty of whom were O’odham. These included thirty-seven Pimas and twenty-three Pápagos. In addition, it had thirty-nine resident workers, only five of whom were O’odham – all Pimas. So sixty-five out of 107 residents were O’odham. In 1805, it had eighty-two Indians but an equal number of non-Indians (Kessell 1976:201-202). Nonetheless, in 1820, Indians were again the majority, with 121 out of 196 residents. Kessell argues that Tumacácori still had a high mortality rate among Indians and attracted few O’odham. Rather than growing due to natural increase among O’odham mission residents, it attracted non-Indians and non-O’odham Indians.

Recap

The O’odham spoke similar dialects of the same language, but they were not otherwise a single group. Historical evidence suggests that they recognized different types of division that affected their relationship to what became mission lands. While other divisions may have had effect, one salient division for which evidence exists was between the Sobáipuri Pimas, other Pimas, and Pápagos, with a clearer split between all of the river-dwelling Pimas and the more mobile Pápagos. The non-Sobáipuri Pimas were the main inhabitants of this landscape when missionaries arrived, and some Pimas remained on the landscape – despite dislocations within it – to the end of the mission system. Before missionaries arrived, Pápagos might have visited these Pima farming communities seasonally as laborers and at other times for trade or other sorts of social, spiritual, and economic interaction. Some might have settled, perhaps due to marriage.

23 A transcription of the census is available online at: http://www.cdarc.org/pages/heritage/rio_nuevo/people/records/1801_pimeria.php, accessed 8/5/06.
with Pimas. Pápagos definitely engaged in these patterns during the mission period. By the end of the period, they probably constituted the largest group of Indians in this mission, in which, accepted by the missionary as permanent members of the community, they farmed their own plots as Pimas did. Indeed, it is possible that this change in position led them or others to identify them eventually as Pimas. Independent of that question, their economic position might have led them to employ non-resident Pápagos as seasonal laborers and to trade with them as Pimas did. In short, over the course of a century a mission among the Pimas became a mission among the O’odham.

Other connections

Thus far, I have discussed issues surrounding who among the O’odham resided, even if temporarily, in the mission communities. A main draw for these people seems to have been economic: to farm or trade. I also have pointed out that some O’odham relocated to or within this area as the result of conflict. However, O’odham established other connections with this landscape during the mission period, sometimes as part of their residence there and sometimes as part of their separation from it.

Religious change

Spanish society supported missions to effect changes in Native Americans’ spirituality. Like Indians, Spanish speakers regarded all or almost all practices – such as settlement patterns – as having a spiritual character. But some practices were explicitly focused on religious belief,

24 Spicer (1962) discusses religious, political, linguistic, and many other changes among the Native American groups of what is now the U.S. Southwest and Northwest Mexico.
and, within this domain, missionaries taught Catholic beliefs and rituals to Native Americans in the missions or in the areas that the priests visited. And they tried to suppress, often with force, Indian rituals that did not conform to Catholicism.

As a result, missionization changed Indian communities profoundly. While it is unlikely that many O’odham fully accepted European Catholicism and rejected all nonconforming spiritual beliefs, many did convert officially and at least hid O’odham spiritual beliefs and practices. This retraction of non-Catholic spirituality from public spaces might have led to the extinction of some aspects of O’odham belief. In addition, O’odham’s version of Christian beliefs and rituals spread throughout the region, as they, like Europeans, combined different spiritual traditions to make sense of their situations.

Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas must have had an important role in this process of religious change. However, I have found only mixed indications that Christian O’odham in recent years have preserved or looked to these sites as icons of this process. For example, in an exhaustive survey of O’odham chapels, Griffith (1974, 1992) does not mention Tumacácori as a model for churches built by Franciscans or O’odham on the Tohono O’odham reservation. However, he does note a “San Xavier O’odham tradition” that a statue of San Francisco at Bac had come from Tumacácori (1992:46-47).

“They missionaries and Spanish authorities intended to change the traditions of native peoples, and they encouraged the O’odham to accept a European way of life. … For the most part, the O’odham viewed these changes with skepticism” (Erickson 1994:24).
“Some who did join the Catholic church shared their faith with members of their bands, but then they were left without supervision, which led to the development of Sonoran Catholicism. Converts usually assimilated into the villages or ranches of the [non-Indian] settlers and lost their identities as O’odham” (Ibid.:65).

Learning and teaching

Through missionization, O’odham learned a myriad of things. Some of these changes were the direct result of missionaries’ attempts at religious indoctrination. But also important were the technological changes that missionaries and other colonizers brought. Sheridan (2006:38-42) provides a discussion of the tremendous innovations in O’odham agriculture and husbandry that missionization spurred: new crops, new animals, and new techniques. The colonizers also brought new weapons; styles of dress; materials, such as steel; architectural designs and techniques; styles of interaction and organization, such as waged labor and the cash economy; skills, such as reading and horseback riding; language; food-preparing techniques; and much more (cf. Erickson 1994:54). The missions were key sites in which O’odham learned about and adapted these innovations.

On a smaller scale, missions also were places where O’odham taught Spanish speakers and other Native Americans, intentionally or not, about their shared space. Insofar as non-O’odham made use of this knowledge and communicated it to others, missions served as a place where O’odham helped shape other groups’ lives.
“The priests and their guards mistook the O’odham’s curiosity for a desire to hear the religious message they had brought … It is more likely that the O’odham wanted to trade with these men for their tools and animals, or to learn practical skills” (Erickson 1994:34).

“The missions also encouraged the O’odham to abandon traditional food-gathering in favor of farming” (Ibid.:65).

Names

As part of missionization, priests renamed Christianized O’odham. This and perhaps other pressures have led to many O’odham today having names from Spanish-speaking society, such as Rubén and López.

Underhill argues that non-Catholic spiritual beliefs among the O’odham led them to seek Spanish names through baptism. In O’odham spirituality, “naming by a shaman was already a well-known source of power” (1969:313). “The names were thought to possess magic and were not used in later life” (1978:41). Thus, O’odham, including Pápagos, flocked to baptisms because “it seems probable that the Desert People were anxious to add power from a white shaman to what they already had” (1969:313). Some Pápagos “remained aloof from the churches, merely making their occasional trips ‘to get names’” (1969:314).

At the same time, O’odham have provided unique and enduring names for both Tumacácori and Guevavi (Griffith 1992:29), although their original pronunciation and meaning have become debatable among O’odham and others over time.
Disease

While the economic benefits of mission life attracted O’odham, mission communities’ association with fatal disease kept others away. Sheridan (1988:161-163) writes that “some Pimans came … to associate the waters of baptism and the tolling of church bells with the spread of disease. … Fear of disease undoubtedly drove many Pimans to resist missionization and to flee the Europeans.” This was particularly so, he argues, since Pimans would have regarded priests as shamans, who could inflict disease on others.

“Because the O’odham judged a medicine man by his effectiveness, they were perfectly willing to listen to a Jesuit missionary … When such an event as the baptism of an ill infant seemed to have a healing effect, the O’odham would believe the Christian messages, and at the priest’s next appearance, he would be welcomed openly. However, the O’odham also would expect more of him. … If subsequent actions failed to produce a desired effect, the priest could lose the prestige he had gained initially” (Erickson 1994:34).

“The missionaries were no more effective when it came to healing the sick or bringing good luck than the medicine men” (Ibid.:37).

“Many who did reside on or near the missions died from diseases and thus did not pass the European cultural influence on to their children or the people outside the mission” (Ibid.:53).
Disease also changed the ethnic profile of the missions, as missions recruited or at least welcomed Pápagos to replace deceased Pimas (cf. Fontana 1971:69-70). Conversely, Erickson (1994:50-51) argues that O’odham fleeing epidemics along the rivers joined others in the desert, reducing the differences among them in communities away from the missions. If either of these types of migration led to intermarriage or at least breeding, then disease probably helped to generalize the cultural and biological heritage of mission O’odham among all O’odham.

However, Oblasser reports the story of Carnación, who said that an epidemic, which must have occurred in the second half of the nineteenth century, wiped out almost all of the Pimas at San Xavier del Bac. “All the rest here are Papagos, who have come from the desert. I do not tell them what I know, for they do not believe me; they just make fun of me” (1931:98). So it is unsafe to assume that these disease-induced migrations inevitably led to high levels of cultural or biological intermingling.

Thus, the high rate of serious illness at the missions repelled some O’odham but made room for others. In addition, it profoundly shaped the mission’s – and thus the O’odham’s – demographics. And it added a reason for O’odham to oppose the mission. Finally, many people died and received burial in mission communities, and disease shaped their numbers, ethnic identity, and ages.

**Defense**

The mission landscape was one of intermittent violence. Some O’odham defended this land against groups of other Native Americans, particularly Apaches. O’odham eventually

---

25 This quote further bolsters the argument that O’odham recognized significant divisions among themselves.
migrated away from Tumacácori, Calabazas, and Guevavi because of recurring Apache attacks.\footnote{I discuss the motives for and the implications of these attacks in the chapter on Apaches’ affiliations with this landscape.}

It is possible that O’odham and Apaches engaged in violent conflicts there before Kino arrived, but the arrival of Spanish-speaking society increased the stakes considerably. The Spanish brought more-moveable resources for Apaches to take and new modes of transport that helped attackers to withdraw much more quickly. In both cases, the horse stands as an example. Further, the Spanish introduced new weapons, such as guns and swords, which were more deadly than pre-existing technologies in some situations. In addition, Spain’s state-level organization meant that a battle could trigger a drawn-out campaign involving troops from adjoining regions.

The cooperation of some O’odham, especially Pimas, with Spanish religious, military, and civil institutions intensified their hostilities with Apaches. Missions were sites that O’odham defended, and, because Spanish speakers administered them, they became sites where the alliance between O’odham and Spanish interests deepened.

The hostilities with Apaches were not one-way. Justifying their assaults as retaliations, O’odham and Spanish forces and Apaches attacked each other in extended cycles.\footnote{See Alonso (1995) for an in-depth exploration of this process between Apaches and Spanish-speaking settlers in Chihuahua.} The O’odham took, or retrieved, goods from the Apaches, but all sides also took captives.\footnote{Brooks (2002) discusses this phenomenon across the “Southwest borderlands.”} This was a common practice among Native American groups and Spanish speakers throughout northern New Spain. The raiding groups might kill, adopt, enslave, or sell these captives. Some controversy has existed from that time to this over the extent to which different groups “adopted” or “enslaved” captives. All groups tended to incorporate women and children by force more often than men, whom they were more likely to kill (cf. Kessell 1976:79).
Mission settlements, as targets of attacks, were thus places to which some O’odham were denied a greater connection. This resulted either from fear of raids or from being taken in a raid. It is possible, though, that captured O’odham had an indirect relationship to the missions through their new relationship with Apaches who engaged in later raids there. For example, captives may have eaten food taken then or later from the mission. As I will develop later, it also is likely that Apaches who were incorporated by force into O’odham society became mission residents or peaceful visitors.

In summary, missions remained areas that O’odham defended against Native American attacks. Missionization and the defense of their villages extended O’odham’s ties – including ones they perceived as negative – to both Spanish-speaking and Apache societies. 

“The Apaches … became so despised for their raids that the O’odham word for ‘enemy’ also means ‘Apache.’ When the Apaches began to invade O’odham lands, the peaceful O’odham had to … defend themselves. At times, the O’odham also assembled to attack the Apaches to prevent future raids.

“The Apaches were not interested in much of the land, but they wanted food, goods, women, and children.” (Erickson 1994:13).

“The ancestors of today’s Tohono O’odham were a peaceful, nonaggressive people who usually were able to reside amiably with their neighbors. Most of the neighbors were also peaceful. However, some tribes, such as the Apaches, dominated the less-aggressive peoples of the region” (Ibid.:16).
The O’odham “often joined forces with the Spaniards, and in many battles, their ability to fight and defend their lands won the Spaniards’ respect” (Ibid.:25).

---

**H:** [Apaches took] horses, cattle, even the women … I bet there are lots of Pápagos … in the Apache [unintelligible]

**T:** There must be cousins that you don’t know about.

**H:** That’s what I mean.

---

**B:** … we are friendly to the Apache, this was a long time ago, we don't have no fear, like they used to a long time ago ... Now I work with them. … There's no, there's no difference, we are all friendly and all that you know. … I work with the B.I. and they have all kinds of um different tribes in that, works, and you know we get along together, we never, you know, my boss was an Apache and I worked with him ... Just like any person. When I go to Apache reservation, in San Carlos, ‘cause I go up there and work in Coolidge Dam, and um, I meet with all different Apaches, no different, no difference. Except that they live up there and we live down here.

**T:** Right, right. Do people joke about that? About the old days?

**B:** No, they don't, they don't really talk about it, about how long time ago they used to attack uh, the Tohono O'odham down here. … And uh, um, the way I heard it you know they come for food or whatever you know, to take it away from the Tohono O'odham, but I don't, you
know, they're trying to survive too I guess, or whatever or I don't know. … But I never really hear bad things about, you know.

**Opposition**

Some O’odham also opposed Spanish involvement in these lands, including missionization. They acted in different ways to express their differing levels of antagonism to various aspects of Spanish-speakers’ activities. The mission lands are sites in which O’odham expressed this opposition either directly, for example through attacks, or indirectly, for example by avoidance.

Some O’odham physically attacked the mission settlements. These attacks included a full assault during the Pima Revolt 1751. Kessell’s account (1970:105-118) implies that Pimas from other villages – as close as Tubac – conducted the early, direct attacks and that Guevavi’s inhabitants simply fled. Later, some joined the rebels and participated in sacking Guevavi’s church and the priest’s quarters. Others remained in the hinterland to avoid the conflict. Eventually, this uprising led to the creation of a presidio at Tubac and to the relocation of Tumacácori across the river. The widespread participation in this influential event means that many O’odham today must be descended from participants, even if they never resided in the mission area.

“[A]fter their first experiences with the European-based civilization, most O’odham rejected the mission programs. … First, many of the missionaries and settlers … took the best lands of the O’odham. Second, the settlers and miners who employed the native people often treated
them unfairly. … Although some of the O’odham who had accepted Catholicism stayed to work at the missions or on the farms, many of the O’odham who had lived in these fertile regions lost use of the land completely. This forced them to adopt seasonal migration” (Erickson 1994:36).

“[T]he missionaries often whipped the O’odham for any minor offense, and especially for participation in native traditional activities. Because the O’odham did not believe in corporal punishment, they resented this treatment even more” (Ibid.:39).

“Luis … accused [the Jesuits] of using lands set aside for the O’odham, and of severely and unjustly punishing anyone who questioned their commands. Garrucho at Guevavi … [was among] the most serious offenders” (Ibid.:45).

“For the O’odham, the rebellion seemed, at first, a success. Most of the Christianized Indians and settlers were removed from their lands” (Ibid.:42).

After the Pima Rebellion, “the Spaniards completely or partly abandoned … Guevavi … and Tumacácori. This was an advantage for the O’odham, of course, but only for a decade or two” (Ibid.:46).

In addition, some O’odham also engaged in smaller raids. For several years after the Pima Revolt, Pima raiders took livestock and Native American residents from the mission and
Tubac and killed others. Mission residents fought back. Since most of the people who suffered from raids were O’odham, the missions had become sites of intra-O’odham conflict.

Other forms of resistance to aspects of missionization were more common than open violence. For example, Father Segesser accused O’odham of fatally poisoning his predecessor, Father Grazhoffer (Kessell 1970:53). Then Segesser suspected that shamans had caused his own serious illness (Kessell 1970: 56). Also, Kessell reports (1970:110) that the O’odham of Guevavi resisted the imposition of a new priest for a year after the Pima Revolt.

Sometimes the O’odham resisted missionaries’ rules. Kessell (1970: 54-55) highlights missionaries’ long history of failed attempts to end O’odham’s drunkenness, which at least sometimes was part of seasonal rituals. And, in 1786, O’odham curers apparently still practiced in Calabazas (Kessell 1976:170).

Perhaps the most common method of opposing Spanish-speaking society was to avoid it physically. I have made scattered references to this tactic throughout the preceding discussion. As further examples, Kessell (1970: 55) implies that Segesser, at least, moderated his disciplinary actions to avoid abandonment of the mission. Perhaps more often, O’odham stayed away because they associated missions with death. In the 1760s, Pápagos abandoned Tumacácori due to an epidemic, although Pimas stayed (Kessell 1970:160). In 1734, O’odham along the Santa Cruz, including in Guevavi, fled the missions due to a rumor that troops were going to kill them (Kessell 1970:57). The fear of attacks by Apaches was also a constant deterrent to settling in mission communities (cf. Kessell 1976:79, Officer 1987:49). Indeed, this motivated O’odham’s ultimate abandonment of Tumacácori in 1848.
Between the Jesuit and Franciscan periods, “the O’odham who converted to Christianity often abandoned the missions to rejoin their families” (Erickson 1994:47).

**Birth and death**

Birth and death were two common and important results of many of the connections that O’odham had with the missions, unfortunately occurring within a short interval for many. I have not found a discussion of any particular attachment among O’odham for their birthplaces.

Catholic mission burials were an innovation, based on beliefs that differed from those that the O'odham had developed. The O’odham “had a feeling that death is dangerous to the remaining members of the family for the dead person is lonely and will try to take them with him if he can. Therefore, they buried the dead person as quickly as possible and though they loved him, tried not to think of him” (Underhill 1978:44; see also 1969:323). It is possible that O’odham feel a significant affiliation with the mission’s burial grounds but also want to avoid it.

**Asymmetric interpenetrating articulation**

As shown above, one of the consequences of missionization was the development of new divisions among O’odham, depending on their relationship to the missions. The mission landscape, thus, was a site in which these divisions – religious, economic, social – were created and developed.

This differentiation was part of pattern in which Spanish colonizers made their institutions an intrinsic aspect of conquered Native American groups. This process was unequal: Native Americans inserted their institutions into Spanish ones much less frequently and mostly
through Native Americans adapting to Spanish expectations. Thus, the Spanish defined the context in which both they and the O’odham acted more than the O’odham defined it.

An example of this process was the Spanish procedure of naming officials within Native American settlements and sometimes larger groups. These officials had titles and functions that the Spanish defined (Kessell 1970:76). A crucial requirement was loyalty to Spanish institutions. But antagonisms among Spaniards meant that O’odham could be caught up in and perhaps try to take advantage of divisions among the colonizers. Due to the missionary’s intimate involvement in mission communities, this process occurred more intensively in places such as Tumacácori. Because U.S. Indian policy has continued this pattern of penetrating articulation, the mission landscape can serve as a reminder that this pattern, and O’odham adaptations to it, developed in such sites. That is, missions were key sites in which O’odham became incorporated, however partially, into a state society, as a subordinate group.

“"The Spanish government also created civilian offices among the natives, issuing canes as symbols of authority. … but the civilian offices represented by the canes probably were not very important to the O’odham. Since the Spaniards usually gave the canes to leaders of the village, it is unlikely the canes … changed the power or respect for the newly commissioned leader. … the O’odham did not recognize Spanish authority … The O’odham probably accepted the canes as interesting gifts or curiosities” (Erickson 1994:26).

Missionaries “often issued canes of office to converts who were not respected by group members” (Ibid.:37)
“Although the O’odham were generally unaware of the policies made by the Spaniards, they often felt the effects” (Ibid.:57).

Attachment

Overall, then, great changes among the O’odham occurred during the mission period. Many occurred on or at least in relationship to the mission lands.

What kind of attachment they felt to this land is unclear. I already have noted that at different times O’odham relocated to, within, and eventually out of the Upper Santa Cruz settlements. I have not found any evidence that they voiced spiritual objections to or reasons for these moves. Instead, the written historical evidence suggests that they moved for similar reasons as the Spanish speakers: economic opportunity and physical safety. This evidence supports the impression that the O’odham of Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas, by the 1800s, regarded this particular landscape primarily as an economic asset.

Economic

Few records in which O’odham seem to present their own viewpoint with relatively little filtering survive from this period. The papers relating to their successful petition for legal recognition of their landholdings at Tumacácori constitute an exception.²⁹ Both Kessell (1976:206-214) and Sheridan (2006:65-73) recount the contents of these documents in detail. I

²⁹ SED 207, 46th Cong., 2nd Session; see also HR 558, 47th Cong., 1st Session; SED 53, 48th Cong., 1st Session.
would like to highlight a few aspects germane to this discussion. First, the O’odham worked within the colonial system. They based their claim on the mission’s ownership or control of the land – not on aboriginal control. Indeed, they recognized their non-Indian neighbors’ property, even though it once had been under O’odham control. In addition, they expressed only economic concerns in their petition. Second, the O’odham governor of Tumacácori and other, unspecified O’odham directed the survey in 1807 that redefined their lands, and they did so in a public fashion. Third, they claimed only lands that would be productive for farming and ranching. The documents contain no expressions of their desire to control lands on the basis of their spiritual or emotional value.

Religious identity

The O’odham of Tumacácori fled the area for Bac in December 1848. Kessell writes, without providing a source, “Come spring they hoped to return” (1976:308). As late as 1855, items from the church at Tumacácori were “kept … separate from those of San Xavier” (Kessell 1976:318). This information supports the idea that at least some O’odham from Tumacácori felt affiliated with the church there – not simply the settlement – and hoped to repopulate the village as, at least in part, Catholics. It also provides a further indication of place-based divisions among O’odham.

“For those who converted to Catholicism … the missions provided a means for subsistence and religious instruction” (Erickson 1994:49).
Those O’odham who accepted the Spanish religion and way of life received land from the mission for their own use. In return for the privilege of working their own fields, converts had to work three days each week on the mission fields. … But only a few O’odham embraced the Catholic religion and lived on the missions. Most did not consider the missions permanent dwelling places, but came to the missions only for the planting and harvesting seasons or in times of need …” Declining baptisms in the late 1700s mean that “Perhaps they later felt that baptisms were less effective for protecting their children than their traditional medicine. Most left the missions and raised their children elsewhere” (Ibid.:50).

In the late 1700s, “records seem to indicate that the O’odham relied on missions as a refuge for the elderly and the infirm. Most likely the people saw missions as sanctuaries for those unable to take care of themselves in the desert. Life at the missions was easier, and food and shelter were available throughout the year” (Ibid.:50).

**Legal claim**

A decade later, they considered the former mission lands to still be theirs. In 1858, they petitioned for aid in reclaiming their lost lands, to no avail (Kessell 1976:319).\(^{30}\) It is unclear on what bases they felt ownership besides legality: aboriginal, spiritual, or other.

\(^{30}\) To see the terms that the O’odham used, I sought the letters that Kessell cites here, but the archivist was unable to find them.
Documentary bias?

It is possible that Spanish and Mexican institutions and expectations predetermined that the historical record would report only legal, economic, and Catholic attachments to these lands among the O’odham. Perhaps the O’odham whom Spanish speakers named as local officials and chose to interview were those who shared a similar worldview. Or perhaps these O’odham had learned to restrict their arguments to those that the Spanish speakers recognized. Or perhaps the O’odham expressed other attachments to this landscape, but the Spanish speakers preparing the official documents chose to ignore them. Nonetheless, the choices by O’odham were in line especially with an economic view of the land. Corroborating this interpretation is the lack of comments by missionaries about O’odham’s spiritual attachment to this landscape – despite observers having noted other comments among the O’odham regarding the spiritual character of places such as the Casa Grande (cf. Mange 1926:310-312).

In short, the written historical record suggests that the O’odham living in the mission communities came to see this landscape much as Spanish speakers did. They chose boundaries for the land grant on this basis, and they moved within the mission lands and away from them apparently without voicing any objection to losing their connection to a spiritual or aboriginal homeland.

However, they or other O’odham living elsewhere might have regarded the lands differently from this. Oblasser (1931:98) reports that Carnación, an elderly woman living at San Xavier, said as late as 1930 that “Tumacacori belongs to us, too.” This statement reveals a feeling of group ownership of this particular place. Unfortunately, Oblasser has so thoroughly edited the extended quote attributed to Carnación that it reads like a paraphrase. Thus, it is unclear whether
Carnación ever expressed this sentiment. Assuming that she did, it is interesting that she pointed out this specific place as belonging to the O’odham rather than referring to it as one part of an entire O’odham region. Perhaps she, like the inhabitants of Tumacácori, had also accepted the Spanish, Mexican, and later U.S. expropriation of large swaths of O’odham land as normal.

“Perhaps the most foreign concept that the Spaniards introduced to the O’odham was the idea that one man could own property that was protected by legal rights” (Erickson 1994:24).

**Dispossession**

Spanish speakers used fraud to finally take Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas from the O’odham. Thus, for some or all O’odham, it is a landscape from which they or their relatives have been unjustly dispossessed. Indeed, for many, it serves as one of innumerable examples of the larger dispossession that the O’odham suffered under Spanish, Mexican, and U.S. rule and/or as the result of Apache attacks.

*H: Yeah, they [Apaches] came and disturbed that place of theirs, so they [the O’odham] left it.*

The process of dispossession began with the establishment of missions and the accompanying expansion of other aspects of Spanish colonial society around this region. This did not occur entirely by force or the threat thereof. Based on the written record, at least some O’odham invited Spanish-speakers to establish missions in their midst at Guevavi and Tumacácori (Spicer 1962:123). They probably knew about mission practices from contact with
missions and their inhabitants to the south. However, once missions were established, Native American individuals or communities could not peacefully reverse their prior invitation to the missionaries. Colonial authorities recognized Indian communities’ autonomy tactically: much more during initial contacts than when Spanish speakers felt that their institutions were entrenched. While it is true that mission settlements officially belonged to their Native American inhabitants, most of whom were O’odham throughout most of this period, priests and other Spanish officials had considerable control over events within them. The Spanish, and perhaps O’odham in the missions, saw interludes of Indian autonomy as temporary. One such episode occurred in 1828, when the expulsion of Spanish priests left Pápago governor Ramón Pamplona in charge (Lamb 1993:13). And legal changes decided far away, by non-O’odham, could fundamentally affect the status of these villages. In short, outside rule – first, by Spain – irreversibly replaced self-rule among the O’odham in the missions.

A map of “Spanish intrusions on O’odham lands” highlights presidios and Kino missions. San Cayetano del Tumacácori is listed among the latter (Erickson 1994:22).

“The first priests … seemed to have a genuine concern for the native people. The O’odham began to accept the new circumstances, and they made adjustments, but conditions would change as more Europeans and Mexicans came into the area, and military personnel, missionaries, and settlers invaded the O’odham lands” (Ibid.:34).
This initial change created the context in which O’odham lost legal title to Tumacácori, Calabazas, and Guevavi. Using an intermediary, Sonoran strongman Manuel Gándara bought these lands in 1844 at an auction far to the south, in Guaymas (Sheridan 2006:101-102). The lands were subject to auction because they had been declared abandoned. Yet the O’odham did not abandon them until December 1848, and even then they considered this removal to be temporary.

It was not. In 1898, the U.S. Supreme Court accepted Gándara’s fraudulent history of the land (although not his agent’s purchase of it) by stating that that the O’odham had lost right to the land when they had abandoned the mission lands “many years before” the auction (Sheridan 2006:136). At least since the appearance of Kessell’s history of Tumacácori in 1976, any English speaker seriously interested in the history of Tumacácori has known that this judgment was based on fraudulent claims. Apparently, no one – including the Tohono O’odham Nation and the U.S. federal government – has attempted to restore this land to the heirs of the O’odham (and perhaps others) from whom it was stolen (Sheridan 2006:240).

“The O’odham who had claims to Tumacácori lost all their lands because they had no legal documentation to verify their ownership” (Erickson 1994:67).

T: you feel like, uh when you come to Tumacácori uh...

D: Yeah, that it, yeah.

T: ... that it should be, still be O'odham land?

D: O'odham land, yes.
T: Yeah. So do you feel when you're here like you're on land that should still be controlled by
the uh, or should be controlled by the tribe, or...

F: ...I mean...I guess my response would be yes, but you know, things have changed so much
that, at least the recognition [in exhibits].

T: Umhmm. Uh, do you feel like that? (to E)

E: Yeah

Downstream

Academic historians and O’odham representatives with whom I spoke recognize that the
descendants of those who fled Tumacácori are concentrated in San Xavier. Although no elder has
shared a memory with me regarding this connection, the O’odham with the strongest biological
and cultural connections to Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas are probably those of San
Xavier. Indeed, some O’odham recall this relationship in their belief that a statue from
Tumacácori is still on display there (Griffith 1992:47).

After Abandonment and Dispossession

Since 1848, O’odham’s time on the former mission lands has been intermittent and under
someone else’s de facto ownership. As such, it has attracted less study and probably is less
documented than the mission period. Instances that I have read about or observed indicate that
O’odham have visited mostly to labor at others’ discretion. As such, they are continuing a pattern
that began among Pápagos who visited this area to trade or work on farms, perhaps even before the establishment of missions.

Some early examples of this pattern come from Calabazas. In 1854 a German traveler listed “Pima Indians” as working for the German caretakers on Gándara’s ranch at Calabazas (Fontana 1971:79). Apparently, Pápagos traded there and raided in the area later in the same decade (Fontana 1971:82-84). Pápago recruits in the U.S. Army were stationed in Calabazas, where Apaches raided their horses (Fontana 1971:85).

 Almost certainly, O’odham have continued to visit the former mission lands for similar purposes to the present day. They must have come to work, and perhaps live, on farms and ranches, in hotels, and in residences as servants. Some perhaps have owned private residences on these lands. Others have passed through, perhaps camping near the river in decades past, certainly driving past or stopping at the Park sometimes. It seems likely that O’odham have hunted, played, relaxed, or explored in these lands. Maybe some have visited for spiritual purposes that are secret to O’odham, and they or others have visited the mission church in part because of its spiritual significance to them.

| T: So um, does the fact that there's a church here make any, you know, a difference to you …? You know, does it feel like sacred ground, or ...
| B: I don't think so, I think uh ... history and we should respect it, you know. What went on long time ago, and up to, up to now, I think people respect it, and that's why they come here, and ... |
T: Do you know of anybody who, uh, like, goes to the church for religious reasons except during the fiesta?

D: No, no

T: Like, uh, are you Catholic, or..

G: Yes I am.

T: Does the church hold any special, like, you don't know of anyone who comes here to, for praying, or anything?

G: No.

For many years, the Park’s staff has provided opportunities for O’odham to visit for multiple purposes. For example, in 1930, the convento building served as a school; apparently, O’odham camped nearby while females attended classes. Also, the Park has invited elders to visit to connect with and comment on their relationship to the Park. Some O’odham visit on their own to learn more about the Park’s and thus O’odham’s history. And some are invited to give demonstrations or sell items to visitors on normal days and during special events, such as the annual Fiesta de Tumacácori. For one such O’odham (H), the Park provided a trailer for an overnight stay. Different Native American groups, including O’odham vendors, have constructed ramadas on the Fiesta grounds, and a ki, or traditional house, “was built in 1998 by O’odham men from the San Xavier Tohono O’odham Reservation,” to “to give visitors an immediate sense of a once thriving Native American community.”

The Park’s invitations appear to follow the prevailing sense among O’odham today that Tumacácori is part of their collective heritage; that is, the O’odham who participate do not necessarily have genetic or possibly cultural ancestors who once lived in the mission. On the other hand, some seem to: several food booths at the Fiesta I attended benefited churches on the Tohono O’odham reservation, which seems congruent at a park commemorating a mission. Likewise, workers from the San Xavier District constructed the ki, perhaps in recognition that the residents of Tumacácori relocated there. Overall, though, it appears that the Park’s efforts have increased the sense that its lands are part of the heritage of the O’odham as an undifferentiated population.

\begin{quote}
\textbf{T}: Have you come to the park, uh, just to visit?

\textbf{E}: Not that I can remember, just always to ... to sell.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{B}: Well I had to come down to see what's going on, what they have here, you know. I know they have a lot of Indian crafts here, and I see a lot of Indians here too, you know, that's why we come down here, we hear about it but, never been here before.

\ldots

\textbf{T}: So you heard about it from friends?

\textbf{B}: Ah, uh, yeah from the, uh, all the people down in Sells, and that area that uh, that uh, and the people that are the fiddlers, the musicians,

\textbf{T}: Oh, okay.

\textbf{B}: All them, cause I'm one of the musicians too.
\end{quote}
T: But you're not performing here this time?
B: No, I'm not, I'm just here to see what's going on, you know.

T: What is the...do the proceeds go to?
F: The church, for our church.

T: What denomination?
E & F: Catholic

T: So, how did, how many years have you been coming to the Fiesta?
G: Probably ten or fifteen years.

T: Ten or fifteen years, wow.
G: No, actually maybe twenty, I think.

G: Um, most of the time we are vendors or we do basket weaving.

T: Okay, um, basket weaving demonstrations, or..
G: Demonstrations, yeah.

T: Okay, sales also?
G: Yeah.

T: Would you stay actually at the Park?
H: No, they gave me a trailer. … It was nice.
Pan-O’odham identity and organization

U.S. rule has brought influences that have made O’odham – and other Native Americans – more likely to identify with, first, a “tribe” or “nation” and, second, all Native Americans. This has increased the likelihood that O’odham who recognize no other connection to Tumacácori will still see it as their former land because it belonged to the ancestors of members of what is now their group. Indeed, several O’odham have claimed that they have always been one people and that Spanish speakers wrote about divisions among them that O’odham never recognized. I have argued above that O’odham in the past probably did recognize such divisions. Yet, in describing present-day O’odham’s feelings about Tumacácori, it is important to recognize that many O’odham believe that their ancestors felt an essential kinship with all other O’odham and thus some sense of shared moral ownership over this landscape as part of a larger O’odham homeland. For example, to them, all O’odham have been dispossessed of Tumacácori.
“By the late 1700s and the early 1800s, numerous deaths and continued migration into the more remote regions had erased many of the differences that had distinguished the various groups of O’odham” (Erickson 1994:50).

“[T]he [U.S.] system forced tribes to organize strong centralized government to control the affairs of all tribal members” (Ibid.:148).

A: See here we have this generation again or the new generation who're not really aware of, uh, their cultural history and their heritage. But otherwise, uh, in general they know that the whole part of uh, southern part of Arizona's, uh, O'odham country, uh, because it's the land of our ancestors. So they already feel and know that much that they're not really aware of any particular places, like this place, Tumacácori. … So they know they have a connection just by viewing it that way in general, with the whole southern half of Arizona.

T: do you feel like, do you feel like it's still your group’s land ... ?

D: Uh huh, Yeah, Yeah we do, we do, we feel that uh all the southern part of our ... is our reservation. And that, you know that was our ancestors’.

T: Yeah. Do you feel like it should still be O'odham [property]?

G: I think so, Yeah.

T: I mean do you feel like this is more Tohono O'odham area …?
B: Umm, I would say yes, because it's right here, close to the reservation. And, and you take it back long time ago too, um, all the Tohono O'odham and Pimas and Salt River Pimas were all together at one time, I think, and that they, uh, they went their separate ways, you know. … And, that's the way it is now.

T: And you kind of wish that the O’odham had more access to the old lands, basically?
H: Uh-huh.

T: Yeah. Do you know, uh, of anyone who has, who, you know, has relatives that they say came from, you know, right here? …
B: No, not that I know about, I don't think that anybody… No, nobody ever … on that, I haven't heard anything about it, you know so … …
T: I'm just saying, you know, that it's one thing to say, you know, O'odham came from here, and it's another thing to say, my family came from here.
B: Yeah, no, ‘cause I think it's been too long ago. … And I think of...that I saw one family that came from here, but I'm not sure, I think I heard about it. That a family used to, you know, came from … their family came from here.

Above, I have discussed the likelihood that, at least to some observers, Pápago became Pimas by adopting a Pima lifestyle. Since the abandonment of Tumacácori in 1848, a similar process might have occurred. At least to some observers, Pimas have become Pápago by living
among them. Pimas from Tumacácori and elsewhere have been accepted into Pápago-dominated jurisdictions, such as San Xavier del Bac (by 1848) and then the Tohono O’odham Nation. Indeed, I have chosen to not substitute ‘Tohono O’odham’ for ‘Pápago’ in this report because the Tohono O’odham today include the descendents of Pápagos and Pimas, including Sobaipuris. It is likely that many non-O’odham assume that all Tohono O’odham are Pápagos, since this was the name of the reservation for many years. It might also be that the descendents of Pimas within the Tohono O’odham Nation have become similar to the descendents of Pápagos as the result of living among them. Thus, the dispossession of the mission lands has perhaps decreased the diversity among O’odham by reducing the prevalence of a Pima identity.

Importance

Finally, it is uncomfortable but important to ask how important Tumacácori is or was to the O’odham. Representatives from the group who left in 1848 continued to struggle to regain the lands for a decade. And this stretch of the Santa Cruz appears in a map of the O’odham’s traditional lands given to me by an O’odham representative and on a similar map on file at the Arizona State Museum. Yet, as noted above, the O’odham struggle to reclaim this land appears to have ended around then. Even some of the O’odham who attend the Fiesta de Tumacácori have chosen not to learn more about the site. My difficulty finding O’odham experts to interview for this report and the lack of oral histories involving these lands among those O’odham I did interview suggest that the O’odham have focused their collective memories and interests elsewhere. A map in Erickson (1994:143) shows “O’odham lands reserved by the United States.”
It includes Saguaro and Organ Pipe Cactus National Monuments, the Coronado National Forest, among other lands, but not Tumacácori National Historical Park.

_T_: No, there's exhibits over that way in a welcome building.

_A_: Oh, oh, okay, yeah, I've never even been there, all these other times I've been here.

_T_: I understand. hehehe

_A_: hehehe. Yeah, then I've never, you know, I don't know if there's out here 'cause we just came to dance and then…

_T_: So do you um, uh ... do people talk about Tumacácori, or are stories, or "ah my relatives used to live there" or anything, have you ever heard anything like that? Or Guevavi, or Calabazas, or just, you know, along this, this particular stretch of the Santa Cruz, or...

_D_: Oh, no, not me particularly, no.

_T_: Just kind of a general...we knew it was our land...

_D_: Tribal land, yes.

_T_: … do you ever hear anyone talking about that or even...

_A_: About this area here?

_T_: Yeah, yeah.

_A_: Ah, no not in recent times for anybody, even the elders to talk about this location. But uh, we know that this is an area of O'odham, and that the O'odham ancestors the [O'odham word], before the coming of the US Government or Europeans, that they, you know, were all O'odham
before we got this..these designations..Akimel O'odham, Tohono O'odham. … We were all O'odham. hehehe

**T:** Do you think they're coming uh, like, that they would come to the same fiesta even if it weren't at Tumacácori, I mean, or do you think that the fact that it's uh, O'odham, uh historically O'odham land, do you think that matters to people?

**G:** I think it does, I think they're familiar with the area. I mean they've heard about it through their elders, and they know what actually went on here years ago.

**T:** So have you heard about it from elders?

**G:** A little bit.

**T:** Just kind of like, ‘Oh, we used to have it,’ or do they have..

**G:** They used to live here, that the O'odham used to live here, that they remind us of the whole area.

**T:** Oh, and just kind of like offhand comments, or parts of stories, or...

**G:** Parts of stories, people that have stayed here, camped here on their way to different areas.

…

**T:** … so like people coming through, and they say like 'oh we went to Tumacácori', and that used to be our land, and they're telling you that later?

**G:** Yeah.

**T:** How do you feel about that, that now it's, you know, it used to be O'odham..

**G:** There's something special when you know, knowing that our ancestors have passed through here, have lived in this area.
**T:** Just mostly up this area, this stretch of the river was a place where people would maybe go hunting, or camp out, or work, or..

**I:** They used to camp on their way to other areas.

**T:** Like going to Tucson from Mexico, or..  

**I:** Probably going back home to the reservation from here, like San Xavier.

**H:** Sometimes [O’odham] come through Nogales, and some stop over there [at the Park], and just ones that are in a hurry, they just pass it.

The following is the only story specifically about Tumacácori shared with me by an O’odham who referred solely to oral tradition as its source:

**H:** Have you heard about that tunnel they have there?  

**T:** Huh-uh, a tunnel?  

**H:** There was a tunnel there, under the mission, somewhere.  

**T:** Huh.  

**H:** Where they put the gold.  

**T:** Oh! People are always looking for that.  

**H:** But they never found it, though. … Is it really true? Or is it just a saying?
In this sense, the Park has provided an important resource for those O’odham who become interested in this place and who are familiar with parks’ and museums’ interpretive offerings. Some say that they have learned from the Park’s interpretive work and other non-O’odham sources, in combination with what they have gleaned from other O’odham. Some hope that other O’odham will learn from these sources, too. And some would like this interpretation to reflect more O’odham moral ownership of the space or at least their practices.

T: When you, do you tell people, oh yeah we're going down to dance at Tumacácori and..
A: That's when they ask, "Where is that"? hehehe

T: So when people say Tumacácori, do, uh, like do other O'odham know where they're talking about?
B: Yeah, um, they all, all the O'odham know where it is, you know. That that's our tribe that was here.

B: Yeah, I think, again, to tell you, sometime...some...we don't hear too much about it …

T: … So, um, when you say you're going to Tumacácori, do uh, the other O'odham know where you're talking about?
G: Pretty much, Yeah, everybody knows where the area is and..

T: Even like, people back in Big Fields, they would know.
G: Yeah, they know the area.
T: Do they come here, or?

G: Some of them do, um, the last, probably about ten years, that I've known a lot more people coming to this..

T: A lot more O'odham?

G: Yeah.

T: So where's Newfield?

E: How many miles are we away from home? (to F)

F: Thirty miles, south of Sells. …

T: … So, uh, when you say you're going to Tumacácori do people know where you're talking about?

E: Just us … hehehe

T: Hehehe. I mean like, do you feel like other people in the area know, like if they were driving through here do you think they would think, just in general, oh this is, you know, this is our ancestral lands? Or...

F: No … Even our own people don't, don't know that. Very few people, um, even uh, where the city of Tucson sits, that's aboriginal lands, very few... We just don't hear it enough, I guess.

T: had you been to the, the park before, not just to the fiesta but to the ...

D: No, I've not.

T: Have you heard of it before?

D: Yes I have, yeah. When I go by, I travel a lot to Magdalena for (unintelligible).
T: For what?

D: Uh, pilgrimage for Magdalena. Uh, we go out there every year, and so when we go out we see the sign, so yeah.

T: So when people, when you say you're going to Tumacácori, uh, you know "I'm going to Tumacácori this weekend", um do people know where you're talking about?

D: There are quite a few people, 'cause of course the people we're involved with Tucson, or southern Tucson area, most of the people know, when you say Tumacácori, or you're going to go towards Nogales, "oh that's towards Nogales", they seem to understand, know where it's at.

T: Right. So did uh, do you get most of that from um uh from like oral history and things or from reading or you know combination or...

A: Combination of both. While the elders, when I say the elders I'm talking about 80 years and over, 75... 'cause there's the you know the different generations of elders, and the younger elders uh of the O'odham uh really can't recall...those kind of things but there's other, the older elders, the real elders you know can recall orally...through oral tradition what they've been told by their elders.

T: do you think, Oh, it's a shame that you know, more O'odham don't come down here or do you just feel like, nya, that's the way it is, or.
A: Oh, I see, yeah. No, it's uh something that uh, they should be aware of, that's what uh can take pride in their culture itself, and for the young people to know about their culture. And uh, yes where their roots are really from, where their real connection is …

A: [Referring to “a group of seniors or elders from Salt River” attending the Fiesta de Tumacácori] So now I don't, really don't think they're even really aware, you know, of the O'odham occupation here in this area, or how the missionary Indians were occupying, or just you know the general history of this area.

T: have you all gone past, you know, over into the exhibits and things?

E & F: Um-hmm.

T: What do you think of that?

F: Well it's just like at the Arizona State Museum, they have that … Pathways. … I was concerned that, being that this is O'odham territory, that they didn't, um, emphasize the aboriginal lands of the O'odham. Very few people are aware that even this mission, this place, was the aboriginal land of the O'odham, and you don't hear about that, and so I inquired at the museum why, and at the time that they put up the exhibit it was just whatever was available, that they worked with, but I guess, um, they just need to educate people more.

T: You feel like there should be more emphasis here, on the grounds, that this was O'odham before it was Spanish, uh, a Spanish mission with O'odham on it.

F: Yes.

…
E: Yeah, well I really haven't been here with them [her coworkers] that much. When they do come, there's more Hispanic people. It seems like it's more their, their traditions and stuff. They don't have too many O'odham or Yaqui traditions carried on.

T: Yeah. Well what about the, the Yaquis? … do you feel like they have as much a...like they should be included as much as the O'odham, or?

…

E: I don't see too much of them, I haven't seen too much of them.

F: But they, uh, you know I, I think they should be invited to participate, I mean just to educate people about their culture, um, but their aboriginal lands, are, are elsewhere. But in terms of sharing of culture, I think that's important.

…

T: Do you think there should be, uh, O'odham ceremony...like in some parks, they open the park for, um, Native American groups to have ceremonies, and, uh, do things that other folks aren't uh, allowed to do, like hunt, maybe on the park land, or whatever it might be? Do you feel like, uh, the park should do things like that for O'odham, or...do you like it being a reserve...?

…

F: Right there's yucca here, that's used for basket weaving, or there's 'hwe' (?), 'hwe', and I was, I was just asking one of the park rangers if we're allowed to walk to the river..I mean we're allowed to walk, but if we're allowed to um, take rocks to shine pottery with. … And she mentioned that it was private property but she didn't think it'd be a problem, I mean it's just ...
T: … Well um, uh, so what do you think they, the park could do to bring more, uh, O'odham here or to increase the feeling of, of belonging, or justice, or ...

…

E: I think you have pretty good crowd, now,

T: Of O'odham, you mean?

F: I'd like to see, like I said earlier, to see more um, emphasis on this area being the aboriginal lands, and I heard um [person's name] make that comment a while ago that...that there was maybe a display, or um, or place where people can go to learn more.

T: So, uh, you know this fiesta has O'odham, but it also has Yaqui, Anglo, Mexican, Mexican-American...Do you feel like it should be more O'odham? …

I: Actually I think it's a good mixture. … Just bringing people together, I mean, that's the whole idea.

T: Have you toured the exhibits?

I: When we come here we don't even get a chance to...

T: Well is it your impression that the park, that there's something that you wish the park did more of? …

I: Um, I don't..I think they're doing as much as they can, and...I can't think of anything else, maybe more activities throughout the year, educating people..
T: So did you look at anything, you know, like where the church is and the exhibits and stuff?

B: Yeah, yeah and it's interesting, yeah.

T: What'd you, what'd you think of that?

B: Uh, I just uh...I just uh...my mind just go back to where, long time ago how it is, and all that, you know, how it was. Uh, what went on, and how it is you know reading about it in the...what went on long time ago, and a lot of that just kind of goes back to, to my old days, my childhood. About how the Indians grew up, cause I, I felt part of it, that I'm still, I'm in part of the history, you know.

T: how do you feel the park presents that uh, that history, have you been through the exhibits and things?

D: Uh, no not a whole lot, you know, but then with the, you know, with the palo verde trees, it's like it's like home. … it's like out of our back door. That's how it is.

T: Do you feel like, uh, other people come, you know like Anglos or Mexicans come here uh, and get a good view of ... of that, you know, that it's O'odham land or, or the history?

D: I think they do get a good sense of the history, but, you know like...there's a group I see that are selling here that are Native American, uh I thought there'd be more uh, Tohono O'odham culture …
T: Well um, so, uh do you feel that it's, you know, they have Anglo stuff here, they have Mexican, they have Yaqui, um, do you think that's okay, or do you think it should be all O'odham.

D: Yes, no, no, it should be a variety.

T: So, what do you think they could do to im ... get more people to, more O'odham, or for that matter anyone ... hehehe ... to, to come here?

B: hehehe, well I think, if uh, if uh, to have more, more O'odham to show their knowledge, their whatever, you know, the Indian dancing, more Indian dances, more chicken scratch, fiddlers, uh, anything that Indians can do, you know, the Tohono O'odham, have a tribe maybe you know then you know, it might get bigger and bigger, you know ... ...

T: … is there something that you thought should be changed about the way they have exhibits or they show things, or like, nothing that should be more O'odham, or anything like that?

B: No, no, I think that I enjoy all what they, what, what, what's here. It's educational you know, you see, all different, how they show, uh, making uh pottery, baskets, no a lot, you know. … I think it's real good to, to show the people how the, uh, Tohono O'odham um do their thing out there in the reservation.

H: They camped around there where the women can go to school there … that little adobe schoolhouse is still there, but it’s just kept; it’s not used anymore. …
T: And so how did you hear about the schoolhouse and the camping?

H: Well, it’s written in there. It’s all explained in that building.

T: So have you heard stories, told by other elders or like when you were growing up, about Tumacácori?

H: Oh, yeah, mmhmm, yeah. They’d talk about it.

…

T: What sorts of story would they tell?

H: Well, everything’s all out. We’re not holding it quiet now. Like you read in papers where they tell you about where you’ve been and where the O’odham’s been and all that.

H: That was the home of the O’odham before. I wish O’odham would move up there. … I don’t know how it’d be, just to built hothouses or mudhouses or what. I don’t know … I don’t know, myself, but I read it in books.

T: Had you heard things from O’odham about the Park?

H: Oh, yeah, my grandfolks. Whatever they knew about the missions … All I heard in the beginning was that just the women went to school over there, in the little mud school. … There’s a story inside. Once in a while, when I go to weave, when I’m on one of my breaks I might walk around.

H: You just wanted to know [our history] out of a person. It’s written all over.
The Yaqui people, or Yoemem, have a variety of connections to the TNHP landscape that extend from at least the Spanish colonial period into the present. Indeed, Spicer (1980:237) points out that Tumacácori is the “earliest known settlement of Yaquis in what became Arizona.” Unlike O’odham, Yaquis typically consider their homeland to lie far away from what is now southern Arizona, along the Yaqui River in southern Sonora, Mexico. However, some Yaquis may have resided in the former mission lands more recently than any O’odham.

The documentary evidence regarding Yaquis on this landscape is scant compared to that for the O’odham. Much of the following discussion depends on extending observations in other locations to conjecture about what might have occurred in southern Arizona.

**Pre-mission**

The Yaqui language, like Upper Piman, is part of the Uto-Aztecan family, and Yaquis formed part of a swath of Uto-Aztecan speakers that extended from Mesoamerica to the Colorado Plateau. Thus, it is possible that Yaqui traders visited Tumacácori and Guevavi or that O’odham traders visited the Yaqui homeland. It is even more likely that their products or stories about their lives made this trip. Such direct and indirect contacts might well have continued after Spanish-speaking missionaries arrived among the Yaquis.

In addition to these putative interchanges before the mission period, Yaquis and O’odham shared a heritage as linguistic cousins and as participants in a corridor of cultural
communication. Thus Yaquis have a tie of kindredness to the people who inhabited this landscape after the Hohokam period (at least), along with all other Uto-Aztecan speakers.

**Mission Period**

Yaquis have a documented history of direct involvement in the Tumacácori mission complex that extends back to the eighteenth century. While never numerically dominant and apparently never claiming this land as their people’s ultimate homeland, Yaquis did reside there. Perhaps prehistoric trade routes had led some to settle among O’odham before Kino’s arrival. Or perhaps these residents first arrived with Spanish speakers, such as missionaries. Kessell (1976:71) writes, without offering documentary support, that the Jesuits had the practice of “settling in their missions a few families of more advanced or acculturated Indians. In the Pimería Alta they used Ópatas or Yaquis. The friars ... encouraged these model families to enter into ceremonial kinship with the neophytes, serving as godparents or becoming compadres.” However, I have found no early evidence of this practice. Instead, Yaquis appear in the mission records sporadically and late. I discuss this evidence below, under “Demography.”

The first mention that I have found of a specific Yaqui somewhat near the TNHP landscape is from 1736. Antonio Siraumea, part of a group looking for a site to mine precious minerals, found hunks of silver lying in the open at a place named Arizona, southwest of present-day Nogales (Officer 1992:97, Polzer 1998:177). However, I have found no indication that he had any direct connection to this mission group.

---

33 Historians commonly have reported this place name as Arizonac. Garate argues that it was known as Arizona in Siraumea’s time (http://www.docstoc.com/docs/652222/Arizona-Never-Arizonac-by-Donald-T-Garate-Although, accessed 9/27/09).
Other early references likewise note the presence of Yaquis in the region, without linking them directly to the missions. For example, Kessell (1970:70) reports that, in 1740 in the “Pimería Alta,” Spanish “soldiers executed four Yaquis and an Apache, whom they suspected of plotting an uprising of the whole Pimería” as an extension of the Yaqui Revolt that year. According to Navarro García (1966:128), this event took place in Motepore, Sonora.

The Mission 2000 database identifies Yaquis specifically at Tumacácori, Guevavi, and Calabazas (see Tables 4-1 through 4-6). Of the twenty-three listed for Guevavi, nine have dates associated with them – the first mention for each individual occurs between 1814 and 1819. Officer (1987:88) and Kessell (1976:239) note that at this time Yaquis were working in gold mining there. Only one is listed at Calabazas, in 1816. Yet for Tumacácori the database identifies four Pápago-Yaquis, all of whom shared the same mother, and forty-nine Yaquis. Those with dates have their first mention in the documents from 1785 to 1824. This evidence suggests that Yaqui incorporation into the mission landscape began well into the Franciscan period.

Census data indicate that most Yaquis’ residence there was transitory. The 1796 census listed “a dozen Yaquis” (Spicer 1980:237) as vecindarios (Kessell 1976:190), whom Officer (1987:70) refers to as “‘outside’ Indians.” But, only five years later, the census of 1801 includes only one Yaqui, a community member (Officer 1987:78; see also Kessell 1976:78).34 Kessell (1976:202) wrote that Spanish-speakers “seemed to have replaced the Yaquis of five years earlier” as peones. Josepha Ocoboa was a forty-one-year-old, married woman. Thus, she seems to have become a community member through marriage with a non-Yaqui. Between 1807 and 1824, Mission 2000 lists another eleven Yaquis in Tumacácori and the only dated entries for

Yaquis in Guevavi (9) and Calabazas (1). However, Kessell (1976:239) suggests that “from the number of baptisms, marriages, and burials … performed for ‘Yaquis de Guevavi,’ there must have been dozens of them” after mining started in 1814.

**Work and Hierarchy**

According to Kessell (1976:190), “The first Yaqui vecindarios listed in the 1796 census, ‘described in the mission books as peones, evidently composed the craftsman-worker corps who supervised and showed the others how.’” However, he presents no evidence for this deduction, which is questionable given the lowly label of “peón” applied to the Yaquis, the existence of alternate labels for artisans and supervisors, the late date of the census, and the Yaquis’ transience. It seems possible that the Yaquis were simply workers, probably at the mission. Others, living in Guevavi, worked in the nearby mines that opened in 1814 (Kessell 1976:239). Indeed, Kessell (1976:238) also claims that Yaquis, in addition to gaining employment in mining, “came to work for the mission and [for] the [increasing Spanish-speaking] settlers” as servants. Officer (1987:88) presumes that “some of the proceeds” from mining went “to construction of the Tumacácori church.” This would represent an important contribution by Yaquis to creating this enduring symbol and artifact of the mission and, later, park system.

The mission landscape might have represented sanctuary to Yaquis living there, as Kessell notes (1976:238).

Yaquis’ position within the mission’s hierarchy affects their relation to its landscape. If they were intermediate between the missionary and the mission members, then they probably had some intellectual authorship in developing the mission physically and socially. However, these
Yaquis would have been in the community and in that organizational position by leave of the priest. Observers who believe that O’odham should have had control over residence in the community and over its organization might question the legitimacy of such Yaquis’ position and influence. Again, it is quite possible that, instead, the Yaqui residents were workers but not models and supervisors. In either case, most individuals apparently were there but briefly. Some must have had significant experiences at the mission, but the number of such events must be small compared to those that O’odham had; likewise, these Yaquis’ effect on the community’s overall development probably was slight. Nonetheless, it is arguable that Yaquis’ situation was analogous to that of present-day international migrants; to some observers, official pronouncements on which groups intrinsically belong in a place and to whom the place belongs might illegitimately reduce some people’s affiliation with that place or others’ recognition of this affiliation.

In any case, the Yaqui residents fit into a broader pattern of increasing porosity at the mission. The ideal of missions was that they were Native American communities run by Spanish-speaking priests and kept separate from other outside influences. But, generally, increasing numbers of non-Indians and of transient, non-O’odham Indians resided on the mission lands in the late mission period, reducing the community’s separateness. The Yaquis there in 1796 and afterward form part of this pattern. Perhaps control of the lands by non-O’odham made the pattern possible.
Military protection

Kessell (1976:161) notes that, in 1783, the “Compañía de Pimas” – the presidial troops relocated from Tubac – included three Yaquis. Thus, Yaquis’ relationship to the mission landscape included its protection.

Birth and Death

Baptism

Few records of baptisms of Yaquis have survived. Baptism has an important role in Yaqui spiritual stories, as its introduction, long before European Catholic missionaries arrived, separated people into the baptized, material mortals and the non-baptized, invisible immortals (Spicer 1980:172). However, I have not found information to support the idea that a Yaqui’s place of birth or baptism has special spiritual significance.

Nonetheless, a household can become consecrated through dancing and singing and other ritual activities, as part of a Pahko (Spicer 1980:90-92). These are rituals that commemorate: “a child’s funeral, a death anniversary, the leave-taking of the spirits of the dead in November, a Lenten Posada, a hosting of Matachín Dancers, the annual celebration of the patron saint of a town or church, and a wedding” (Spicer 1980:90). To the extent that Yaquis in southern Arizona continued these practices, then the areas where their households sat were, and may still be, consecrated ground.
Burial

The Park grounds potentially have great emotional or spiritual importance as a site of births, deaths, and burials of Yaquis. Spicer’s work holds the most promise for clarifying these possibilities. He (1988:25-26) describes Yaqui attitudes toward the dead but, unfortunately, not toward burial grounds per se. Nor does he describe attitudes toward the dead in a way that clarifies Yaquis’ attitude toward long-dead ancestors. Finally, his focus on established, Yaqui-dominated communities in Sonora and Tucson leaves unclear whether his findings translate to the Upper Santa Cruz Valley.

If the patterns found in the Yaqui homeland apply to the TNHP landscape, then the presence of Yaqui burials would imbue this landscape with continuing spiritual importance. For example, the extent to which Yaquis performed specific rituals for the dead at the cemetery would affect its level of consecration (Spicer 1980:66, 209). Cemeteries and these ceremonies “reinforced the sacredness of” surrounding areas (1980:170). But it is unclear whether such beliefs pertained to areas away from the homeland. For example, “The spirits of the dead … are believed to be in the village during the month of October” (1980:346; see also 1962:511) – did the dead buried in Tumacácori return there or to Sonora?

Overall, an important question, which I have been unable to answer, is whether the presence of Yaqui burials, and the performance of rituals for them, increase Yaquis’ sense that the TNHP landscape is part of their homeland, similar to O’odham’s sense that it is.
**Interbreeding**

Written records identify a few individuals as having both Yaqui heritage and ancestry from another group. Referring to such individuals as “part” Yaqui or as Yaqui at all might not reflect their self-conception. That is, they or some others around them might have considered them to be fully Yaqui (and, possibly, simultaneously fully a member of some other group) or, depending on their actions and circumstances, completely non-Yaqui, as a parent’s ethnic affiliation does not adhere automatically to children but must be recognized socially. One such individual was Ramón Pamplona, who became the native governor of Tumacácori. He was born in 1785 to a Pápago father and Yaqui mother. However, in 1801 he was listed as a Pima, and he married another Pima in 1803. If considered a Yaqui, he significantly increases Yaquis’ impact in the area; in addition to serving as governor, he “had been a member of the land grant delegation to Arizpe late in 1806” (Kessell 1976:254-255). Another, less clear example is “María Gertrudis Brixio listed variously as a Yaqui or an Ópata” (Kessell 1976:201). Her husband, a Pima from Caborca, was killed at Tumacácori. Perhaps she had parents from different groups or other attributes that affiliated her with different groups.

**Names**

Naming patterns and many individual names among Yaquis reveal Spanish influence. Based on fieldwork in the 1930s and 1940s, Spicer (1988:19-21) notes that the Yaquis of Arizona had both given names and surnames; all examples of the former were of Spanish origin, but some of the latter were of Yaqui origin. He describes personal names and especially surnames as having little importance, even for purposes of identification. Indeed, Yaquis at that time
commonly changed surnames throughout their lives. However, Spicer links this to Yaquis’ need to hide their identities during conflicts in Mexico in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (1980:160). It seems likely that those who lived in the southern Arizona missions had already participated in Spanish-Catholic naming practices elsewhere, given that both missionization and early Yaqui migrations flowed from the south. In this case, the TNHP missions probably only bolstered an existing trend, and the Park serves as a reminder of a process primarily occurring elsewhere.

**Compadrazgo**

Compadrazgo – the relationship between parents and godparents – and other Yaqui-Catholic rituals and relationships have been vital to Yaqui identities and organization (Spicer 1980:22-23). But their institutionalization among Yaquis occurred in southern Sonora. If anything, it is more likely that Yaquis in Tumacácori, due to small numbers and to the effects of intercultural relations, became more like O’odham or at least less like Sonoran Yaquis.

**Ritual**

The dance of the Matachinis is one of the most sacred rituals of the Yaquis. According to Spicer (1962:510), it “was introduced by the Jesuit missionaries originally as a dramatization of the triumph of the Christians over the Aztec ruler Montezuma through Malinche … The whole of that meaning, however, had disappeared from Yaqui belief.” This introduction, however, would have taken place in southern Sonora, whence Yaquis brought the dance to southern Arizona.
TNHP might symbolize both the adoption and spread of this dance, but it is also one of the few sites at which the dance currently takes place. In 1992, Griffith wrote that, “On two occasions Matachinis may be seen outside Yaqui communities, the Tumacacori Fiesta … and the San Xavier Fiesta … While each of these events is organized for secular reasons by non-Yaquis, both take place in church settings, and they appear to have sufficient sacred content to satisfy the Yaqui participants” (p. 97).

Influences on O’odham

In their time together at Tumacácori, O’odham and Yaquis undoubtedly influenced each other. Unfortunately, we have scant evidence of this process. One possible example is that Yaquis spread the dance of the Matachinis to O’odham at the mission. This need not be the site of the first communication of the dance to any O’odham for it to have been the site for its first demonstration to some O’odham. In 1825, commenting on a Yaqui revolt in Sonora, Father Liberós wrote to a colleague, “Now that they say the troops are coming from the Colorado, my Pimas have not a care in the world. They are dancing vigorously and practicing for the matachines. Already they do it well, especially your compadre Cayetano” (Kessell 1976:267).

Influences on Spanish-speaking society

Even from afar, Yaquis had indirect effects on Spanish-speaking society around the mission. For example, their revolts in Sonora provoked vigilance in the Pimería Alta. In one instance, in 1827, non-Indians feared that the Yaqui rebels would reach this region and find allies among Pápagos, Yumas, and Coyotero Apaches (Kessell 1976:268-269).

35 See: http://parentseyes.arizona.edu/msw/tohono/index.html, accessed 8/13/06.
Post-Mission

Continuity

Yaquis have a homeland within traveling distance of TNHP, and they are renowned for their migrations. Thus, it is possible that most or all of the Yaquis who lived in the missions returned to southern Sonora or moved on to other regions. However, it is also likely that they or their descendents – cultural or genetic – have since moved to the Yaqui communities in Arizona or even worked on the former mission lands in ranching, construction, transportation, or some other capacity.

Work and play

Yaquis worked ranches in the area during and after the mission era. They probably used this landscape for grazing, worship, and recreation. Indeed, Yaquis continue to participate in park activities, most notably the annual Fiesta. They have consecrated part of the Fiesta grounds, and they continue to do so there and wherever they engage in spiritual singing and dancing on the grounds.

Residence

Among Native Americans, Yaquis appear to have had the most nearly continuous direct occupation of the landscape from the latter part of the mission period to the early years of the Park. However, this habitation was by different families. For example:
• Settlers evicted as part of the struggle over the Baca Float included Yaquis who migrated from Mexico (Sheridan 2006:167).

• According to Mission 2000, Pedro Calistro, a Yaqui born in Banámichi, was the “self-appointed caretaker of Tumacácori mission prior to 1920.” He was a homesteader in Tumacácori, along with his brother Reyes. This snippet of an individual story hints that at least some Yaquis valued Tumacácori intrinsically.

Migration

During their large-scale migration from southern Sonora in the late 1800s and early 1900s, Yaquis moved surreptitiously through southern Arizona from the international border to settlements from south of Tucson to Phoenix. Their paths likely followed watercourses such as the Santa Cruz and Arivaca Creek. In fact, a historical marker in Arivaca notes that U.S. troops patrolled in the area on the lookout for “Mexican rebels, Yaquis, smugglers or German infiltrators.”

Referring to Tumacácori, Spicer writes, “This settlement, still inhabited by descendants of the earlier [mission-era] group, was by-passed by the refugees” (1980:237) from the 1880s to about 1920. His point is not that Yaquis avoided passing through the area; he does not address this issue. Instead, he is indicating that they settled farther north, especially around Tucson.
Teresa Urrea

Teresa Urrea of Cabora, or “Saint Teresa” to some Mayos, was exiled from Mexico to Tumacácori in 1892. With a Native American mother who was neither Yaqui or Mayo and a non-Indian father, she was a spiritual healer associated with apocalyptic prophets who foresaw the end of white rule in a flood. According to Spicer (1980:149), Mayos flocked to her, and Yaquis did not. According to the Handbook of Texas,36 “They lived briefly in Nogales, Arizona, before settling in nearby El Bosque, which became a mecca for thousands seeking cures. Among those who came were also a number of political revolutionaries, and Nogales and El Bosque became centers for forces plotting the overthrow of the Díaz government.” And, contradicting Spicer’s claim, Yaquis were among her followers. Perhaps these events brought Yaquis and Mayos to the TNHP landscape fleetingly or lastingly.

Relationship to Mayos

Above is the only reference that I have found to Mayos, or Yoremem, having a connection to these lands. However, the Yaquis and Mayos have intertwined histories, and it is possible that outsiders misidentified Mayos as Yaquis or that someone labeled simply as ‘Yaqui’ had a Mayo parent.

Conclusion

The Park could symbolize, through association, Yaquis’ experience with missionization not just there, where it was focused on members of other groups and where few Yaquis

experienced it, but missionization in their homeland, too. It also is a place through which Yaquis migrated and where they lived after the mission period. Its spiritual importance among Yaquis continues to be maintained and, in some ways, extended through activities at events such as La Fiesta.

*T:* Do you think that other Mexicans or other Yaquis know about the existence of …

*C:* Yes, yes. They know and even many relations … even of Yaquis who come to spend time here in Arizona due to their families. They don’t return again to the Yaqui community.

*T:* And they stop here in …

*C:* Yes.

*T:* … Tumacácori to pray, or only to …

*C:* To pray and to visit. And when they go back … others arrive here to spend time, too.

*T:* But they come to Tumacácori itself as a chapel or …

*C:* As a chapel and to visit, too.
Chapter 6

Apaches

Sources

In preparing this chapter, I have emphasized sources created directly by Apaches or by others who have relied on direct interactions with Apaches. For example, this account includes museum displays that Apaches have helped to produce as well as ethnographic descriptions based on interviews with participants. Cole's work integrates many of the various possibilities, as he is “a Chiricahua” (1988: 8), 37 has interviewed elders, and also has relied on academic documentary sources.

This approach has weaknesses. Among them is the problem that dates become unclear. And what may have been novel practices, occurring only for a few decades, become imbued with greater time depth because this is what the elders interviewed in, say, the 1930s had heard or experienced during their lifetimes. Furthermore, elders today have different interests and influences than those of previous generations, and their reports do not always jibe with those of their predecessors. That is, like other people, Apaches have diverse points of view and continually reinterpret their past – an unchanging Apache perspective on the TNHP landscape does not exist.

37Thus, sections representing his point of view are marked like those with quotes from other Native Americans.
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Identifying “Apaches”

Apaches have perhaps the most contested relationship to Tumacácori of any Native American group. In part, this is because of observers’ temptation to refer to “the Apaches,” as though different individuals, families, bands, tribes, or even related tribes shared responsibility for the actions of anyone whom outsiders called by this same name. Indeed an interpretive sign at the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center states, regarding the early, Camp San Carlos reservation:

“In 1872, the United States created Camp San Carlos for the purpose of concentrating and detaining thousands of Yavapai, Chiricahuas and Western Apaches from around the state. Many of these were our traditional enemies.”

This mistakenly synecdochal attribution is limited most often to instances in which Apaches were not aiding or cooperating with neighboring, non-Apache groups. That is, it is common to see blanket descriptions of how 'the Apaches' engaged in raiding for subsistence, which certainly was true for many Apaches. But we could as easily make generalizations regarding Apaches as farmers around Spanish settlements or as scouts for the U.S. military. So, when I refer to “Apaches” instead of “the Apaches,” I am signaling that only a portion of people speaking a Western Apache or Chiricahua dialect undertook a particular practice.

This report concerns itself with the particular 'Apaches' who shaped or were shaped by events on the TNHP landscape. The most common and perhaps most consequential relationship that Apaches have had with this particular landscape (unlike areas in which they had settlements) was to participate directly or indirectly in raids or other attacks on communities there or to the south and to suffer attacks in turn. This cycle of conflict included people associated with groups
within what today are commonly called the Chiricahua Apaches and the Western Apaches. However, this is not the only sort of affiliation that Apaches have had with the TNHP landscape.

**Origins**

Most academic accounts focus on Apaches' origins via the migration of Athapaskan speakers from far in the north and disagree mostly about the timing of their arrival in different parts of the Southwest. As Cole (1988: 7) notes, the “preponderance of evidence” in academic accounts points to Apaches first arriving in southern Arizona and New Mexico anywhere from the early sixteenth to late seventeenth centuries. I am unaware of more-recent research that contradicts this (cf. Reid and Whittlesey 1997: 24).

Forbes (1959) presents a detailed version of a scenario that I, and probably other researchers, independently have come to suspect occurred: that the cultural and, especially, biological ancestors of Western and Chiricahua Apaches include members of groups that Spaniards did not call 'Apaches.' According to Forbes, over the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, groups such as the Janos, Jocomes, Mansos (but not “Apaches Mansos”), Sumas, Cholomes, and Jumanos lost their separate identities, at least from a Spanish perspective. He writes, “There seems to be little doubt but that most of them were either absorbed by the Apache or simply came to be called Apaches” (1959: 124). Despite acknowledging the utter lack of any direct evidence such as a supporting comment in a Spanish document, he argues that these groups were Athapaskan speakers – that is, part of the same migration from the north as the one in which all of the ancestors of the 'Apaches' took part. Indeed, he notes (1959: 124-125) that the 'Chokonen' band of the Chiricahuas might well be the continuation of the 'Jocomes' mentioned in
early Spanish documents, especially since they occupy roughly the same region. As discussed
below, Cole's account (1988: 2-3), based on Chiricahua traditions, identifies both Chokonen as a
Chiricahua word and this group as the first one to arrive in what became the Chiricahua
homeland.

I would emphasize, however, that other groups whom Forbes mentions do not have even
this level of evidence for a probable linguistic, and thus ancestral, relationship. Instead, it is quite
likely, based on numerous ethnographic examples from around the world, that recently arrived
groups of Athapaskan-speakers incorporated members of other, non-Athapaskan groups who had
had a longer history in the region and that, together, they constituted the biological and perhaps
cultural ancestors of the 'Apaches' who had dealings with the TNHP landscape.

The upshot is this: from an academic perspective, Athapaskan-speaking ancestors of the
Chiricahuas and Western Apaches probably arrived in southern Arizona sometime in the two
centuries preceding Kino's visits to Guevavi and Tumacácori. Their relations with the O'odham
living there is unknown. The Athapaskan-speakers quite likely incorporated members of similar,
pre-existing groups in the region, whose history and relations with the TNHP are likewise
unknown.

Apache perspectives

Apaches today and in the past have expressed different accounts of their arrival or
emergence in the area that includes the upper Santa Cruz Valley. They overlap with others'
explanations in different ways and to different degrees.
At one extreme, Hrdlicka (1905:481) claims, "The San Carlos Apache know not whence they came. … One of the men said he heard from the elders that they formerly lived in what is now the vicinity of Flagstaff, at the base of the San Francisco mountains, whence they went eastward, and finally came to the Salt and Gila rivers". The attitude that they communicated to him regarding ruins in the area also suggests that they recognized an ancestral migration into the region: “When questioned about the ruined habitations and the people who abandoned them, the Apache profess total ignorance. They say that when they first came into the country the ruins were just as they are today” (1905: 495). Hrdlicka (1905: 495) suspects that this apparent lack of knowledge was due to the recently ended warfare: “Their traditions are meager. Many of the men who would have preserved their lore were killed during their almost incessant warfare, and the younger element know little beyond personal recollection.”

Without completely discounting Hrdlicka's observation regarding warfare's effects, it is possible that the Apaches he knew did not want to share information about their origins with him. More recently, Apaches have produced statements on this question with less filtering by non-Apaches.

An exhibit in the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center addresses this issue:

“There is no easy way to reconcile the popular anthropological theory of the recent arrival of the Apache people in the Southwest with the great time span implied in Apache origin stories, religion and oral tradition. Many knowledgeable and respected Elders believe the Apaches have always been here – as far back as the very ancient times spoken of in their stories."
“Our Tribal Archaeologist has been researching evidence suggesting the Apache are related to peoples who lived in this area for many thousands of years, descended from what are referred to as Paleo-Indian and Archaic cultures. A fresh look at the existing data and assumptions using newer scientific methods may very well dramatically change the popular anthropological theories on the origins of the Apache people.”

Indeed, an Apache man has explained to me the existence of similar languages in Canada as the result of migration from the Southwest to the north.

Some Apaches today adhere to the more common view among non-Apache researchers.

Another interpretive sign in the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center states: “Before the Apaches were segregated onto reservations, they had lived in the Southwest for nearly 500 years as seminomadic hunters and gatherers.”

An interpretive sign in the exhibit on Chiricahua history in the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), co-curated by Chiricahuas, states: “Our ancestors migrated to the Southwest with other Apache people, long ago.”

Cole (1988: 2-3) provides an extended discussion of Chiricahuas' origin accounts, which he distinguishes from those of other Apache groups: “Among Apaches, only the Chiricahuas have a crossing myth.” Some believe that their ancestors lived in ancient Egypt, building the pyramids and fleeing with the Jews. Eventually, different but related groups made their way south through the Rocky Mountains, with some splintering off along the way. Also, as the
migration occurred, these Athapaskan-speaking groups had conflicts with other peoples and among themselves.

The leading group of those who would become known as Chiricahuas were the “Chokonen,” or 'People of the Rising Sun.' Eventually, “between the Gila and the Yaqui Rivers on the flanks of the mountains, they found land very like the land they had left over forty generations earlier” [presumably Egypt] and they settled there. Cole (1988: 3) states that “Central and Southern Chiricahua oral tradition” has Chiricahuas in the region since about 1200 CE, fighting “Aztecs, Pimas, Tarahumaras, and other enemies.” The Aztecs told them of the Spaniards, and hearing of the Europeans' lust for gold leads Chiricahuas to warn other groups to get rid of their gold.\(^{38}\) When the Spaniards arrive, the Chokonen – still the only group of eventual Chiricahuas in the region – successfully hide from them for a lifetime and “observe the Spanish and their ways.” The other groups that became known as Chiricahuas arrived later, and this is when generalized hostilities with the Spanish and with other Indian groups begins.

In this way, Cole presents an account from Chiricahua tradition that generally agrees with the prevailing chronology among academics with regard to: the arrival in southern Arizona of the bulk of Apaches, Europeans' recognition of their existence, and the development of hostile relations involving them.

**Group Identity**

Although they shared and recognized behavioral similarities, the people whom ethnologists commonly designate as Western and Chiricahua Apaches did not see themselves or,

\(^{38}\) Cole writes that “those who did not comply were annihilated,” but it is unclear whether the Spaniards or the Apaches destroyed them.
apparently, other peoples as members of large ethnic groups who would inevitably or preferentially cooperate on that basis. As Opler (1961: 7) writes, somewhat ethnocentrically, “Tribal solidarity and tribal consciousness were poorly developed.”

According to Perry (1972: 381), writing about the San Carlos:

The kernel of Apache society was the gota, the martrilocal matrilineal extended family cluster. This was the minimal social unit and often the maximal unit as well. Several gota sometimes also clustered to form what some writers have called a 'local group.' These local groups – as well as single gota – were scattered over most of eastern Arizona during pre-reservation times. They were seminomadic and tended to be unstable, segmenting and rejoining situationally.

Ethnologists, at least, identify multiple 'local groups' as forming bands. However, these bands rarely acted as a single entity. As Goodwin (1971: 13) reports, subtribal groups “considered themselves quite distinct,” with some intermarriage and hostilities. Indeed, Chiricahuas called the Southern band “Enemy People,” albeit for unknown reasons (Cole 1988: 10, Baldwin 1965: 55). A presidial soldier reputed to speak Chiricahua and have great familiarity with Chiricahuas' ways noted, and perhaps overstated, “the peculiar distrust of one another in which they live, even though they are related … with the greatest facility the weaker see themselves despoiled by the stronger; and bloody battles are stirred up among the different groups, which end only when a common cause unites them in their common defense” (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 349).
Opler (1961: 7) states, referring to all Apaches, “Occasionally a local group leader was so outstanding that he was recognized as a band leader, but more often a number of local group leaders led the band when a large gathering took place.” Such unity was fleeting and resulted more from each follower's relationship to the individual leader than from his or her solidarity with the band per se – much less the tribe. Likewise, Baldwin (1965: 23) writes, “Only rarely did an entire band unite for warfare or for any other purpose.”

Clans, according to Perry (1972: 381), provided Western Apaches with a wider sense of affiliation. “They constituted a wider network of interrelationships that overlay the gota and gave Apache society an essence of unity. ...The clans were nonlocalized, although each had a myth of origin referring to a specific locality from which its members supposedly had migrated.” Not only did clans tie together members living in different locations, “Unlike the gota, the clans had much deeper structural duration. In essence they were timeless” (1972: 384). While this shared kinship might motivate cooperation, clans did not “have any sort of leadership, hierarchical structure, or political apparatus” (1972: 384).

Emory Sekaquaptewa once described Hopis' clan-based society as multi-ethnic, and perhaps this term conveys the sense of clan membership within Apache society. Rather than uniting all Apaches, clan organization provided a shared identity among members of the same clan but a recognition of difference between clan members and other Apaches, thus motivating both cooperation and indifference.
In short, Western and Chiricahua Apaches do not seem to have felt a 'tribal' identity. An individual's identity as a member of a band was tenuous, while membership in a local group and family cluster was comparatively more binding yet still fluid. Clan affiliation was immutable. As will be made clearer below, in none of these groups could internal cooperation be forced or expected automatically – it had to be recruited continually. Thus, to associate all members of a tribe, band, local group, or clan with the actions of some of its members – for example, raiding – contradicts Apaches' understanding and practices.

Goodwin (1971: 286-287) describes an event that helps to illustrate the practical consequences of this shifting affiliation. One of his Western Apache informants reported how his relatives had taken an Apache Manso boy captive. This boy escaped back to Tucson and led non-Indians back to his captors’ camp.

Apache perspectives

“Each Chiricahua belonged to a group or band” (NMAI).

“According to Chiricahua tradition, there were four major bands” (Cole 1988: 10).

Group Cooperation

This section focuses on patterns of cooperation among Western and Chiricahua Apaches. Ideas of affiliation, as summarized above, are one aspect of motivating cooperation. Thus, this section and the preceding one overlap. But cooperation can occur for a multitude of reasons among people who do not sense that they share a group identity. Because Apaches often
cooperated with other Apaches and non-Apaches on an ad hoc and particularistic basis, the specific people who had direct and indirect involvement with the TNHP landscape could differ greatly from event to event, even when non-Indians identified them broadly as Apaches. For example, the people participating in and benefiting from one raid, including by trading with Apaches for raided goods, might differ considerably from those involved in the next. Conversely, this pattern of cooperation – small-scale units with ever-changing membership cooperating promiscuously – would have spread the effects of relationships, such as trade in raided items, quite widely over time.

One of the bases for cooperation among Apaches was linguistic. Because members of different Apachean groups could understand each other to some extent, despite dialectal differences, they were more likely to cooperate with other Apaches than with other nearby people. And it seems likely that sharing a dialect was one of the criteria for determining who was in the same band.

Recognizing similar lifestyles might have been another motivation for cooperation. They overlapped in many ways, from kinship patterns to spiritual beliefs to political organization and economic practices. For example, members of both overall groups hunted, gathered, and raided. Indeed, as I will discuss below, Chiricahua and Western Apaches educated boys similarly for raiding and warfare, and their puberty ceremonies for girls were likewise similar. Also, they communicated with smoke signals using a common vocabulary (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 348).

In addition to recognizing similarities, sometimes different Apaches were drawn to cooperate because each had independently chosen to follow the same leader. Leadership among
Western and Chiricahua Apaches was not automatic or by definition. Individuals led by persuasion and by example, and their ability to attract followers changed according to their fortunes and and other contextual factors. At least among Chiricahua, a leader's reputation could extend even beyond the band, but leadership lasted only as long as the leader's success continued. And leaders still consulted broadly to achieve consensus within the group (Cole 1988: 27-32). For Western Apaches, Goodwin describes local groups as being “headed by a chief who directed collective enterprises such as food-gathering expeditions, farming projects, and activities involving other local groups and tribes” (1971: 14). Leadership of multiple local groups, Perry writes, “was ephemeral, apparently based on a combination of seniority, success in raiding, sagacity, diplomacy and momentary popularity” (1972: 383).

Cole (1988: 27-32) also mentions a socioeconomic division among Chiricahuas that gave some individuals a greater likelihood of exercising leadership. The Haldzil were families who had maintained preeminence over a relatively lengthy period. However, their fortunes were still quite fluid, and this was but one aspect of gaining followers for any endeavor.

Simple proximity also increased cooperation. Baldwin (1965: 23) writes that local groups conducted attacks “with occasional help from other neighboring local groups.”

Another factor that facilitated cooperation, underlying the rest, was mutually supporting self-interests, as Apaches and others perceived them. That is, others might want what one or more Apaches could distribute through trade or gift-giving. Or they might want to go on a raid, too. For example, one of Goodwin's informants reports that, as some Cibecue were preparing a revenge attack on Tucson, passing men from the San Carlos and Arivaipa bands volunteer to join them (1971: 78). This mutually supporting self-interest involved Western and Chiricahua
Apaches with members of diverse bands and non-Apaches, whether Native Americans or not.

Goodwin provides another example, in this case of Yavapais – from a separate linguistic family – joining with Western Apaches against Pimas (1971: 80).

**Limits on cooperation**

Countering these bases for cooperation was Apaches' widely reported suspicion of other Apaches from any group, protection of their own autonomy from them, and willingness to raid them. For example, Cordero wrote in 1796 that “every family head considers himself a sovereign in his district” (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 339). Later, he writes that large family groups “are dismembered as soon as those who compose it become displeased. There are some so jealous and proud that they prefer to live completely separated from the others with their wives and children, because thus no one disputes their leadership” (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 341). Opler (1961: 7) describes all Southern Athapaskans: “the fortunes of local group leaders rose and fell rapidly. ... Feuds between families were common.” According to Cole (1988: 11), “smaller bands, or local groups,” from a dozen to more than one hundred members, “were virtually autonomous in every respect.”

Goodwin underlines this idea of local autonomy and calls into question the power of proximity to motivate cooperation. He writes of Western Apaches that “the territorial boundaries of each group were clearly defined, and it happened occasionally that trespassers were forcibly expelled or killed” and claims that bands engaged in no “joint political action” (Goodwin 1971: 14).
So, just as an individual Western and Chiricahua Apache might have implicated people of almost any other category in activities on the TNHP landscape, any other Apache individual might have avoided involvement with the first individual or might have felt antagonism toward him or her. And, as I discuss below, those who cooperated in, say, raiding may well have had quite different reasons for doing so. The atomistic and voluntaristic nature of Apache relations means that generalizations regarding their activities as a group are even more imprecise than they would be for people living with more corporate and compulsory organization. That is, statements such as, “the Apaches continued to raid,” encourage misunderstanding compared to stating that “some Apaches raided, but it is unknown what their relationship to previous or later raiders or to other Apaches was.”

**Relationships with TNHP**

It is unknown what dealings the ancestors of Western or Chiricahua Apaches had with the TNHP landscape before the establishment of the mission. If we accept the estimates that place their arrival in this region quite recently, then they could not have had any direct involvement with the Piman villages there before the mission. Accepting arrivals toward the further extreme makes involvement more likely, albeit speculative. One reason to doubt that any such interactions were intense and frequent is that Chiricahuas had little to trade with others until Europeans arrived. Afterward, other groups feared to hunt as much as in the past for fear of Apaches' attacks, and Apaches raided goods that they could subsequently trade. So, while Apaches' ancestors might have had direct involvement on the TNHP landscape or with its inhabitants, any such involvement probably was of relatively minor consequence.
Rotating the question, however, presents a different perspective. Cole (1988: 49) reports a "very old Chiricahua tradition": "We took what we needed even before we came to this land."

That is, the mission landscape eventually became part of a shifting matrix of raidable resources and thus can symbolize this succession, reminding visitors of the places raided before and during the period in which Apaches targeted it.

Mission Period

*Spiritual affiliation with landscape*

Cole (1988: 11) notes that “Chiricahuas exhibited a distinctly proprietary interest in the territory they occupied,” referring to it as "my" or "our country" when speaking to Americans. "Many Chiricahuas felt Life Giver made 'this land' for the Apaches. Other lands were made for other men and for common use.” Thus, “Chiricahuas did not make war to seize or control land. What was common was a very strongly defined sense of homeland” (1988: 11-12). The G'an – mountain spirits in human form – dwelt within mountain ranges and advised and protected the Chiricahuas. The Chiricahuas fought to protect their spiritual relationship with G'an and the mountains – including the basins between them. Not surprisingly, then, Chiricahuas did not recognize Mexico's ability to transfer their homeland to the United States, especially since Chiricahuas had enjoyed spiritually sanctioned usufruct of this landscape for so long.

But where is this spiritual homeland? Several sources suggest that Apaches considered particular parts of Arizona and Sonora to be part of their homeland. However, I have found only one, slight indication that Western Apaches considered the upper Santa Cruz Valley to be within
their territory. Based on close collaboration with Apache informants, Colwell-Chanthaphohn and Ferguson (2006) write, “Although Western Apache groups differ in which mountains constitute the four sacred peaks, all situate them within what is now New Mexico (east), the Sierra Ancha in Arizona (west), northern Mexico (south), and the San Francisco Peaks in Arizona (north).” The Sierra Ancha is directly north of the upper Santa Cruz. Thus, this valley lies on the border of the spiritual homeland of the Western Apache.

Cole loosely considers “traditional Chiricahua territory” (1988: 8), associating this with the areas Chiricahuas dwelt in and raided:

To the west, the Chiricahuas used to harass the Pimas and Papagos throughout the Gila and Salt River valleys. This brought them into the Superstition Range and at times as far west as the Big Horn and Eagle Tail mountains [both more-or-less directly west of present-day Phoenix]. More than one raiding party reached the Gulf of California at about Puerto Peñasco. More usually, Chiricahua bands wintered east of Tubac.

No other source that I have found includes the TNHP landscape in the homeland of any Apache group. Goodwin (1971: 8) displays a map showing the San Carlos “subtribal group” of Western Apaches as closest to the Santa Cruz Valley; however, their farthest extension westward is the west bank of the San Pedro River as far south as Benson. Indeed, Goodwin writes that their territory is “near the foothills of the Santa Catalina Mountains and on both sides of the San Pedro River. Likewise, Opler (1965: 1) delineates the Chiricahuas' western boundary as a line through “Duncan, Wilcox, Johnson, Benson, Elgin, and Parker Canyon in Arizona”: all to the east of Guevavi and Tumacácori.
An exhibit at NMAI, co-curated by Chiricahuas, contains two germane bits of information. Part of the text states: “Their [“our ancestors”] lands extended throughout what are now southwestern New Mexico, southeastern Arizona, and the northern parts of Sonora and Chihuahua, Mexico.” A Chiricahua speaking on a video also identifies southeastern Arizona as part of the Chiricahua homeland. An inexact map depicts “CHIRICAHUA TERRITORY” extending from the Rio Grande in New Mexico to what appears very likely to be the San Pedro River. In addition, the map includes Tucson, which, although placed too far west, is shown to be distant from the Chiricahua lands; thus, the rest of Sta Cruz Valley appears to be, too.

In short, when Apache informants or sympathetic researchers with direct experience with Apache elders address the question of Apache homelands, they do not clearly include the TNHP landscape. It seems that, at most, this territory may exist on the outer edge a loosely defined traditional or spiritual territory.

**Attacks**

Apaches' best-known relationship with the TNHP landscape is as attackers. This section will provide a comprehensive survey of reasons for and ramifications of raiding and warfare among Chiricahua and Western Apaches. Cole (1988: 49) underscores the importance of these activities: “Raiding and war were found to have ties to virtually every facet of Chiricahua society”. How these general patterns relate specifically to attacks on the TNHP landscape remains mostly unknown. The chapter on the O'odham presented many of the profound effects of these attacks on the mission and post-mission community – most notably successive abandonments of different areas.
Here is what interpretive signs at the San Carlos Apache Cultural Center say regarding raiding and warfare:

“The coming of winter signaled our return to our camps in the river valleys. It was during these months that our men most frequently went out on raiding parties if the supply of our foods stored from our hunting and gathering during the rest of the year ran low.”

“Apaches were not war-like bloodthirsty savages. We raided for food only during times of shortage. Wars were waged not as random acts, but were generally well planned campaigns for revenge against injustices against us.”

“The arrival of outsiders to the region brought hostilities and change. The newcomers had little regard for our aboriginal ties to the land. In an effort to protect our traditions and culture, our ancestors fought and won many battles against the soldiers and citizens of Spain, Mexico, and the United States.”

“Tensions quickly rose in the 1870s as settlers demanded more and more of our territory. We were increasingly unable to carry on our traditional movements with the seasons to hunt, gather, and collect those things that kept us clothed, fed, sheltered and happy. We resisted by increasing raids on their farms, ranches, and towns. This was a course of action taken out of necessity by
countless other American Indian cultures across North America, but led to increased conflict … and bloodshed”.

“In desperation, our people left the reservation to hunt, gather plants, and raid in the traditional ways. These forays to relieve our poverty were commonly referred to as 'outbreaks' in the local press. We were branded criminals in the struggle to maintain our dignity.”

Except in rare cases, it is unknowable from which Apache and other groups raiders came. General comments, however, indicate that diverse Western Apaches and Chiricahuas might raid the same area. Above, while discussing cooperation with members of other groups, I presented evidence that Apaches would raid with members of other bands and, indeed, with people, such as Yavapais, whose native language was quite different. Likewise, in 1796, Cordero indicated that Western Apaches raided in Sonora in cooperation with Chiricahuas (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 350).

The importance of raiding and warfare among Western Apaches and Chiricahuas is seen in that the only organized preparation for adulthood that Western Apache and Chiricahua boys received was extensive training and experience in these activities. According to Goodwin (1971: 288), among Western Apaches, "the training of adolescent boys in prereservation times was directed towards attaining proficiency in activities connected with raiding and warfare. ... The nearest thing to a formal initiation ceremony took place on the occasion of a youth's first raiding expedition." Cole (1988:26) notes that “Chiricahua society did not develop alternatives to warrior training for boys.” As a prerequisite to fully participating in raids this education was
thereby tantamount to also being “a prerequisite to the status of a grown man and warrior” (Opler and Hoijer 1940: 619) and thus marriage.

One non-Apache observer said that central goals of the education of Apache males were “to rob and not be robbed; to kill and not be killed; to take captive and not be captured” (Cole 1988: 24). A Chiricahua informant shared this rationale: “Only by being strong and clever in comparison with others can we live out our lives. If we don't learn to [raid] well, the Mexicans will kill us all” (Cole 1988: 52). While both Western and Chiricahua Apaches distinguished between warfare and raiding, they entailed the “same general strategies, tactics, and techniques” (Cole 1988: 26). Among these was a “special 'warpath language” (Goodwin 1971: 17). Both Goodwin (1971) and Cole (1988: 23-27) provide other details of this training.

The elaborate preparations for raiding and warfare indicate that these were activities that Apache groups anticipated and saw as important. While this elaboration and institutionalization is not necessarily inconsistent with claims made in recent decades that Apaches raided only in times of severe hunger, it does imply that raiders considered raiding for sustenance – or other reasons – to be an acceptable long-term socioeconomic strategy.

Women also had direct and indirect involvement in attacks. At least among Chiricahuas, women might participate in decision-making councils and even train for and take part in raids and warfare (Cole 1988: 34-35). The prevalence of these activities is unclear. Among Western Apaches, women observed taboos to foster the success of men’s attacks elsewhere (Goodwin 1971: 267-269).
Raiding

Differences from warfare

Western Apaches and Chiricahuas distinguished between two main types of attacks: raids and warfare. Western Apaches used different terms for each, “to search out enemy property” and “to take death from an enemy,” respectively (Goodwin 1971: 16). Chiricahuas used the same term for both practices but also considered them to be separate activities – raids having a mostly economic rationale and warfare aiming to cause death, usually for revenge against a Chiricahua's death during a previous raid or another attack (Cole 1988: 48). Thus, in short, the goals of raiding and warfare were distinct. Apache raiders typically tried to maximize their capture of booty while minimizing direct confrontation with their victims, although they certainly recognized that fatal combat sometimes would result. War parties, in contrast, sought combat as their primary purpose. They preferred to identify the individual who had previously killed one of their allies, but they might simply attack the first convenient settlement that they identified with the killer. Most often, they would conduct a surprise attack in the morning, killing “as many of the enemy as possible” and then retire with whatever booty they could capture (Goodwin 1971: 18).

While Apaches and ethnographers have distinguished raids from warfare as ideal concepts, it is clear that, in practice, Apaches combined the two. Warfare yielded raided booty, and raids often led to combat. Young men's training was simultaneously for both activities. And Opler and Hoijer (1940: 622-623) note that, as a sign of raiding and warfare's equivalency, the same “clothing and amulets” spiritually provided protection during both.
**Identifying targets**

At least among the Chiricahuas, coalitions of Apaches (and perhaps others) did not attack other classes of people indiscriminately:

Chiricahuas attacked only groups who had, from the Chiricahuas' perspective, intentionallywronged them several times, perhaps on as many as four occasions. Further, the other group had to be clearly attempting to commit “injuries or insults” (Cole 1988: 58), since the Chiricahuas recognized that some people are foolish and do not understand their own actions. Once a pattern of antagonism was established, this offending group became “traditional or ceremonial enemies,” referred to with a term translated as “enemies we go against them.” These groups became, by definition, potential targets of raiding, for, as will be discussed below, “the failure to get even put the world out of balance” (Cole 1988: 60).

Chiricahuas interpreted the world through their own experience, and their method of grouping others sprang from their experience of their own relatively non-centralized society (Cole 1988: 58). Thus, they saw separate groups where others might see different parts of a single, broader society.

Different towns were judged separately, as were trappers, garrisons, wagon trains, ranchers, Mormons, and miners (Cole 1988: 59). Miners, indeed, caused the most offense for “defiling the homes of the mountain spirits” and use of gold, “a metal sacred to the sun and forbidden for Apache use” (Cole 1988: 59).

Thus it is likely that Chiricahuas and perhaps other Apaches raided mission settlements per se, rather than as agents of, for example, Spanish colonization. Perhaps, though, they attacked them as O'odham villages.
Cole claims that Spanish-speaking society became ceremonial enemies quickly and permanently, although, conversely, he notes that the Galvez policy of creating dependency among Apaches on Spanish guns, food, alcohol, and other goods did lessen raids and induce some to settle near or trade with Spanish towns (Cole 1988: 71).

Apparently, Chiricahuas eventually recognized ties between different aspects of the state societies that confronted them. For example, scalp-hunting against them increased “Chiricahua hatred of all things Mexican” (Cole 1988: 75).

Goodwin's materials hint that Western Apaches applied a similar, though perhaps less developed logic. According to an informant, they would take scalps only from “real enemies, like Navajo, Mexicans, Whites” – never from people they had attacked within “their own group” (Goodwin 1971: 277). Scalps were taken to ceremonially weaken the entire group from which they came.

**Motivations**

The origins of Apache attacks have received different explanations. Above I have noted Apache claims that their ancestors raided before arriving in Arizona or encountering non-Indians.

In contrast, a variety of observers believe that the preponderance of responsibility lies with Spanish, Mexican, and U.S. colonization. Cordero in 1796 speculated, “Perhaps it was originated in former times by the trespasses, excesses and avarice of the colonists themselves” (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 350) Silas Cochise, Sr., agrees (NMAI: A Peaceful People):

Most people think of us as violent and warlike, as if our ancestors were barbarians. We had periods of war and peace, like all peoples. But we were
mainly a peaceful people. Our ancestors were husbands and wives, children and grandchildren, and nephews and nieces, who moved here and there as families, not as war parties. Our reputation for being warlike started later because of intrusion onto our lands. Non-Natives created that change.

Similarly, the Center for Desert Archaeology (2004: 9) states:

Apache people are keen to note that the Spanish explorers and missionaries were the invaders, intent on eradicating a 'peril' that was created, in part, by European colonialism. Raiding became more profitable as the Spaniards concentrated people into villages and introduced cattle, new weaponry, and horses. Military expeditions promoted violence, rather than suppressing it, because the Apache could not adequately farm or hunt while they were constantly assailed. Apache warfare – revenge for unjust killings – became increasingly necessary as the Spaniards more regularly conducted ruthless military campaigns, murdering entire families and burning villages and fields. Apache elders today do not view their ancestors as aggressors but as the defenders of a revered homeland.


Despite these many statements, I find it likely that Apaches raided as an important part of their way of life before coming into contact with Spanish society and before reaching southern Arizona. In short, so many Athapaskan-speaking peoples – spread so far across northern New Spain in different social and environmental conditions – focused on raiding more than most of their Indian neighbors that it seems likely that their
common ancestors focused on raiding, too. Many good reasons have been suggested above for the *intensification* of Apache raiding when Europeans begin settling.

Raiding was primarily but not exclusively an economic pursuit, and it was an integral part of Western and Chiricahua Apaches' economic relations. The other major aspects of their economic 'production' were hunting and gathering and, among Western Apaches, some agriculture (Goodwin 1971: 13, Ctr Des Arch 9, Cole 1988: 47). Raiding stood in particular contrast to hunting (Cole 1988: 49). Excellent hunters not only used distinct skills; they were believed to exercise spiritual powers that could not coincide easily with those favoring raiding.

The victims of raids were”economic resources.” As Goodwin (1971: 19) puts it:

The western Apache did not organize raids for the purpose of increasing their already vast territory; nor was their aim to drive away or exterminate the Mexicans and Indians who had settled along its margins. To the contrary, these populations had become extremely valuable economic resources which could be counted on throughout the year to produce substantial amounts of food and livestock. ... This may help explain why mass killing and the destruction of enemy property never formed a part of the raiding complex.

Warfare, discussed below, had different aims.

Leaders cast raids as resulting from need, but need is in the eye of the beholder. Goodwin (1971: 16) states, "Raids were organized in response to a shortage of food. The leader of a raid would typically give a speech casting it as a economic necessity to motivate other raiders (Opler 1965: 333).
Cole (1988: 52) quotes a Chiricahua informant, whom he must have interviewed after 1970:

“They went on raids because they were in need. They divided their booty among the poor in camp. Sometimes they traded it to the well-to-do. Sometimes the horses were traded for a woman [in marriage].” Another informant limited the motivation to being “in need.”

Apaches' dependence on raiding changed historically:

As Cole (1988: 48) summarizes it: “Far more productive than agriculture was the practice of raiding. From the seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries, Apaches, and especially Chiricahuas, obtained increasing amounts of their sustenance from raids directed against settled farming and ranching peoples.” Chiricahua diets changed to include livestock after Europeans arrived in the region. Cole also claims that Chiricahuas could get “most of their protein needs” met through hunting until Mexicans and Americans settled the area more extensively (1988: 42-43). So, “as long as ample territory was available for hunting and gathering, raiding was not necessary to survival, although it was essential for any increase in wealth and prestige of the families within the bands; ” the constriction of Chiricahuas' territory for hunting and gathering meant that “raiding became a basic means of survival” Cole 1988: 56).

Apaches also participated in raids to improve their social status via economic means. Or so Opler and Hoijer (1940: 620, n. 8) strongly imply: “raiding expeditions for booty ... were the royal road to wealth and distinction.” Similarly, Baldwin (1965: 96-97) writes: "Wealth was gauged in terms of property – horses and cattle a man secured in raids, the meat and hides and food supplies stored away.”

The distribution of booty implicated wider networks of Apaches (and non-Apache trading partners) in the raiding economy:
For example, a White Mountain Apache told Goodwin that “some Mexicans and also a few White people used to come from the north to get horses, mules, and burros from us that we had taken in Mexico. They used to trade us blankets, guns, and gunpowder for them” (1971: 63).

Through raiding, Chiricahuas also gained items to trade and also made their neighbors reluctant to hunt and gather items on their land, which thus spurred trade for these items (Cole 1988: 49).

Cole argues that “the economics of the girl's ceremony encouraged raiding in the nineteenth century” (1988: 20). This was a major rite of passage that families provided for girls as they entered adolescence. Then, as now, the girl's ceremony was costly because of the great amounts of labor-time, materials, food, and gifts that the girl's family had to furnish, and “only by raids could the necessary goods and food be acquired” (Cole 1988: 23).

Cole's informants denied that surpluses from raiding created the desire for large-scale largesse during the girl's ceremony. Indeed, they told him that “the lavish bestowal of gifts at the girl's ceremony 'has always been done,'” which, since this contradicts other oral traditions, he reinterprets as “before Spanish arrival” (1988: 22).

However, raiding did bring changes, as Chiricahuas increasingly gave European-derived trade goods, such as cloth, instead of items given before Europeans arrived, for example buckskin. In addition, the increasing settlement of non-Apaches on their traditional hunting grounds made raiding even more preferable as a way of obtaining items for the ceremony.

Western Apache groups conducted similar ceremonies. It is possible that they, too, undertook raids, at least in part, to enhance the success of these rituals. This is an example of
how economic necessity is perhaps in the eye of the beholder and of how Apaches raided for economic reasons but not always to quell hunger.

While raiding was primarily an economic activity, Apaches' cosmology shaped how they conceived of their relations with others and their options for action (Cole 1988: 62):

For Chiricahuas, raiding was “a practical application of a cosmology in which forces of the universe were at war with one another” (1988:52). Amoral, conflictive power is primordial. This power infuses the universe and all human relations and attributes (Cole 1988: 14-15).
Supernatural beings “sponsored and protected human beings” (Cole 1988: 15). Power of a certain type worked mostly “to preserve its allies and destroy its enemies” (Cole 1988: 17), including through raiding and warfare, among many other aspects of life.

Chiricahuas “held the belief in the simultaneous likeness and difference in all things” (Cole 1988: 37). While this quote refers to their gender ideologies, it also applies to their view of ethnic relations. This is seen in a Chiricahua account of different groups' origins:

The spiritual being Ussen created White Pained Woman, also a spiritual figure – and a pivotal one who got the G'an, or mountain spirits, to help Apaches (Cole 1988: 14). White Painted Woman had two sons who lived past infancy, and these sons had different fathers. She and the sun begot Killer of Enemies, who “caused the creation of White Man”; lightning helped conceive Child of the Water, who “caused the creation of the Chiricahuas and other Indians” (Cole 1988: 15).

Thus, Chiricahuas and non-Indians had both similarity and difference in their origins. (It should be noted that Chiricahuas had conflictive relations with people from any other group, including other Chiricahuas.)
Thus, “humans were a product of supernatural creation. They were created in a world filled with conflict, in which the ability to kill was necessary to survive” (Cole 1988: 15). Chiricahuas did not see antagonism as an unnatural state; quite the contrary.

At least some Chiricahua Apaches “considered the raid to be not only an economic necessity, but a positive means of shaping individuals and society as well” (Cole 1988: 49). It also provided them with opportunities to improve their social status in ways that were not primarily economic. Attacks allowed participants to demonstrate their bravery, which received social emphasis. Cordero wrote, “The Apache is proud of nothing, except of being brave ... he despises the man of whom no bold deed is known” (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 341). Likewise, Opler mentions “glory and enhanced status” as “by-products of the raid” (1965: 333).

Boys were expected to become full-fledged raiders before they married, and this transition prototypically required that they go on four raids as novices. So did Apaches undertake some raids, at least in part, to give boys an avenue to adulthood? Cole (1988: 26) provides indications that this did occur. He notes that “traditional means of male alliance and advancement were closed in times of prolonged peace.” Thus, during the reservation period, “pressures for male advancement, both as youths and adults, created a powerful incentive for continued raiding ... In the absence of acceptable alternatives to acquisition of status and wealth, raids were to be expected.” However, the importance of this self-perpetuating cycle (training-raiding-training) in motivating raids is unknown.
Regarding Chiricahuas, Cole (1988: 54) states that a traditional raiding season, “from full moon in October to full moon in November,” changed to smaller raiding expeditions that took place year-round by the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Goodwin (1971: 16) offers a prototypical scenario for Western Apaches organizing a raid. As meat in a local group dwindles, an older woman would call for a raid. An experienced man would volunteer to lead the expedition, and other experienced men would choose whether to join in. Some men who were eligible might choose, for whatever reason, to not go (Cole 1988: 53). Among Chiricahuas at least, “the one considered to be most valiant takes the command of all by common consent; and although this dignity does not cause any particular subordination, or dependence on the part of the others, since every individual is free to go, to remain, or to disapprove the ideas of the chief, the influence of the latter is always preponderant” (Matson and Schroeder 1957: 342).

**Warfare**

Warfare was a distinct activity that had different aims from raiding but required similar powers. Among Western Apaches, war parties were recruited within local groups among relatives and across local groups by clan or phratry affiliation. The prototypical goal was to avenge a death during some earlier confrontation, whether via raiding, warfare, or some other encounter (Goodwin 1971: 17). An informant described how attackers encouraged each other: “If we kill one of those Mexicans like they killed one of us, they we will all be talked about and praised” (Goodwin 1971: 255). Among the Chiricahuas, warfare might target a specific individual or a group. As seen above:
groups might end up “evolving into a permanent, nearly ceremonial enemy status. ... War parties would go against the enemy without any triggering causal incident. After many years, Mexicans and Comanches achieved such status for most Chiricahua bands. Americans also achieved this position with some bands, but in a much shorter time” (Cole 1988: 25).

**Effects of raiding and warfare**

The conduct of raids and warfare involved different members of Apache societies in particular ways. The effects of these attacks likewise ramified throughout these groups in culturally specific patterns.

**Demographic changes**

One of the demographic changes to Apache societies resulting from hostilities was the taking of captives. Accounts present a similar pattern for Chiricahuas and Western Apaches. They usually preferred child captives, especially young boys. These might (or might not) initially be treated as “servants,” and some would escape eventually. For others, “the feeling of captivity wears off in time” (Opler 1965: 351). However, one of Goodwin's informants said that captives incorporated into Apache groups were referred to as “born outside” and that “there are lots of them at Cibecue” (1971: 286). Despite such verbal marking, “such a boy can marry into the tribe later, and his children are accepted as members of the tribe” (Opler 1965: 351). Baldwin states that some obtained “high positions within the group” (1965: 121).

The Apaches who adopted captives might have lost relatives in attacks. They termed this 'to be paid back,' “and when it was done they felt all right again” (Goodwin 1971: 77; see also
Captives reportedly called their adoptive parents “mother” and “father” (Opler 1965: 351). Similar adoptions of adult men and women occurred, too, but less frequently (Cole 1988: 75).

Another reason for taking captives was to learn their languages. Cole (1988: 31) claims that Chiricahuas engaged in “sporadic” attempts to capture speakers of European tongues to learn from them. Multilingualism would provide advantages in trade.

Apaches rarely kept adult-male captives. They were too dangerous, and the introduction of scalping by non-Indians led Apaches to focus more on retaliatory scalping and torture (Cole 1988: 75). Most often, captured men and sometimes women were brought back to camp so that female relatives of killed Apaches could torture and kill them to restore a sense of balance (Goodwin 1971: 18, 286). Similarly, a Western Apache told Goodwin of a young male relative whom the Chiricahuas captured and killed (1971: 286).

Captive women were not forced into marriage – or sex. One of Opler’s informants claimed, “‘The Chiricahua do not force a woman captive. If you can make her love you, all right. But she is not mistreated’” (1965: 351). Baldwin claims that some captive women were enslaved (1965: 121).

It is unclear which captives – or how many – were incorporated into which Apache societies. So I have not been able to trace the effects of captive-taking on the lives of specific inhabitants of the TNHP landscape. It is possible that captive-taking that occurred away from this landscape led people to change their relationship to it, for example by moving to a mission community.
Spanish-speaking society and O'odham likewise took Apache captives. For example, Mission 2000 contains a record for the baptism at Guevavi in 1753 of Tomas Beldarrain, “Apachito comprado por el Capitán Juan Tomás de Beldarrain.” While those taken by Apaches might have been denied a greater relationship with the TNHP landscape, such Apaches taken by Spanish speakers or O'odham might have been forced into one.

Apaches readily adopted people “born outside” into their societies, but they did not ‘write off’ members of their group whom others had captured. Western Apaches reintegrated returned escapees without ceremony (Goodwin 1971: 287). Females who had been held captive but then escaped were among the few Chiricahuas who could speak other languages. They were trusted enough to serve as envoys to other groups (Cole 1988: 31). Western Apaches continued to consider the fate of those who did not escape (Goodwin 1971: 192-193).

Place of death

No doubt Apaches died on the TNHP landscape. Apparently the place of death per se had little importance to them, but the burial location was the subject of considerable anxiety. Apaches feared the malevolent actions of ghosts – whether closely related or not – who could cause misfortunes such as disease and even death. Apaches thus sought to dispose of corpses at a considerable distance from their settlements, typically under rocks or in caves, and they burned the dead person's possessions (Hrdlicka 1905 483, 492). Indeed, they avoided mentioning or even thinking the name of the deceased, lest they summon his or her ghost (Perry 1972: 383; Baldwin 1965: 96-97). Thus, it is unlikely that Apaches in the past would have wanted to visit the TNHP landscape to consecrate it as a burial place.
Migrations

As the chapter on the O'odham made clear, Apache attacks spurred migrations among other groups. For example, O'odham left the San Pedro Valley, the displaced residing at least temporarily at Calabazas. Ultimately, Apache attacks led to the O'odham's abandonment, unintentionally permanent, of the TNHP landscape and their dispossession. Thus, it is conceivable that Apache raiding indirectly made the Park possible, while bolstering San Xavier's continuing autonomy with the influx of O'odham from the Upper Santa Cruz. The retreat of the O'odham during the mission period also led them to consolidate in fewer locations and to mix socially and probably genetically more than they had in the decades immediately before the Apache groups' ascendance.

Apache attacks likewise led to migrations among members of Spanish-speaking society on this landscape. As Apache raiders over-exploited this resource, the reduction of Spanish-speakers in the surrounding areas (Cole 1988: 80) might have lessened Spanish-speakers' intervention in the O'odham mission communities.

Changing expectations

Apache raids, on the TNHP landscape and elsewhere, led to changing expectations among Apaches. Because of the wide distribution of booty these changes probably were quite widespread, beyond the individuals who participated directly in raiding and warfare. For example, they learned to expect different foods, such as horse meat. As noted above, their expectations of
wealth also changed, as raiding afforded them trade goods and the ability to host more-elaborate ceremonies for young women.

Post-Mission period, through the Apache Wars

With the end of the mission period at Tumacácori and the transfer of putative jurisdiction from Mexico to the United States as part of the Gadsden Purchase in 1854, Apache relations with the TNHP landscape changed. Many Apaches eventually came to regard Americans as traditional enemies, along with Mexicans and some members of any other Indian group, including other Apaches. Cole states that, in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, Chiricahuas would raid anyone except other Chiricahuas (1988: 56).

For this period, a couple of sources provide a bit more specificity regarding whence the raiders along the upper Santa Cruz came. John Spring reports that the culprits in the attacks within one hundred miles around Tubac were “for the most part Chiricahuas” (Spring 1966: 150). However, he also writes that Es-ki-men-zin's group “reinforced” more-local Apaches in attacks along the upper Santa Cruz (Spring 1966: 237-238). Cozzens observed a group of Apaches near this landscape and identifies them without explanation as “undoubtedly, Coyotero Apaches, and a part of Delgado's band” (1876: 171).

I have not been able to identify many activities of Apaches specifically on the TNHP landscape during this period. However, Cozzens writes that, during his visit in the late 1850s, “owing to the constant raids of the Apaches, 'tis [Santa Cruz Valley] but a barren waste” (1876: 165). More specifically, many nearby mines were abandoned (1876: 166-175), and he attributes Tumacácori's worse preservation compared to San Xavier del Bac to “the vandalism of the
Americans and the depredation of the Apaches” (1876: 165). Utley states that Apaches' raids led the United State to establish Fort Buchanan on Sonoita Creek, “to provide protection for the growing settlements in the Santa Cruz Valley south of Tucson” (1977: 20). And Spring claims: “Especially severe was the loss of life of settlers and travelers in the Santa Cruz Valley and near the present site of the city of Nogales and about the Sonoita Creek and the pass of the same name, leading from Heubaba [Guevavi] to Fort Crittenden [across the Santa Rita Mountains from Tubac]” (1966: 150).

Despite this evidence of Apache raiding during the early U.S. period in this region, neither Cole's (1988: 50-51) or Baldwin's (1965: 40-41) map of raiding trails includes raiding routes along the upper Santa Cruz. Indeed, the index to Cole's work includes does not have any entry for locations within the TNHP landscape. It is possible that, while Apaches' actions are central to the history of this area, this area was more peripheral to Apaches' history.

The pace of attacks changed over time. Cozzens' report suggests that Apache attacks were frequent in the 1850s, yet apparently the withdrawal of U.S. troops to fight the Civil War led to an increase in raiding (Baldwin 1965: 31, Utley 1977: 25). Conversely, Spring credits the Camp Grant Massacre, in 1871, with spurring the repopulation, by non-Indians, of the general area in which the TNHP landscape sits.

**Americans as enemies**

There are different explanations for the development of how Apaches, especially Chiricahuas, came to see Americans as enemies.
According to Cole (1988:77), the U.S. military under Gen. Kearny arrived in the region during the U.S.-Mexico War with a predefined expectation of Indian responsibility for Indians' hostilities with Spanish-speaking society. So, even though Chiricahuas offered to aid the United States against Mexico, Kearny pledged to protect Mexicans against them. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo formalized this alliance by making the United States responsible for preventing or compensating Mexico for Indian attacks that originated in the United States.

(As mentioned above, Chiricahuas did not recognize either state's jurisdiction over their territory, at least, as legitimate.) Thus, in this account, U.S. personnel predefined their relationship with Apaches as antagonistic, ensuring that it would become so.

Spring (1966: 52-55) provides a different account, based on his discussions with non-Apaches and a former “half-breed” captive of the Apaches. This explanation centers on events along the Santa Cruz. After the Gadsden Purchase, Apaches, under Cochise, abstained from attacking Anglos or Mexicans – but not O'odham – in US territory, and they received corresponding consideration from these groups. Indeed, Apaches worked in nearby mines (and thus perhaps on the TNHP landscape, too). Supposedly, raiding groups of Apaches used the upper-to-mid Santa Cruz as an escape route from Sonora. However, Texans and other Anglos squatted along the Santa Cruz from Calabazas and Guevavi to La Canoa. After a large Apache raid, apparently around 1857, the Mexican victims rode ahead of the Apache raiders, who were herding their cattle through the Santa Cruz. The Mexicans enticed the squatters, who initially had felt reluctant because of their neighbors' warnings to preserve the truce with the Apaches, to help them attack the Apache raiders. They did so successfully, killing seven Apaches: "leaving seven dead upon the field, an almost unheard of thing with them ... as they invariably carry off or hide
their dead whenever they have any possible opportunity to do so ... Cochise might have forgiven
the recapture of the herd, but never the killing of his warriors.” The longer-term result:
“relentless warfare.” Again, in this account hostilities do not spring solely from Apaches' actions.

From interpretive displays at the NMAI:

"We were once a nomadic people who moved with the seasons. Our best camping sites were rich
in resources -- silver, gold, and copper. That is why the Americans wanted our lands.

“War came to us, and we fought back.”

GREAT LEADERS OF THE CHIRICAHUA APACHES, 1861-1880

By Silas Cochise, Sr., 2007”

The Chiricahua Apaches have had many great leaders, including Nana, Naiche, Loco,
and Toclanni, who fought for the survival of our people. Here you will encounter stories about
Cochise, Mangas Coloradas, Victorio, Chihuahua, and Geronimo – wise and honorable men who
served Apaches well, but who were shamefully betrayed by the U.S. government.

“Mangas Coloradas (ca. 1793-1863) became a leader of our people in the early 1840s. He was a
brave warrior who led raids on towns and villages in Chihuahua and Sonora, Mexico. When our
lands in the U.S. were overrun by miners and settlers, he and other Chiricahua leaders decided
that resistance was the only way to stop the intruders.
Coloradas led war parties that attempted to shut off all traffic through our territories. They ambushed wagon trains, attacked stagecoach stations, and invaded towns. One time, cannons were used to drive them out of Los Pinos, New Mexico.

In 1863, Mangas Coloradas was lured into negotiating under a flag of truce, but U.S. troops captured him instead. He died 48 hours later. … Today, we remember him as a brave chief who gave his life to defend our lands."

“Cochise (ca. 1810-74) became a chief around 1850." [The Bascom Affair is described.] "To avenge his relatives' deaths, Cochise waged war against the Americans, leading raids against towns and U.S. Army troops. By 1872, conflict had taken its toll on Cochise, and he agreed to stop fighting. Peace, he said, was necessary to ensure the survival of our people.”

"With thousands of soldiers pursuing our people, peace seemed like the best way to ensure our survival. That is why some Chiricahua Apaches worked as scouts for the U.S. Army."

After the Apache Wars

After the final subjugation of Apaches in the United States, Apaches' direct involvement with the TNHP landscape has been infrequent and relatively inconsequential. For example, James, in 1917, wrote that “the long-forgotten Franciscan Mission of San Jose de Tumacacori, ... on my visit a few years ago, was being used as a stable by an Apache Indian” (1917: 15-16). I have found no corroboration of this assertion, and it seems much more likely that James misidentified a Yaqui caretaker. Perhaps others have worked on ranches, hunted and gathered, or
migrated through this landscape. Recent years probably have seen the visit of an occasional Apache tourist. Also, Apaches such as the Peridot Headstart Apache Crown Dancers have participated in La Fiesta (Eisele and Mariolle n.d.).

Cole (1988: 1-2) provides one potential reason for Apaches' lack of interest in visiting the Park and in participating in this research:

“Apache tradition requires that at such a point, the names of those persons no longer be used. In a few years Apaches will remember only the 'Old Ones,' 'they,' and 'those people.'”

Perhaps a similar blurring of history regarding places has taken place among Apaches. In addition, basic works of academic research that focus on Western Apaches and Chiricahuas carry little or no information regarding their relationship to the TNHP. Thus Apaches today might have little to report specifically about this place.
Chapter 7
Concluding Thoughts

Meaningful connections abound between the TNHP landscape and each of the three groups considered here. These relationships have changed historically, as have other aspects of the groups and control of the landscape. The academic historical evidence yields connections that the interviews do not or, sometimes, that directly contradict them. Yet a connection felt today, or an unrecognized one discernible in old documents, is still a connection.

On a group level, it would be difficult for most observers to deny the primacy of O’odham’s relationship to this land, given its length, extent, and variety. Yet on a subgroup or individual level, an individual O’odham may feel or have less connection than does, say, an individual Yaqui. Weighing such issues involves making distinctions that are intrinsically debatable.

Of course, this report is incomplete, especially in its treatment of Apaches’ relationship with this area. In addition, coverage of other groups is needed: Yumas, Puebloan clans, Mexicans & Mexican Americans, the Catholic Church, Park Service personnel, and treasure hunters, at least.

For most of these groups today, Tumacácori seems to be a peripheral concern, at most. Still, members of these groups have had a strong influence on events on this landscape in the past and present. Moreover, the Park, through its interpretive offerings, can serve as more than a monument to past events in this specific place. It can highlight more fully the ways in which local history serves as an example of processes – such as missionization and the reduction of
Native American control of lands – that have occurred more broadly and that, thus, receive more emphasis in the broader society.

Finally, I recommend that the Park consider whether its primary purpose in interpretation is 1) to document events and relations and to provoke thought and discussion about them or 2) to advocate for a particular side of historical struggles and debates. In my experience, the choice of Living History characters and their actions, the uses of the church, and comments by interpretive personnel (especially but not exclusively about Apaches) amounted to an implicit, if not explicit, defense of missionization. I do not advocate a blanket condemnation of missionization, but historical and present-day debates exist over its character. A more polyvocal approach would help visitors to understand these disagreements. Although I have not focused this report on points of divergence, I hope that it will help to highlight at least some of them.
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