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Abstract

This dissertation offers a broad community history of the Tigua Indians of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo from colonial contact to their federal recognition in 1987. Considering Tigua history in a Borderlands context, it explores the interaction between community and identity. Here I argue that the Tiguas persisted through Spanish, Mexican, and American colonization because various identity markers involving place, interaction, and shared culture enhanced their community identity as an Indigenous people. This dissertation also examines how social upheaval, migrations, and land dispossession impacted the Tiguas in various contexts, as well as some of the ways in which they adapted to change and maintained group cohesion as an Indigenous pueblo.
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Introduction

The Tigua Indians of Ysleta del Sur, Texas have experienced significant cultural, political, social, and economic changes since their initial migrations from Isleta, New Mexico during the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. As one of the first Native American tribes to be recognized at both the federal and state levels in the wake of the post-World War Two termination era, Tigua recognition in 1968, as stated by Vine Deloria, Jr., “plainly demonstrated that Indian tribal society had the strength and internal unity to maintain itself indefinitely within an alien culture.”¹ Deloria’s statement illustrates how the Tigua community of Ysleta resiliently persisted as it experienced both change and continuity for over three hundred years. It also exemplifies how the Tigua community responded to various pressures from outsiders. From the period of Spanish colonization during the 1600s, to the era of tribal recognition, cultural renewal and social renaissance of the 1960s, 70s and 80s, the Tigua have negotiated resettlement, maintained a predominant mission-Indian community, and preserved their identity as a unique group of people living in a place that has been impacted significantly by myriad forces of change. Situated directly on the U.S.-Mexico Border, Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo has experienced an intense amount of social change under the influences of Colonial Spain, Mexico, and the United States.

Yet in spite of the social and cultural influences brought on by these empires and nation states, Tiguas crafted a flexible socio-cultural identity that survived incorporation into the dominant Mexican, Mexican-American, and American societies. In *Custer Died For Your Sins*, Deloria explained that the Tigua and other Native American groups like them maintained this sense of tribal cohesion because they maintained important cultural traditions that connected them to their pre-Pueblo Revolt ways of life, yet reflected their adaptation to the new cultural landscape of
the Paso del Norte region. Taking a closer look at how the Tigua maintained their identity, tribal anthropologist Nicholas Houser stated that this happened because they practiced religious customs and tribal rituals, such as ceremonies and dances; they retained the tribal system of government as established under Spanish colonization; they upheld kinship ties and bonds of “compradazgo,” which involve familial commitments based on responsibilities as godparents; and they did not experience any major catastrophic disruptions to their community. In addition, Houser also stated that the Tigua maintained their identity in opposition to external pressures, such as discrimination, prejudice, and land dispossession. As such, these scholars suggest that the Tigua maintained their identity through a combination of internal and external factors.

As a mission-Indian community situated on the U.S.–Mexico border, the Tigua experienced a variety of external factors that influenced their identity as a group. Beginning in 1680 with the first migration from New Mexico as captives, burden bearers and refugees who accompanied the retreating colonial Spanish settlers to El Paso Del Norte during the Pueblo Revolt, the Tigua community eventually solidified in Ysleta Del Sur and transitioned into a vibrant, productive, and attractive Indigenous community which flourished amongst its Indigenous and non-Indigenous neighbors. During the colonial era, this cohesion allowed the Tigua a space to establish themselves as a strong mission-Indian community in New Spain’s northern borderlands. As this period drew to an end with the secularization of the missions and Mexican independence, the Tigua community benefitted from the new nation’s Indian policies and its inconspicuous location on the periphery on Mexico’s northern frontier. During this time, external pressures such as Apache raiding parties also influenced group cohesion among the Tigua and helped reinforce their identity as a people.
These pressures on Tigua society increased with the expansion of the U.S. nation-state, its economic influence upon northern Mexico, and the bloody U.S.-Mexico War, the aftermath of which placed Ysleta Del Sur in the state of Texas. Although there is little, if any documentation of Tigua participation in the War, the peace and signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 rearranged their cultural landscape and brought many of them into the recently created U.S. territory. The creation of the U.S.-Mexico international border along the Rio Grande River significantly impacted the Tigua as a shift in the river placed Ysleta north of the boundary line into the United States. Amidst increasing Euro-American expansion and rising ethnic tensions in the region, the Tigua faced a new specter of prejudice and discrimination as outsiders encroached upon their land and demeaned their Indigeneity. While this pressure caused some fragmentation, such as the migration to Tortugas near present-day Las Cruces, it also strengthened group cohesion among the Tigua and increased their resolve to persist as a community. In response to encroachments on their lands by outsiders and increased warfare with other Indians in the region, the Tigua negotiated their situation and used the circumstances of the time to their advantage. By assisting in U.S. cavalry campaigns against the Apache, Tigua actions suggest that that their willingness to aid the United States stemmed less from a conformist position and more from a desire to play these new arrivals against their old enemies. However, the most significant pressure came in the form of racialization during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in which Euro-Americans categorized the Tigua as Mexicans because of their strong ties with the region’s local ethnic-Mexican community.5

The assumption that the Tigua had fully assimilated into Mexican society at the turn of the twentieth-century ironically reinforced Tigua identity. In spite of dominant assumptions about their Mexican-ness, the Tigua maintained their identity and shared it in the public sphere by
performing dances and rituals, such as their presentation at the 1936 Texas Centennial. By the late 1950s, the external pressures of U.S. mainstream society had strained the Tigua community to its limits as property taxes threatened to take what land they had left. Yet the community resisted these efforts as attorney Tom Diamond and others helped to bring them out from historical obscurity and gain state recognition in 1968 and federal recognition in 1987. In the climate of this changing political milieu, outsiders increasingly questioned the validity of Tigua indigeneity. As a result of recognition, the Tigua community experienced a social and cultural renewal that echoed the era’s civil rights movements and national awakening of Native American consciousness. Through these often volatile periods of change, the Tigua maintained their community and identity as a dynamic and cohesive group of Indigenous peoples for the past three hundred years.6

**Objective**

Considering the aforementioned overview of the main currents in Tigua history, my objective is to present a broad history of the Tigua of Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo and discuss how they maintained their community and identity under the pressures of Spanish colonization, Mexican statehood, warfare with other Indigenous groups, and United States expansion. I also seek to position the history of the Tigua in a Borderlands context by illustrating how they negotiated a dynamic borderlands world that transitioned from colonial New Spain’s northern frontier to the modern politically constructed U.S.-Mexico border. Viewing the Tigua as real life historical actors who made decisions “on the ground,” I intend to move beyond the viewpoint that sees American Indians as helpless victims of circumstance and oppression. Although it is undeniable that Euro-American expansion has marginalized and oppressed Indigenous peoples throughout history, it is an injustice to Native Americans to present their history through such a one-sided view. Thus,
finding historical agency where it becomes apparent, I seek to present a balanced perspective that offers another look at the Tigua historical experience. In short, this project’s objective is to reveal the unique nature of the Tigua as a borderlands people who persistently negotiated the complexities of their changing social environment.

Building from the work of Loretta Fowler and Morris W. Foster, which draws the connections between community and identity in a way that reveals how they reciprocally reinforced each other over time in various social and historical contexts, my overarching argument contends that Tigua identity maintained itself because of various external pressures and internal articulations over the past three hundred years. More directly, I argue that the Tiguas maintained their community identity through connections to place and collective interactions in which group activities reinforced a sense of belonging. Underlying these communal interactions, kinship and family ties, traditional meetings and ceremonies, and notions of place and sovereignty all served as markers that helped the Tigua maintain their community identity as a cohesive group of people. As such, the Tiguas negotiated the changes around them and made decisions in their own best interests without regard for the future historical implications of their actions. Although the Tigua community has changed over time, identity as a member of that community in relation to people, place and collective experience bonded its members. These connections and lived experiences allowed for the perseverance and continuity of community identity in various colonial contexts.

Although Tigua identity is strongly associated with place, it is also centered in being Tigua and practicing the cultural lifestyle and traditions of the community. Over time, these involved various group activities that enhanced their collective consciousness as a people. Participation in tribal government, traditional ceremonies, agriculture, hunting, military service, boarding schools, and various other collective experiences all reinforced community identity. In turn, these types of
activities and experiences created an internal sense of belonging that enabled the community to withstand migrations and resettlement, absorb outsiders through intermarriage and kinship ties, and persist through social upheavals such as the Pueblo Revolt and the land disposssession.

**Literature Review**

The history of Tigua community of Ysleta Del Sur fits well into the threads of Borderlands History and American Indian History. In addition, the corpus of literature that pertains specifically to the history of the Tigua is another genre of its own. My work seeks to position Tigua history within an eclectic historical framework that falls into these three historical narratives of Borderlands, American Indian, and Tigua history. Overall, my main contribution is looking at the broad history of the community through a Borderlands perspective that elucidates the messiness and complexity of Tigua history.

Examining Tigua history through a Borderlands perspective illuminates how they negotiated various historical contexts. As a mission-Indian community narrative, the history of the Tigua relates well with the trajectory of Borderlands literature that emerged early in the twentieth-century. Beginning in 1917 with Herbert Eugene Bolton’s pioneering article, “The Mission as a Frontier Institution in the Spanish American Colonies,” Borderlands scholars examined the history of various mission-Indian communities and continued to do so into the twenty-first century. A student of Frederick Jackson Turner, who in 1893 proposed the “frontier thesis” in his famous essay, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” Bolton brought out the history of colonial Spain in the North American Southwest and illustrated that the history of this region involved a great deal of cross-cultural contact between Indigenous peoples and colonial Spanish settlers, soldiers, and missionaries. Often referred to as the father of Borderlands History, Bolton
embedded the history of the Spanish Borderlands into the narrative of United States history. By refuting the implicit idea in Turner’s argument that United States westward expansion occurred over empty and free land, Bolton viewed Turner’s thesis as shortsighted because it neglected the presence of the Spanish, French, and Native American historical actors who shaped the region’s history.9

Although Bolton is known for numerous publications, such as his 1921 book, The Spanish Borderlands: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest, his 1917 article, “The Mission as a Frontier Institution,” set a precedent for Borderlands History by illustrating the role that the Spanish missions played among Indigenous peoples and colonial settlers. For Bolton, missions served as benevolent institutions that sought to preserve and protect Indians from the evils of colonial settlements.10 Yet this oversimplified version of mission/Indian relations did not fully account for the ways in which Indigenous peoples accommodated to and negotiated life within the missions. In response, various historians criticized Bolton for being too Eurocentric, romanticizing the Spanish missions, and portraying Indians as passive recipients of Spanish civilization. By the 1940s, scholars such as Sherburne F. Cook and Carey McWilliams de-romanticized Bolton’s Spanish missions and rearticulated Borderlands History by focusing more on the dark side of the Indigenous experience.11 In his essay, “The Indian versus the Spanish Mission,” Cook discussed how European diseases, forced labor, and corporal punishment caused a significant population decline among California’s mission-Indians during Spanish colonization. Similarly, McWilliams’s Southern California Country vilified the Franciscans and equated California’s missions with Nazi concentration camps.12 Thus, from the turn of the century until the 1940s, Borderlands viewpoints of the mission-Indian experience shifted from a romanticization of Spain’s colonial legacy to a victimization of its Indian participants.
Between the late 1940s and late 1960s, another thread of Borderlands scholarship emerged as anthropologists and ethno-historians such as Edward Spicer emphasized intercultural contact, migration patterns, and identity in Indigenous communities. Yet despite this seeming disappearance, the earlier thread of scholarship that emphasized the Spanish Borderlands, persisted throughout the 1950s and 1960s as scholars like John Frances Bannon greatly perpetuated the Boltonian tradition. By 1970, Bannon’s book, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier, 1513-1821*, echoed Bolton’s viewpoints, presenting Spanish colonization in a positive way that minimized its negative implications for Indigenous peoples.

As Bannon’s viewpoint faded with the rise of “new” social histories tied to the civil rights and power movements, Borderlands History as a field seemed on the verge of being absorbed by either United States or Latin American history. In response, Borderlands scholars such as David Weber revived the field and brought it out of seeming obscurity. This emergence is evidenced in Weber’s 1979 anthology, *New Spain’s Far Northern Frontier*, which examined the borderlands between California and Texas and consolidated the work of many contemporary Borderlands historians. Bringing together the Turnerian, Boltonian, and Bannonian views of the frontier as a process and the Lamarian views of “new western historians” such as Patricia Nelson Limerick, who viewed the frontier as a place, Weber merged these two views in 1992, bridging the gap between Borderlands and Western historians and breathing new life into the field of Borderlands History.

This convergence is evidenced in Weber’s *The Spanish Frontier in North America*, which followed in Bolton’s and Bannon’s footsteps by examining Spain’s colonial frontier in the North American Southeast and Southwest. Yet unlike his predecessors, Weber sought a more balanced approach that neither romanticized colonization by overlooking its impact on Indigenous
communities nor victimized Indigenous peoples, instead seeing them as historical actors who shaped Spanish frontier society as much as it shaped them. Importantly, Weber defined frontiers as “zones of interaction between two different cultures,” in which place and process are inextricably linked, as “imbricated zones” of “contention and transformation.” Seeing Spanish colonization as a process that involved settlement, agriculture, ranching, commerce, and urbanization, Weber equated frontiers with borderlands and presented them as zones of conflict and exchange, in which resistance, acculturation, accommodation, assimilation, and syncretism often occurred simultaneously. Published in 1992, Weber’s *Spanish Frontier* is significant in the trajectory of Borderlands History because it established Spain’s colonial borderlands as dynamic and contested spaces in which Indigenous peoples possessed a significant amount of historical agency.

As Weber published *Spanish Frontier*, scholars from various fields also presented the historical complexities of borderlands contexts in ways that mirrored El Paso’s borderlands history. In 1989, European historian Peter Sahlins published *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrenees*, which discussed how national borders divided and created a borderlands community in the Cerdanya valley of the Pyrenees Mountains between France and Spain. In 1991, U.S. historian Richard White’s “new Indian history,” *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, revealed the complexities of Indian-white contact relations in the *pays d’en haut* Great Lakes region. Like Weber and Sahlins, White’s *Middle Ground* is significant because it illuminated this borderland as “the place in between: in between cultures, peoples, and in between the nonstate world of empires and villages…where many of the North American subjects and allies of empires lived.” In this way,
scholars considered some of the complexities and implications of cross-cultural contact that resembled the Tigua borderlands experience.

Subsequent scholars produced monographs that examined colonial contact relations, mission-Indian communities, and identities in borderlands contexts very similar to that of the Ysleta mission. For example, in *Conquests and Historical Identities in California, 1769-1936*, Lisbeth Haas discussed how the mission-Indian community of California’s San Juan Capistrano maintained its identity throughout Spanish colonization and integration into United States society. Viewing identity formation as a process involving access to land and economic resources, Haas illustrated how Indigenous identity and culture persisted in spatial enclaves amongst its neighbors, who identified as either Hispanic or Mexican. 

Delving further into the process of Indigenous identity formation, Cynthia Radding’s *Wandering Peoples: Colonialism, Ethnic Spaces, and Ecological Frontiers in Northwestern New Mexico, 1700-1850* employed the term “ethnogenesis” to describe how Spanish colonization impacted the region’s Indigenous communities and influenced their evolution into peasant class society. Like Haas and other scholars, Radding revealed how the socio-economic pressures of colonial missions and settlements dispossessed Indigenous peoples of their land and shaped their identities.

Thus, by the turn of the twenty-first century, various Borderlands scholars made the connections between Indigenous communities, economies, and identities and emphasized how they influenced processes of colonization while being simultaneously reshaped by it. James F. Brook’s *Captives and Cousins: Slavery, Kinship, and Community in the Southwest Borderlands* evidenced this trend by illustrating how Native American slave and livestock trading networks influenced Spanish colonization and United States expansion. Emphasizing “cross-cultural negotiation,” Brooks discussed how captives integrated into Indian and Colonial societies through
bonds of kinship and reciprocity and forged new regional identities. Another important point Brooks makes is that Indian cattle and slave raiding persisted after U.S. colonization and gained national attention, bringing severe repercussions to Native American peoples.\textsuperscript{25}

Positioning Tigua history within the Borderlands genre known as “new” mission history is relevant to the Tigua case because it offers significant inroads as to how groups like the Tiguas persisted through Spanish colonization and maintained their identity in contrast with others who seemingly vanished into colonial society. For example, Ross Frank’s \textit{From Settler to Citizen: New Mexican Economic Development and the Creation of Vecino Society, 1750-1820} illustrated how colonial economic pressures created a dichotomy between Indians and vecinos and influenced some Franciscan missionaries to open mission-Indian land to vecino settlers. In turn, this caused resistance among groups like the Tigua and reinforced their community identities during the secularization period.\textsuperscript{26} Revealing the prevalence of disease in colonial missions, Robert H. Jackson’s, \textit{Indian Population Decline: The Missions of Northwestern New Spain, 1687-1840}, discussed how death rates in Sonora’s Jesuit missions outpaced the number of new Indian converts, presenting missions as insatiable death camps that devastated the region’s Indigenous peoples.\textsuperscript{27} In this context, Jackson’s work relates to the severe epidemics that reduced the Tigua population during the eighteenth-century.

Discussing how groups like the Tiguas negotiated colonial life in the missions, Susan M. Deeds’s \textit{Defiance and Deference in Mexico’s Colonial North: Indians under Spanish Rule in Nueva Vizcaya} moved beyond the narrative of oppressed Indians in Spanish missions. Instead, Deeds argued that as Spanish colonialism expanded northwest, the region’s Indigenous peoples strategically negotiated their changing socio-cultural environment through a process that she called “mediated opportunism.”\textsuperscript{28} Eluding notions of colonial dominance, Deeds revealed Indigenous
agency and viewed missions as open communities and as “transactional and transitional crossroads where ethnic identities, subsistence patterns, cultural beliefs, and gender relations were forged and changed over time in a frontier only slowly conquered by non-Indians.” Another significant work in the genre of new mission history that illustrated Indigenous agency is Steven Hackel’s *Children of Coyote, Missionaries of Saint Francis: Indian-Spanish Relations in Colonial California, 1769-1850*. Elucidating a history quite similar to the Tigua experience, Hackel discussed how northern California’s Esselen and Costanoan peoples persisted in the missions well after early nineteenth-century secularization as Mexican and American expansion dispossessed them of their land and cultural lifeways.

Land fraud is another relevant theme in Borderlands History that relates to the Tigua experience. Discussing land fraud in a way that mirrors the Tigua land dispossession, Thomas E. Sheridan’s *Landscapes of Fraud: Mission Tumacácori, the Baca Float, and the Betrayal of the O’Odham* revealed how Mexican caudillos and Anglo speculators dispossessed Arizona’s Tohono O’Odham community of their land surrounding the Tumacácori mission during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Another relevant monograph that examines how the creation of an international boundary dispossessed borderlands Indians like the Tiguas of their land is Sheila McManus’s *The Line Which Separates: Race, Gender, and the Making of the Alberta-Montana Borderlands*. Similar to the way in which the creation of the U.S.-Canada border divided Blackfoot territory and turned it into an interactive border zone before white settler expansion impacted Blackfoot society, the creation of the U.S.-Mexico border divided Tigua land in the Ysleta Grant and set the stage for the privatization of their communal land.

Similarly, Eric V. Meeks’s *Border Citizens: The Making of Indians, Mexicans, and Anglos in Arizona* discussed how the U.S.-Mexico border in Arizona’s borderlands shaped Indigenous
identities in the region. Examining identity formation and negotiation among Arizona’s Tohono O’odham, Yaqui, Mexican, Euro-American, and mestizo peoples, Meeks discussed how race, class, and ethnicity influenced identities in relation to access to economic resources. Looking further at the implications of nation-state expansion, Meeks pointed out that “[t]he diverse border citizens of south-central Arizona actively struggled to define their own identities. But the process of self-identification was deeply entangled with racial ideologies and government policies designed to construct their identities and their place in the nation for them.”

In this way, Meeks illuminated the nuances between the construction of borders and identity formation in a way that echoed the Tigua experience in that the solidification of the U.S-Mexico border disrupted traditional subsistence patterns and caused various social and economic reconfigurations as many Indians left the community in search of economic opportunities elsewhere.

More recent Borderlands scholarship has widely accepted historical Indigenous agency and illustrated it in various borderlands contexts. While many of the aforementioned works view Spaniards and Indians as participants in a mutual process of place formation, Juliana Barr and Pekka Hämäläinen focus squarely on Indigenous peoples and paradoxically refute the borderlands model. For example, Barr’s *Peace Came on the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands* discussed how the Apache, Comanche, Caddo, Wichita, and other Native American groups contested and shaped Spanish colonization through an economic system involving kinship and gender. Similarly Hämäläinen’s *The Comanche Empire* revealed how Indigenous socio-economic systems inhibited and regulated Spanish, Mexican, and American expansion in the Southwest Borderlands. Examining captive and livestock trading, Hämäläinen discusses how the Comanche held territorial and economic hegemony in the Southwest Plains and maintained power by absorbing peripheral groups into their vast social and political economy.
While not denying that Indigenous peoples experienced a great loss because of Euro-American colonization, Barr and Hämäläinen both revealed the extent to which Indigenous agency shaped history as well as shed light on the larger historical context surrounding Tigua society.

In addition, various Latin American historians have contributed to the historiographical dimensions of Borderlands History by discussing contact relations in various contexts that offer a deeper understanding of identity formation in colonial Ysleta. In *The Art of Being In-Between*, Yanna Yannakakis illustrated how Spanish colonization shaped Indigenous identity formation as Indigenous peoples negotiated between colonial power brokers and their own communities. Similarly, in *Imperial Subjects: Race and Identity in Colonial Latin America*, Andrew B. Fisher and Matthew D. O’Hara argued that

Royal and Church officials may have been responsible for articulating and enforcing the norms of colonial behavior and thought, but they never governed passive human objects. Rather, colonial mandates, rulings, and legislation worked in conjunction with the actual exercise and negotiation of power between individual officials and a bewildering array of social actors. The identities of imperial subjects evolved not just in a macro sense, that is, as they changed across large swaths of territory and blocs of time, but in countless brief interactions, through the constant interplay between internalized understandings of self and group association and externalized social norms and categories. Thus, Fisher and O’Hara posit that both internal and external factors influenced identities during the period of Spanish colonization and that these factors depended upon various contingencies according to particular circumstances and historical contexts. As such their concept of identity formation is fundamental to my argument.

The discourse in Borderlands History over the past century moved from a celebratory emphasis of Spanish colonization to Indigenous victimization, to a more balanced view that focused on intercultural negotiation and agency, and then to a more Indian-centered discussion that illustrated the complexities of Indigenous agency, negotiation, and identity. Considering Tigua history through this Borderlands viewpoint allows us to more fully understand how the
Tigua community of Ysleta Del Sur developed through a process in which both external pressures and internal factors influenced one’s identity as a member of that community. It also helps us more fully understand that the Tigua did not persist in isolation from the world around them. Instead, they pragmatically interacted with their neighbors as members of a borderlands community. Historically, these interactions illustrate how the Tigua negotiated their social environment and experienced a significant amount of agency in the process.

Similar to Borderlands History, American Indian History experienced a transition from the later nineteenth century to the early twentieth century that involved a process in which viewpoints towards Indians began with various degrees of epistemic violence, eventually transitioned into a victimization paradigm, and then progressed into themes involving agency, empowerment, and self-determination. During the late nineteenth-century, anthropologists and ethnographers such as Lewis Henry Morgan viewed Native Americans through a dichotomy that pitted Indigenous savagery at one end against Euro-American civilization at the other. These researchers viewed Native American society as being in a process of transition from savagery to civilization, under the schema of cultural assimilation and social evolution.38

At the same time, historians like Frederick Jackson Turner perpetuated this myth of native people as savages in contrast to a westward moving American civilization, which occupied supposedly empty lands under the assumption that Indians had vanished and assimilated into American life.39 This view reinforced the trope of the “noble savage” among romanticist and progressive era historians, which romantically viewed Native Americans as vanishing in the face of western civilization. Co-opting the idea of authentic Indians as original Americans, this trope involved a dualism that ironically reinforced patriotic notions of freedom as nation-state expansion...
dispossessed Indigenous peoples of their lives and their land, while vilifying those who remained and labeling them as burdens on civilized society.\textsuperscript{40}

By the 1930s, various anthropologists had questioned the values of western civilization, refuted the assimilationist views of Turner and Morgan, and began viewing Indigenous communities in terms of culture and kinship. In this vein, ethnographers who studied the Southwest’s Indians merged these two approaches and concluded that culture did not exist in an isolated state of homeostasis and that change served as a fundamental component of Indigenous cultures.\textsuperscript{41} Understanding these changing anthropological views is important for understanding Tigua history, as well as American Indian historiography during the second half of the twentieth century.

During the 1950s, a paradigm shift occurred when anthropologists such as Erminie W. Voegelin and Anthony F.C. Wallace merged historical methods with ethnography by using primary and secondary source documents to investigate tribal land claims cases. Voegelin coined the term “ethnohistory” and saw it as “the study of identities, locations, contacts, movements, numbers, and cultural activities of primitive peoples from the earliest written records.”\textsuperscript{42} In 1960, Jack D. Forbes’s \textit{Apache, Navaho, and Spaniard} evidenced this new methodology and launched a new era in Indian history. Discussing the implications of Spanish colonial contact for Athapaskan peoples during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Forbes illustrated the agency, heterogeneity, and interconnectedness of Indigenous communities in the Southwest. For Forbes, Indigenous resistance inhibited Spanish colonization, which introduced “warfare, population decline, and cultural decay,”\textsuperscript{43} In 1962, Edward Spicer’s \textit{Cycles of Conquest} also applied this new methodology in a broad and comprehensive discussion of the various and diverse Indigenous responses to Spanish and United States incursions upon their lands and cultural lifeways.\textsuperscript{44} As
ethnohistory gained popularity during the 1960s, various government officials and scholars recognized the Tigua as an Indigenous community.

By 1970, Vine Deloria Jr’s *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto* evidenced a significant turning point in American Indian history by moving the field away from narratives centered on victimization, instead emphasizing empowerment and self-determination in the face of U.S. imperial oppression. In this changing context, themes involving identity and community emerged in numerous monographs. In 1971, Hazel W. Hertzberg’s *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* discussed how fragmented groups formed a politically conscious collective movement in an “effort to find a common ground beyond the tribe, a broader identity and unity based on shared cultural elements, shared experiences, shared needs, and a shared common fate.” Both Deloria and Hertzberg’s works significantly illustrated some of the factors that led to tribal recognition. For example, as Deloria validated the Tiguas’ cultural authenticity, Hertzberg described the process through which other Indigenous groups such as the National Council of American Indians recognized the Tiguas and pressured the federal government to formally recognize them.

More significant to my argument that Tiguas maintained their community identity through their own internal articulations of external pressures, Loretta Fowler and Morris Foster offer a foundation from which to build. In *Arapahoe Politics, 1851-1978: Symbols in Crises of Authority* Fowler contended that Arapaho identity, like Tigua identity, continued despite white impositions. Explaining how this Indian community strategically negotiated and adapted to their changing social environment, Fowler argued that their tribal political structure remained intact because tribal elders reasserted and revitalized traditional values through political symbols, such as ceremonies, language, ritual objects, and clothing that appeared acceptable to whites. Fowler also illuminated
how Indigenous communities reinforced the identities of community members as they adapted to colonial impingements in *Shared Symbols, Contested Meanings: Gros Ventre Culture and History, 1778-1984*. Although here, Indigenous identity did not depend on ritual forms and symbols. Establishing Indigenous agency in the process of identity formation, Fowler argued that Gros Ventre identity stemmed from their own rearticulations of shared symbols and reconstructions of their history, enabling them to “make creative transformations of their own world on their own terms.”

Importantly, Fowler’s work set the stage for Morris W. Foster’s *Being Comanche: A Social History of an American Indian Community*, which illustrated how changes in Comanche culture and society did not cause the abandonment of Comanche social identity. Instead, Foster argued that Comanches maintained their traditional community by articulating changes in language, social identities and situations through a shared network in which public gatherings that involved face to face meetings and interactions helped sustain cultural meaning despite changing customs. According to Foster, Comanche community membership depended upon on one’s ability to communicate. During the eighteenth century, this criteria enabled Comanches to regenerate their populations with captives who had adjusted to social norms and learned to communicate. It also led to the informal exclusion of Comanches born into Comanche society during the twentieth-century if they had later been raised outside the community and had not learned to communicate effectively with community insiders. Considering the conceptual framework of Fowler and Foster’s work in relation to the Tigua allows for a deeper understanding of the internal relationship between community and identity, as well as how it persisted throughout the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods as they absorbed some outsiders, maintained their form of government, and continued to practice their traditions in public spaces.
Echoing the complexities and messiness in which Indigenous peoples such as the Sumas, Mansos, Piros, and Tiguas experienced in the El Paso borderlands, Alexandra Harmon’s *Indians in the Making: Ethnic Relations and Indian Identities Around Puget Sound* discussed how federally imposed Indian identity is a construct and argued that culture shaped relationships between Indians and non-Indians in Washington’s Puget Sound region.\(^{51}\) Harmon contends that the region’s Indigenous population eluded federal criteria for ethnic identity because intermarriage and kinship ties connected them with immigrants well before statehood.\(^{52}\) In the Tigua case, culture also signified one’s community membership. Yet assumptions of assimilation into Mexican society through mestizaje combined with federal pressures over tribal recognition and caused them to establish a one-eighth blood quantum for tribal membership in 1987.

Further interrogating the phenomenon of blood quantum, Circe Sturm’s *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma* discussed the heterogeneous structure of northeastern Oklahoma’s Cherokee community and revealed the inconsistencies between tribal and federal definitions of identity. Illuminating the politics behind Cherokee identity, Sturm explained how Cherokee membership is contingent upon one’s family lineage being linked to someone listed on the Dawes Rolls. For Sturm, the process of being formally recognized as a Cherokee tribal member is paradoxically flawed because whites with as little as 1/2048 blood quantum gained tribal recognition, while rural Cherokee Indians whose ancestors did not register on the Dawes rolls became excluded from tribal membership.\(^{53}\) In this way, Sturm revealed how Cherokees conformed to prevailing racial discourses and adopted a nefarious concept of blood quantum that excluded peoples of African origin and reinforced hegemonic ideologies that marginalized “traditional” Cherokees.
More recently, American Indian historians have written community histories that discuss how off-reservation, non-Treaty bands like the Tigua sought federal recognition. For example, Andrew H. Fisher’s *Shadow Tribe: The Making of Columbia River Indian Identity* illustrated how non-Treaty bands of the Yakima Nation avoided the colonial process of treaty making and developed a separate and distinct identity as Columbia River Indians. Looking at identity formation for this non-federally recognized group, Fisher explained that “Columbia River Indians are the product of social and political processes triggered by Euro-American colonization.” Like the Tigua, this group’s identity revolved around their ancestral connection to place, resistance to reservations, cultural traditions, and detachment from tribal and federal governing institutions. Similarly, Malinda M. Lowery’s *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a Nation* invoked this connection between “factionalism” in Indigenous communities and identity. Discussing the history of North Carolina’s Lumbee Indians, Lowery argued that factionalism served as a strategic approach for Robeson County Indians. For Lowery, this process of identity formation involved kinship, place, culture, and race. Explaining how the Lumbee used segregation to protect their identity, she wrote that as “[f]actions adopted these racial or tribal criteria,” they “added new layers of identity to a foundation of kinship and place.” In both cases, communities of Indigenous peoples who did not participate in the larger formal process of treaty-making and reservations became marginalized because of dominant racial paradigms in the same way that the Tigua had by the 1950s.

Considering the trajectory of American Indian history holistically, the field has transitioned significantly over the last century. Moving from assumptions that civilization would assimilate savage peoples, and sympathetic viewpoints towards victimized Indians, scholars have increasingly established agency, resistance, adaptation, and negotiation as predominant themes of
the American Indian experience. This change in the historical narrative has enabled various scholars to draw out the complexity of identity formation in relation to the history of Indigenous communities and reverse the stereotypes that reinforce popular assumptions of Indianness. Examining how external pressures and internal factors influenced the history of the Tigua Indian community and identity, this dissertation seeks to continue in this thread of scholarship.

**Tigua History**

Early accounts of the Tigua at Ysleta Del Sur are found in the journals of colonial Spanish military and church officials. New Mexico’s colonial governor Don Diego de Vargas, El Paso del Norte Presidio captain Pedro José de la Fuente, and Franciscan priest Francisco Atanasio Dominguez all gave accounts of the region’s Indigenous peoples that included the Tigua. Of particular interest are Nicolas de la Flora’s accounts of New Spain’s northern frontier between 1766 and 1768, when he accompanied the Marqués de Rubí as a mapmaker and engineer on his inspection of New Spain’s northernmost presidios. In his description of El Paso Del Norte, de la Flora noted that the Tigua lived among the region’s diverse Indigenous population in a way that illustrated the their dynamic relationship within its mission-Indian communities.

During the nineteenth-century, various military officials and ethnographers documented the Tigua in their reports. Yet they did so in a way that reflected contemporary stereotypes about Indians and reflected their own misunderstandings about Indigenous communities. In 1849, U.S. Army Lieutenant William Henry Chase Whiting described the Tigua as “the slender remnant of some old Aztec tribe,” whose “numbers are fast dwindling away, and but few years will pass before the last altar of their race will be extinguished.” In 1881, ethnologist and army captain John G. Bourke visited Ysleta and noted how Tigua Indians had seemingly begun to assimilate into
Mexican society. Despite these misconceptions, ethnographers also documented valuable information, which actually affirmed the presence of an Indigenous community in Ysleta. In 1882 and 1883, Herman Ten Kate and Adolph F. Bandelier, respectively, visited Ysleta and noted how the Tigua had maintained their traditions in the midst of Mexican society. Moreover, Bandelier’s writing evidenced the predominance of the Manso, Piro, and Tigua throughout the region.

One inescapable stereotype by the turn of the twentieth-century perpetuated the myth that the Tigua had lost their authentic indigeneity and been culturally absorbed by Mexican society. This idea developed from the school of salvage anthropology that valued “authentic” language and culture above all else. In 1902, Jesse Walter Fewkes wrote that the Tigua had been “Mexicanized” and that “survivals of their old pueblo life which still remain, such as their dances before the church, have long lost their meaning.” Invoking notions of the noble-savage vanishing into Euro-American civilization, Fewkes’s writing exemplifies the type of epistemic violence that resulted from contemporary ethnography’s misunderstanding of cultural change and adaptation in relation to Indigenous communities. Yet Fewkes, in spite of himself, also evidenced that the Tigua had indeed passed on their traditions and maintained a distinct group identity in the process.

The historical record for the Tigua is sparse during the first half of the twentieth century, and it appeared that they had been erased from the region’s historical narrative. However, some scholars did evidence the historical significance of the Tigua. In 1914, Anne E. Hughes presented the Tigua as significant historical actors in the region’s history. As a student of Herbert Eugene Bolton, Hughes recognized the importance of Indigenous peoples in the formation of New Spain’s northern borderlands. Despite this, the Tigua remained obscure in the region’s popular history until their 1936 appearance at the Texas Centennial. By this time, historians like Cleofas Calleros, Joseph I. Driscoll, and Carlos Castañeda had worked hard to establish the Ysleta mission and the
Tigua into the region’s public history. After publishing an article that illuminated the Tigua community of Ysleta as an exciting tourist destination, the Tigua made Driscoll an honorary tribal historian. During this time, it appeared that the missions received more recognition than the Tigua did.

By the early 1950s, the Ysleta mission narrative and Tigua history had become inseparable. This is evidenced in the various publications of historian Cleofas Calleros, who worked diligently to publicize the region’s mission-Indian history. In *Tigua Indians: Oldest Permanent Settlers in Texas*, Calleros seemingly romanticized the Tigua in a way that echoed Bolton’s emphasis on the mission as an institution. At the same time, his writing evoked the previous century’s ideology of the noble savage vanishing into civilization. For example, his closing paragraph stated that “the Tigua Indian nation is disappearing… They are dying out, and in the near future will be only history recorded on a page. One day soon the beat of the tom-tom bidding Tiguas to assemble will only be an echo.” On balance, it is fair to say that Calleros, as a Catholic social worker, did his best to help the Tigua improve their situation. His writing presented the Tigua as real people who lived in the present as well as the past. Despite the hegemonic appearance of the assimilationist master narrative in his work, which believed that the Tiguas would vanish into Mexican society, Calleros interjected the Tigua into the region’s popular history more than anyone else before him.

For most of the termination era between the 1950s and late 1960s, Tigua history seemed forgotten as Callero’s prophesy appeared very real for the people of Ysleta. After the City of El Paso incorporated Ysleta and threatened to dispossess the Tigua of their homes for unpaid property taxes, attorney Tom Diamond took interest in the Tigua community in 1965 and began a crusade that resulted in federal tribal recognition. During this recognition period, Diamond and researchers such as Rex Gerald, Nicholas P. Houser, Alan H. Minter, and Myra Ellen Jenkins wrote various
historical reports and articles that emphasized the legitimate status of the tribe. In 1966, Diamond’s short monograph, *The Tigua Indians of El Paso* focused specifically on Tigua history and detailed their current situation.\(^6\) In 1969, Minter’s article, “The Tigua Indians of the Pueblo De Ysleta Del Sur, El Paso County, Texas,” discussed the Tigua’s legal history, emphasizing themes of victimization and survival.\(^6\) And in 1970, Houser’s article, “The Tigua Settlement of Ysleta del Sur,” argued that in spite of land dispossession, intermarriage, and acculturation, the Tigua “retained an Indian identity and tribal organization.”\(^7\) Thus, these lawyers, historians, and anthropologists greatly contributed to the historical record and tribal recognition.

By the late 1970s, Tigua history had been established within the broader narrative of American Indian history. In 1972, Stan Steiner’s *The Tiguas: The Lost Tribe of City Indians* told a story of tribal persistence despite the difficulties of living in an urban environment. Yet Steiner’s book reflected contemporary themes of victimization in its discussion of the Tigua.\(^7\) In 1974, the American Indian Ethnohistory series in Indians of the Southwest offered a more scholarly view of Tigua History by compiling reports by Gerald, Jenkins, and Kenneth F. Neighbors in *Apache Indians III*. Offering an intensive look at Tigua history, these reports focused on land tenure and interactions between the Tigua, Suma, Manso, and Apache, as well as colonial Spain and the United States.\(^7\) Then in 1979, anthropologist Nicholas Houser made a significant contribution that established the Tigua in the historical record by publishing his article “Tigua Pueblo” in *The Handbook of North American Indians*. Summarizing the history, culture, and social dimensions of the Tigua community, Houser’s article positioned the tribe alongside numerous well established American Indian nations.\(^7\) More than any other scholar in the field, Houser’s research has made an immensely positive impact on the Tigua community.
As the Tigua pursued land claims in the region during the post-recognition period, various scholarly reports illustrated the depth of their connection with the land. In 1998, historian Rick Hendricks intensively discussed the evolution of Tigua land tenure in Ysleta Del Sur from 1680 to 1871. Anthropologist Adolph M. Greenberg illustrated how Tigua land tenure extended into today’s El Paso, Hudspeth, and Presidio counties, revealing the complexity of Indian land use in the region. And in 2001, Malcolm Ebright and Hendricks illuminated how Spanish land grants helped maintain group cohesion in New Mexico’s various Pueblo Indian communities. Recently published in the *Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo Archives*, these reports offer an in depth ethnohistory of the tribe’s relationship with the land.

More recent publications on the Tigua have blended older themes of victimization and survival with newer ones, such as change and continuity, in their discussions of community and identity. In 1996, Randy L. Eickhoff’s *Exiled: The Tigua Indians of Ysleta del Sur* discussed tribal identity, land dispossession, and tribal persistence in the midst of Euro-American oppression. Invoking the “tragic-savage” paradigm, Eickhoff wrote that “[w]ith the loss of their land also went their cultural spirit and sense of self-identity.” Yet he also revealed the transition that Indigenous communities make when they move from victimization to empowerment and self-determination, basically arguing that although they have been oppressed, the Tigua are here to stay. Then in 2009, S.K. Adam’s *Extinction or Survival?: The Remarkable Story of the Tigua, an Urban American Indian Tribe* connected culture with identity and argued that both are influenced by pressures of the dominant society. Emphasizing “cultural persistence,” Adam recognized how Tigua identity intertwined with community and contended that “the threat, and actualization, of forced cultural change has bound the community together.” Thus, Adam presented how the Tigua negotiated their changing world and continued in spite of it.
From the reports of colonial officials and early ethnographers to the books and articles of more recent historians and anthropologists, the Tigua narrative correlates well with some of the historiographical trends and threads discussed earlier in this chapter. While early ethnographers and historians viewed the Tigua as a vanishing people on the verge of full assimilation into Mexican-American society, more recent accounts have emphasized survival and continuity amidst the social and cultural changes experienced by the tribe. Although historians like Cleofas Calleros worked hard to embed Tigua history into the popular regional narrative, the major turning point in Tigua history occurred during the 1960s, when scholars like Nicholas Houser worked with tribal attorney Tom Diamond and brought the Tigua national recognition. Because of the complexity and immensely broad chronology involved in Tigua history, many of the comprehensive monographs seem to offer more cursory perspectives, while the more intensive scholarly reports appear somewhat limited in scope. In this sense, Tigua history is a challenging endeavor for any scholar.

This dissertation contributes to this historiography of the Tigua by looking at their broad community history of over four hundred years through a Borderlands perspective that considers the conceptual elements of hybridity, hegemony, and identity. Breaking from Adam’s argument that Tigua identity formed in response to the external pressures of the dominant society, I seek to illustrate how Tiguas maintained and articulated their collective community identity as they negotiated change and adapted to new social environments. Significant to my discussion, I consider how connections between place, people, and collective group activities all enhanced Tigua community identity. While my viewpoint on the Tigua may be perceived as being too pro-Tigua at times, it is important to consider that it is my objective as a scholar to present an ethically sound narrative that does not perpetuate the type of epistemic violence found throughout earlier
American Indian history. Positioning the Tigua narrative in a Borderlands context illuminates the messiness of Tigua history by revealing how Spanish, Mexican, and American colonization caused various disruptions, migrations, and resettlements in which the community experienced a great degree of heterogeneity, yet retained their identity. As an Indigenous community situated on the U.S-Mexico border, the history of the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur fits well within the genre of Borderlands History.

Theoretical Framework

In shifting the paradigm of Tigua history and placing it into a Borderlands context, the impingements of colonization and nation-state expansion are inescapable events that shaped the Tigua community and its destiny. Considering change and continuity as an underlying dynamic in Tigua history offers alternatives to the assimilationist and victimization paradigms of the past. Yet change and continuity is nothing new in the Tigua narrative. As noted above, various scholars have applied this theme in their work, and it is just as inescapable today as the topic of colonial oppression. In this sense, my approach invokes Thomas S. Kuhn’s theory of paradigm shifts in that “a new theory, however special its range of application, is seldom or never just an increment to what is already known. Its assimilation requires the reconstruction of prior theory and the re-evaluation of prior fact, an intrinsically revolutionary process that is seldom completed by a single man and never overnight.” Thus, my work builds off the previous research of Calleros, Houser, Hendricks and others as it rearticulates the narrative in a way that incrementally repositions Tigua history within a newer paradigm of Borderlands History. Three theoretical concepts that I seek to eclectically employ in this context are hegemony, hybridity, and identity.
It is an inescapable truth that many of my sources are laden with the type of colonial hegemony that influenced much of the earlier epistemic violence in the Tigua narrative. Assumptions that the Tigua had vanished into Mexican society, or that they would eventually do so, resulted from hegemonic Euro-American ethnocentric misunderstandings about Indians and culture, as well as the subjective nature of colonization and assimilation, which is omnipresent throughout much of the historical record. Illustrating the root of this phenomenon, Antonio Gramsci explained that hegemony is the basic idea that as a society, people are so engrained with preconceived notions of power, nationalism, social class, ethnocentricity, race, religion, gender, behavioral norms, education, politics and popular culture and that these elements shape their worldview so immensely, they are inescapable determinants for human beliefs and behaviors. Hegemony is invisible and intrinsic; it motivates us even when we are unaware of its presence. Applying this concept to the way in which people in the past viewed the Tigua allows a fuller understanding as to why people in the past could not conceive of the Tigua as an Indigenous community. However, hegemony in the history of the Tigua is not a one way street.

Historically, the Tigua have possessed their own hegemony, an interstitial hegemony juxtaposed in the midst of the powers of the colonial project and the region’s other Indigenous peoples, such as the Apache, Suma, and Manso. As power brokers within a dynamic borderlands mission-Indian community, the Tigua interacted with and negotiated between the region’s various factions. From defending against Apache raiders, to developing kinship ties with and assimilating various Indigenous, mesticized, and non-Indigenous peoples into their own community, Tigua interstitial hegemony helped maintain this mission-Indian community throughout the colonial period. My use of the term interstitial hegemony is derived from Antonio Gramsci’s notion of hegemony and Homi K. Bhabha’s concept of a “third space” of hybridity in which negotiation,
translation, contestation, and collusion serve as the main determinants for human interaction between fixed and polemicized binaries or categorized dichotomies, such as distinct communities and groups of people. For Bhabha, “[t]hese ‘in between spaces’ provide the terrain for strategies of selfhood – singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sights of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself.”

This phenomenon fits well within the dynamics of change and continuity and illustrates how the Tigua community interacted in a borderlands context. As such, interstitial hegemony not only describes the dynamic positionality of the Tigua community, it also serves as a reason for the persistence of identity within that community itself, as it changed and continued.

Identity is complex and dynamic. It is a combination of public and private identity, external and internal factors, and a sense of self in relation to place, community and nation. My argument that the continuity of the Tigua community itself helped the Tigua maintain their identity is influenced by all of the scholars mentioned above. In particular, Andrew B. Fisher and Matthew D. O’Hara’s contention that the identities of imperial subjects involved an “interplay between internalized understandings of self and group association and externalized social norms and categories” correlates well with my argument and evidences identity as a process of negotiation in which continuity and change play a major role in various contexts. S.K. Adam’s contention that power relationships with the dominant society strengthened Tigua group identity in response to external pressures also illustrates the reciprocal nature of community and identity that is implicit in my argument. Moreover, Malinda M. Lowery’s notion that layers of identity involving kinship and place preceded newer racial, tribal, and national determinants for identity formation coheres well with the chronological evolution of Tigua identity in relation to community.
Considering identity formation as a process of negotiation also invokes the dynamics of agency and empowerment through self-determination, which are implicitly intertwined with interstitial hegemony. The continuity of Indigenous identity in relation to community signifies agency because it often complimented various forms of strategic negotiation, in which the Tigua both adapted to and resisted the hegemonic power of the dominant society’s imposition of culture and identity.\textsuperscript{87} Illustrating the connection between negotiation and agency, Jon E. Wilson explained that “[t]he concept of agency describes how people have the power to act in a self-directed way, to put their own aims and objectives into practice, rather than being the victims of someone else’s designs.”\textsuperscript{88} Although it is undeniable that at various historical turning points the Tigua did have the capacity to exhibit significant amounts of agency, this does not detract from the fact that those people made real life decisions to the best of their ability in order to negotiate their circumstances towards the best possible outcome. This connects well with my secondary argument that this cohesive group of people negotiated the changes around them and made decisions in their own best interests without regard for the future historical implications of their actions.

\textbf{Methodology}

My research can described as a local process in which I found most of my sources at the University of Texas at El Paso Library (UTEP). I initially investigated The Timmons Papers at UTEP Special Collections, which offered important primary and secondary sources. These included census data, maps and various translated documents from the Spanish colonial era. The Spanish Archives of New Mexico, which is on microfilm at the UTEP library, offered numerous hand written documents, such as reports, budgets, and various other types of bureaucratic
documents from the Spanish colonial era. These documents are challenging because many are highly illegible. From this collection, I scanned a variety of documents that range from the late 1600s to the late 1700s and contain fragmented bits and pieces of information from which to draw inferences and conclusions.

The Juarez Municipal Archives on microfilm at UTEP Special Collections also offered various documents from the colonial era. In this collection I found census data, diligencias matrimoniales, payments to Tigua Indians for labor, Tigua and Suma land claims, church reports and militia lists, as well as various other documents from the Spanish colonial period. The Cleofas Calleros Collection at the El Paso Public Library also offered documents from the colonial era as well as documents relating to Tigua participation in the 1936 Texas Centennial. These consisted of marriage records from the Juarez mission, Ysleta church records, and various letters from Callero’s office. In addition, the Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo Archives at UTEP Special Collections and the El Paso Public Library contained various documents and reports by scholars such as Elsie Campbell, Rick Hendricks, Vina Walz, Adolph M. Greenberg, and Nicholas Houser.

The Tom Diamond Files/Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo Archives on microfilm at UTEP Special Collections offered myriad data that connected with all periods of Tigua history. Compiled by Tom Diamond and Nicholas Houser, this collection includes census records, tribal rolls, travel journals, boarding school rolls, genealogy charts and numerous other documents that directly relate to Tigua history. Consisting of the bulk of my research, I spent months scanning and organizing this data. These documents spanned the entire spectrum of Tigua history and offered significant inroads from which to build from. Notes written by Nicholas Houser and various correspondence between Diamond, Houser, and others illustrate that my work on the Tigua follows in the footsteps of these researchers who made tribal recognition a reality for the Tigua.
Chapter Summaries

In chapter one, I briefly discuss the origins of the Tigua before the Spanish arrival and then focus on the dynamics of contact, colonization, transition and resettlement. This chapter’s main contention is the Tiguas experienced a considerable amount of community disruptions and transitions after Spanish colonization. Despite this and other external pressures, they negotiated their circumstances and adjusted to the best of their ability during various migrations. Here I discuss the dissolution of settlements in Tiguex, resettlement in Isleta (New Mexico), and the Pueblo revolt of 1680, which served as the catalyst for the Tigua migration and resettlement in Ysleta del Sur. I also explain the significance of the 1692 Hinojosa Grant for the Tigua community.

In chapter two, I discusses life in the Ysleta mission from 1692 to 1817. Considering kinship, place, economic activities, population shifts, military activities, and secularization, I examine how the Tigua negotiated colonization through their interactions with other Indians and non-Indians in the El Paso area. Here, the Tiguas maintained their Indigenous identity because the Ysleta mission offered them a space of autonomy and limited agency. This is a significant period in Tigua history because Ysleta’s mission-Indian community endured within the colonial structure as a symbolic marker for Tigua identity formation.

Chapter three examines the nineteenth-century implications of secularization, Mexican independence, and United States nation-state expansion for the Tigua. Here I illustrate that the Tigua land dispossession began in 1821 and tapered off in 1915. Looking at the Mexican period, I discuss vecino encroachments on Tigua land, community population, and military activities. I also illustrate how the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and shift in the Rio Grande River affected Ysleta’s Tigua community. This chapter also discusses how land speculators and...
bureaucrats dispossessed the Tiguas of their land and cultural lifeways, which involved resource gathering in the once open lands of west Texas and southern New Mexico.

In chapter four, I examine the Tigua community from the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth-century. Here I consider the ambiguities of life for the Tigua in the U.S.-Mexico borderlands and the ways that they adapted to their changing social environments. I discuss migrations and ethnogenesis after Anglo American arrival, cultural change and continuity, military service, and participation in the wage labor economy as agricultural workers. Importantly, I examine how the Tigua Tribal Constitution of 1895 signified their assertion of sovereign community identity and efforts to retain their traditions.

Chapter five discusses how the Tigua persisted and negotiated life in the United States during the Progressive and New Deal eras. Here I discuss life in Ysleta, ethnogenesis, violence by the Texas Rangers, participation in Indian boarding schools, and performances of Indigeneity in public spaces. I look at how the Tiguas emerged into the region’s popular history as real Indians of the Ysleta mission. I also examine how Tigua public performances of traditional dances strengthened their tribal identity at events like the 1936 Texas Centennial Celebration, where they made President Franklin Delano Roosevelt an honorary tribal cacique.

In chapter six, I illustrate how the Tigua community of Ysleta del Sur experienced a transition from obscurity to federal recognition between the 1940s and 1987. Here I discuss how Tom Diamond negotiated Termination Era federal Indian policy and skillfully helped the tribe gain federal recognition between 1967 and 1987. I also examine how the Tigua community underwent a significant cultural revival after state recognition. Here I argue that tribal recognition and cultural renewal solidified the Tigua tribal identity.
In this way, this dissertation examines how the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo adapted to Spanish, Mexican, and American colonization and retained their community identity. In these contexts, a symbiotic relationship existed between community involvement and identity formation in which collective activities reinforced group cohesion and enhanced Tigua identity in various social settings. Within the often volatile and dynamic environment of the Southwest borderlands, the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur adapted to change and negotiated it as they maintained their identities as community members.
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Chapter 1:
Origin History

Long, long ago during the First Days, the people broke through the crust of the Earth. They came up out of their dark prison under-ground, crossed the Black Lake of Tears, and came to the shore on this side.¹

When we descended from the Earth Mother, it was in some place way up north in New Mexico, the Black Lake, the place of emergence, the place where the people came up from the other world.²

Origin Stories

The origin stories of the Tigua illuminate their connection to the land and its resources. They show the people’s cosmological connection with plants, animals, their natural environment, and the spiritual world in a way that connects the physical with the metaphysical. In particular, earth and water are significant natural elements in the Tigua origin story. According to Randy Lee Eickhoff, spiritual beings such as the White Corn Mother, the Winter Mother, and various supernatural animals helped the people on their journey by supplying them with the necessary resources that ensured their survival along the way.³ Tribal member Danny Archuleta explained that although there are many varieties of the emergence story among the northern Pueblos, “[i]t is all one concept, one story. Emergence through the soft world, the wet world.”⁴ Archuleta also revealed the interconnection between the natural and the spiritual worlds that serves as a fundamental belief in Tigua cosmology. For example, he mentioned how the beaver and the spruce tree significantly aided the people in their transition from one world to the other.⁵ In this way, the
Tigua origin story illustrates that their connection to the land and its resources involves more than just physical subsistence. It also involves a metaphysical component that connects the people and the land to the spiritual world.⁶

Identity is implicitly connected with origin stories not only through connections with the land, but also through the meaning that is drawn from these oral traditions as the people establish a sense of self in the world in which they live. For tribal member Danny Archuleta, this idea is evidenced through his statement: “[t]here was a yellow world where I believe it started, then came different colored worlds, and I think today, we are in the white world.”⁷ Taken metaphorically, this statement brings meaning to the changing ethnic milieu that the Tigua experienced from time immemorial to the present as their community transitioned through various stages of Spanish, Mexican, and United States colonization.

Origin stories connect people with place. Yet because outsiders recorded much of the tribal history in a fragmented way after colonial contact, many of the oral traditions that explain the distant past appear convoluted and often conflict with one another as well as the documents constituting the historical record. For example, tribal anthropologist Nicholas Houser presented one origin story in which the tribe resided at Hueco Tanks, then moved west to “a very attractive and fertile valley” along the Rio Grande after a hunter discovered it, and “built a church and established a pueblo known as Ysleta del Sur.”⁸ Other oral traditions describe how, even before the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, the Tigua moved from the Gran Quivera to Isleta, New Mexico and El Paso Del Norte.⁹

These types of discrepancies not only illustrate how origin stories conflict with one another, they also suggest that Tiguas from New Mexico participated in multiple migrations to El Paso. Adolph M. Greenberg evidences the possible basis for multiple origins stories by pointing out that
Tompiros relocated to El Paso during the early 1670s; by 1675, El Paso’s Guadalupe Mission contained various Tiwa and Tompiro refugees. Another way to explain oral traditions that referred to places such as Quarai and Gran Quivera as places of origin is to consider that peoples from these areas lived in such close proximity to one another in El Paso’s missions during the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries. As such, intermarriage between these peoples and the Sumas and Mansos who already occupied the area set the stage for multiple origin stories that appear to contradict each other at first glance, yet seem quite reasonable after one fully understands the heterogeneity that existed in El Paso’s missions after 1680.¹⁰

Looking at this discrepancy in oral traditions as to whether or not the Tigua lived in Hueco Tanks and/or the Gran Quivera, it may very well be that they inhabited both places. Or it may be that they migrated west to Isleta, New Mexico from the Gran Quivera into a fertile river valley along the Rio Grande and that somehow this oral history became convoluted with a similar experience among post-Revolt Tigua descendants at Hueco Tanks and their migration into the area of Ysleta Del Sur. This confusion may very well be because the Tigua descendants who passed on the Hueco Tanks version of the oral history may have originated from the groups of Suma and/or Manso peoples who once inhabited Hueco Tanks and then moved to the area of Ysleta del Sur during its incipiency, just after Tigua and Spanish arrival in the 1680s, and amalgamated with the Tigua through intermarriage.¹¹ Thus, here I suggest that because of the interconnectedness of Indigenous peoples and oral traditions within an ambiguous borderlands context, there are hidden truths within these origin stories that are much more important than the debates that they seemingly invoke. Importantly, origin stories are often meant to be metaphorical statements which emphasize the historical and cosmological importance of place, and the ways in which people arrived there.
They are less often meant for literal interpretation in that they frequently embrace movement across, time, space, and multiple worlds.\textsuperscript{12}

**Archeological Research**

The archeological record that supports the migration of people from Asia across the Beringian land bridge into today’s North American and South American continents also conflicts with the origin stories of various Indigenous groups. This story contends that during the last ice age between 10,000 and 122,000 years ago, giant ice sheets covered North America and caused a drop in water levels. This decrease in water levels opened a land corridor across today’s Bering Strait. As retreating ice sheets opened a land passage from Alaska, people migrated into North and South America in various waves between 75,000 and 10,000 years ago.\textsuperscript{13} As melting ice sheets altered environmental landscapes across North America, they created ecological niches for various flora and fauna, as well as the migration of people into North America. Colin Calloway suggests that this may be the reason why land and water are fundamental elements in some Native American origin stories, such as that of the Tigua.\textsuperscript{14} However, Calloway also wrote that the Beringian theory of migration into the continent offends and angers many Native Americans. For example, Lakota scholar Vine Deloria Jr. dismisses the Beringian theory as a “white lie,” something that “exists and existed only in the minds of scientists” and allows Euro-Americans to portray Indians as “latecomers who had barely unpacked before Columbus came knocking on the door.” Disconnected from their American roots, first Americans become relegated to the status of first immigrants.\textsuperscript{15} Pitting oral traditions against science, Deloria’s view illustrates the type of epistemological dilemmas that exist between scholars and Indigenous peoples. Finding a middle ground between these opposing views, I agree with Calloway’s conclusion which proposes that instead of being in conflict with oral traditions and origin stories, archeological data offers new
inroads for their interpretation. For example, the “dark prison” and “black lake” of the Tigua origin stories noted above may very well have been metaphors for, as Calloway suggests, “the Arctic Circle and Beringia.”\textsuperscript{16} If so, then the emergence of the people from land and water relates well with both viewpoints and brings more validity to tribal oral traditions instead of brushing them off as myths.

The more recent archeological history of the Tigua places them as descendants of the Clovis and Folsom peoples who hunted large game, such as mammoths, in the New Mexico area of the North American Southwest around 10,000 B.C. As large game became extinct by 7,000 B.C., the people hunted small game, gathered vegetables, and formed a desert culture as they increased in population. By 1 A.D., the people lived in pithouse villages, used pottery, and formed a horticultural society in which corn, beans, and squash served as the main staples. Around this time, it is believed that the Mogollon and Anasazi cultures emerged.\textsuperscript{17} As these people transitioned into subsistence societies that relied on the intensive farming of domesticated plants by 1,000 A.D., they developed sophisticated irrigation systems which led to the emergence of large communities in the Casas Grandes area of today’s northwestern Chihuahua and New Mexico’s Mesa Verde and Chaco Canyon areas. Rex E. Gerald believes that by this time the Tigua resided in New Mexico’s middle Rio Grande area as a distinct group with their own language.\textsuperscript{18}

Another view suggests that between 1200 and 1450, Mogollon and Anasazi communities transitioned into the Pueblo communities that the Spanish encountered in 1540. Calloway states that by 1300, drought and increased competition for the region’s natural resources caused Mogollon people to either consolidate into large communities in Arizona or merge with the New Mexico area’s predominant Anasazi groups. By 1450, the Mogollon had deserted their remaining settlements in Arizona, which by then had been occupied by Western Apaches.\textsuperscript{19} Similarly,
Anasazi people had abandoned the Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde areas and settled in the more fertile Rio Grande Valley, the Hopi Mesas, and other areas to the south and southwest.\textsuperscript{20} Athapaskan migrations into the region also influenced the consolidation of these settlements. By 1540, the Mogollon and Anasazi had migrated, amalgamated, and formed various new communities, one of which included the Tigua. In the New Mexico region, the people who eventually became known as the Pueblo Indians mainly lived in the areas of Hopi, Zuni, Acoma, and the Rio Grande. The Tigua resided in the Rio Grande area of this immense Pueblo Community just north of present day Albuquerque in a series of settlements that the Spaniards referred to as Tiguex.\textsuperscript{21}

The diversity of Pueblo Indian communities is evidenced through their various languages. Anthropologist Fred Eggan explained that linguistic differences among New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians suggest different historical origins and reinforces the idea that they are an historical amalgamation of various groups who inhabited the region prior to colonial contact.\textsuperscript{22} Pueblo Indian language can be grouped into four major language families known as Hopi, Keresan, Zuni, and Tanoan. Dialects within these families are divided among language groups and villages. Within the four language families, there are 48 village dialects.\textsuperscript{23} The original language of the Tigua Indians of Ysleta Del Sur is in the Tanoan language family under the Southern Tiwa language group. The Southern Tiwa language group is one of six language groups in the Tanoan language family: Northern Tiwa, Southern Tiwa, Northern Tewa, Southern Tewa (Tano), Piros, and Towa. The word Tiwa is the English version of the Spanish word, Tigua, which Spaniards used to describe Pueblo Indians from the Southern Tiwa pueblos in Tiguex.\textsuperscript{24}

Accounts vary about the number of village dialects in the Southern Tiwa language group. Bernard L. Fontana, an ethnologist who researched the Tigua for tribal attorney Tom Diamond,
states that the Southern Tigua language is composed of dialects from four pueblos: Pauray, Alameda, Sandia, and Isleta. He also wrote that Northern Tiwa contains two village dialects: Taos and Picuris.\textsuperscript{25} Anthropologist Michael V. Wilcox clarifies that the Southern Tiwa language group is comprised of five village dialects: Moho, Kuapa, Sandia, Isleta, and Arenal. Like Fontana, Wilcox included Taos and Picuris as Northern Tiwa dialects.\textsuperscript{26} Overall, both accounts support the claim that the original language of the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur is from the Tanoan language family and the Isleta village dialect of the Southern Tiwa language group. It is closely related to other dialects in the Southern Tiwa language group and stems from the same language family as the Northern Tiwa language group.

Linguistic data connects Southern and Northern Tiwa groups and shows that some members of the Northern Tiwa group and other Pueblos amalgamated with the Tigua in pre-colonial New Mexico. Connecting oral traditions with archeological evidence, Rex E. Gerald argues that northern Pueblo people from Taos and Acoma joined the Tigua of Isleta, as did Piros from the South, people from Salinas to the east, and another group from the southeast. Gerald also points out that linguistic data suggests that the northern and southern Tiwa separated around one-hundred years before Spanish colonial contact.\textsuperscript{27} This reveals the dynamic and heterogeneous nature of the Tigua community even before Spanish arrival.

**Social Organization**

The social organization of the Tigua community after 1620 is best described as a hybrid form of government in which they blended Native and European systems and adapted to Spanish colonization.\textsuperscript{28} In this hybrid system, the spiritual aspect of Pueblo society continued to permeate their tribal government. This connection between spiritual and secular realms is evidenced by the
post-contact tribal governmental structure in which the *cacique*, serves as the chief and spiritual advisor, and the war captain serves as his administrator. These two are lifetime positions. In the secular, the lieutenant chief, *teniente*, serves as the governor. The governor is accountable to the cacique and is also responsible for handing worldly affairs. Next is an *alguacil*, or sergeant-at-arms. There is also a tribal council that administers community affairs. All positions besides *cacique* and tribal governor are elected positions. During Spanish colonization, the governor acted as an intermediary between colonial officials and the traditional governing structure, which was overseen by the *cacique* and war captain. In this way, the Tiguas negotiated the Spanish imposed system of governance to their own ends.²⁹

The Tigua are traditionally matrilineal. In a matrilineal society, the women own the home and children are educated by the women’s family. Although intermarriage with people from outside of the pueblo is not preferred, it is not forbidden. Mark Edwin Miller explains that “[o]utsiders who married into the community were welcomed as members yet could not assume office or call themselves Tigua. The families considered children of these unions as full members of the community nonetheless.”³⁰ Understanding these tribal customs towards intermarriage and inclusion is important for understanding how the community transitioned over time.

Tigua religion also plays an important role in community social organization. Traditional Tigua religion places the people in harmony with the natural and spiritual worlds. Tribal anthropologist Nicholas Houser explains that after Spanish colonization, the Catholic Church “has been an important integrative force favoring Tigua cultural persistence,” and that for today’s Tigua, “[t]he surviving Indigenous religious elements blend harmoniously with folk Catholicism.”³¹ Anthropologist Adolph M. Greenberg illustrates that for the Tigua, spirituality is omnipresent throughout all aspects of one’s life.³² Illuminating how the traditional Tigua Pueblo
religion has remained intact, Greenberg explains that Native “beliefs and practices have persisted in large measure because they went ‘underground’ and have been maintained by a process called compartmentalization, in which Catholicism and pueblo religion exist in two separate and distinct systems, each containing practices not present in the other.” This explanation illustrates the hybrid nature of Tigua religion after colonial contact and reveals how they resiliently negotiated their changing social environment in accordance with their group values and cultural traditions. It also shows how they experienced and negotiated cultural change by adapting to Catholicism while continuing to maintain their traditional religious practices, preserving their Indigenous identity and culture in the process. Thus over time, Tigua social organization developed into a system that simultaneously strengthened the community and enhanced its identity.

**Colonial Contact**

Spanish colonization significantly altered the trajectory of Tigua history as it did for numerous Indigenous peoples in the Americas. For the Tigua, it launched a volatile period of social transformation. As signified above, the Tigua negotiated these changes to the best of their ability in order to maintain their traditional lifeways and adapt them to new and changing circumstances. Yet this process of negotiation involved a significant amount of contestation and collusion in relation to Spanish colonization. Initial contact in the region occurred between the 1530s and 1609, when Spanish colonists established the colonial settlement of Santa Fe, New Mexico. It began with Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca’s early encounters and solidified with Don Juan de Oñate’s entrada during the late sixteenth century.

It is unknown whether Cabeza de Vaca actually made contact with the Tigua. His accounts suggest that around 1535 he encountered an Indian village “on the banks of a very beautiful river,” likely the settlements known as La Junta de los Rios at the junction of the Conchos and Rio Grande
rivers in today’s west Texas, and continued to the northwest towards New Mexico. On this journey he met Indigenous peoples who spoke various languages. His description of these Indians hunting rabbits with small clubs about “three palms in length” corresponds with ethnographer Jesse Walter Fewkes’s account of Tigua rabbit hunting traditions in 1901. Accompanied by two Indian women from this group, De Vaca then “crossed a great river coming from the north.” Historian Wilbert H. Timmons believes this to be the Conchos River. Yet it was probably the Rio Grande. Subsequently, De Vaca traveled over fifty leagues of desert and forded another large river. Then while traveling north, one of his Indian guides “led them to the river which ran between some ridges” to visit her father in an Indian settlement in which the people lived on corn beans and “pumpkins,” likely squash. Timmons believes that this may have been present day El Paso. Yet there is the possibility that it may have been further north.

The first documented account of colonial contact with Pueblo Indians occurred in 1536, when De Vaca’s companion, Estevanico, returned and led Fray Marcos de Niza into the Zuni Pueblo region to claim it for colonial Spain. Subsequently, Indians killed Estevanico, and De Niza returned to Mexico with exaggerated reports of great wealth in the Seven Cities of Cibola. In response, New Spain’s Viceroy, Antonio de Mendoza sent de Niza back into Zuni country with a large military contingency led by Francisco Vásquez de Coronado in 1540. Interestingly, around one thousand Indians from Mexico accompanied Coronado’s group of about 290 soldiers and various Catholic priests and missionaries.

After his arrival to the Zuni area, Coronado sent Hernando de Alvarado on a scouting expedition that made contact with the people of Acoma, Tiguex, Taos and Pecos. Borderlands historian Herbert Eugene Bolton wrote that on September 7, 1540, Alvarado reached the area of Isleta, New Mexico and then traveled north, above present day Albuquerque, and camped “near
the border of the group of towns called by the Spaniards the Province of Tiguex.” Alvarado’s account described the Rio Grande Valley community of Tiguex as “a broad valley planted with fields of maize and dotted with cottonwood groves. There are twelve pueblos, whose houses are built of mud and are two stories high.” These sixteenth-century Southern Tiwa pueblos rested on both side of the river near present day Bernalillo, New Mexico. Although early accounts are vague, historians and archeologists have basically identified these Southern Tiwa pueblos as Piedras Marcadas (Moho), Chamizal, Calabacillas, Alameda, Maigua, Puaray, Corrales, Zandia (Sandia), Santiago, Watche, Kuaua, and Tamaya. Gerald points out that Coronado’s chronicler noted four more villages to the east and another eight, twelve miles to the southeast near present day Isleta, New Mexico.

Even before Coronado’s arrival the people of Tiguex had experienced a significant amount of conflict with their neighbors. Historian William B. Carter suggests that this is one of the main reasons they appeared so united against Coronado’s incursion. For example, Carter wrote that it appeared to Coronado’s chronicler that they had arrived in the middle of a war between various Pueblo communities. In particular, “Piro-speakers were at war with the Southern Tiwas, who in turn found themselves in a hostile relationship with Pecos Pueblo.” Yet nothing prepared the people of Tiguex for the dramatic and abrupt changes they experienced after they encountered Coronado’s expedition.

Attracted to Tiguex by Alvarado’s promising reports, Coronado quartered his army there during the winter of 1540-1541. The people of Tiguex initially welcomed Coronado’s group, giving them food and even vacating the southernmost pueblo for them to stay in. Yet resentments ensued from the start as Coronado’s army increasingly strained community resources. These tensions led to violence after one Spaniard raped an Indian woman in a neighboring pueblo, and
Coronado’s men stole material for clothing, forcing some people to undress and surrender their clothes. When the Pueblos rebelled, Coronado’s men set fire to one Indian pueblo, captured some of its men and burned them at the stake. When the violence ended, as many as thirteen Indian villages had been destroyed and abandoned. Numerous Indians, mostly women and children, had been taken captive, and many more had fled into the surrounding mountains. Known as the Tiguex War, this conflict decimated the Tiguex population. In reflection, Bolton wrote that “the whole Tiguex War was fought in a small theater that extended eight or ten miles above Bernalillo. The area should be a fertile field for archeologists.” Thus, the people of the Tiguex region experienced a violent and moving transition during Coronado’s entrada.

On its northern frontier, Spain dispossessed and dislocated various Indigenous communities, such as those in Tiguex. Between 1540 and 1542, many Native peoples in Nueva Galacia fled north or faced extermination during the Mixtón War. Subsequently, Indigenous resistance to colonization continued in the Chichimeca War in Nueva Vizcaya between 1550 and 1590. Spanish involvement in captive slave trading also increased as demands for laborers in the newly established mines of Zacatecas, Saltillo, and other colonial mining settlements increased. Newly introduced European diseases also decimated Indigenous populations on New Spain’s northern frontier. Yet diseases did not impact New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians until colonial settlers entered the region during the 1600s.

In 1581, various Indigenous peoples vacated their villages in fear of being captured as Fray Agustin Rodriguez and Francisco Chamusco followed in Coronado’s footsteps in search of great wealth on New Spain’s northern frontier. Comprised of nineteen Indian guides, two Franciscan missionaries, and eight soldiers, the Chamusco expedition first reached an abandoned Piro Pueblo and named it San Felipe. Farther north, they found numerous recently abandoned pueblos and
named one of them San Miguel. Continuing north along the Rio Grande, they encountered a complex of Tiwa villages, where the inhabitants made the sign of the cross and welcomed them, giving them provisions. Next, they entered a Tewa village complex they called Malpartida, where they encountered around 60 pueblos. Then they moved on to a pueblo in the Pecos area. As tensions mounted here, an internal controversy between the soldiers and priests caused one friar to depart for Nueva Vizcaya. Fearing that he would bring more Christians, the Indians killed him after he left the group. Chamusco’s men then returned to Malpartida, where Indians from the neighboring pueblo of Malagón killed three of their horses. After a dramatic mock execution in which the remaining friars rescued two Indian suspects from decapitation, Chamusco’s group retreated south to the Tiwa village of Puaray, where the two remaining friars decided to stay and convert the people as the rest of the group continued on. Chamusco died of illness before the group reached Mexico.

The Chamusco expedition is significant to Tigua history because it documented various social and cultural aspects of the Tiwa community at that time. For example, it noted that the people ate beans, calabashes, corn-flour gruel and corn tortillas similar to those of New Spain and stated that they lived in three and four story houses made of clay, adobe, and wood. It also documented that while all women had long hair, some men had short hair and others had long hair, and both men and women wore clothing made of cotton and shoes. It also recorded that women cooked, sewed, painted and made pottery at home while men worked in the cornfields. Describing women, it explained that they parted their hair as Spaniards did and carried water jars on their heads. In this way, the Chamusco expedition recorded valuable information about pre-colonial life in a Tiwa pueblo.
Subsequently, the 1582-1583 Espejo expedition encountered various Indigenous groups in the region. Having been charged with murder, brothers Antonio de Espejo and Pedro Muñoz de Espejo fled after their trial and found favor among the Franciscans for the journey because of a report from a Conchos Indian that the two friars of the Chamusco expedition who had remained in Puaray had been killed by the Tiwa.\(^{55}\) Consisting of 150 horses, fourteen soldiers, two friars, and possibly three Indians, the colonial knowledge recorded on this expedition, like that of the Chamusco expedition, contributed significantly to the historical record of the region’s Indigenous peoples. For example, near the Conchos River, Conchos Indians covered themselves with rabbit skins, hunted with bows and arrows and offered gifts such as bread, rabbits, and fish.\(^{56}\) Along the “Del Norte” or “Turbio” river, they encountered various groups including the Caguates nation (Suma) in the El Paso area, and the Tanpachoas (Manso) near “Los Charcos del Canutillo,” north of El Paso.\(^{57}\) For the Tigua, the most significant aspect of the Espejo expedition involved more violence with colonial Spain.

As Espejo’s party advanced north into Piro country, the people used smoke signals to warn everyone of their advance. When they reached the southernmost Piro pueblos, they found them abandoned.\(^{58}\) Wilcox describes this as part of an intense and well organized communication network that warned the people of possible slave raiding parties. Also, this rapid ability to mobilize may have been because the Piro had been at war with the Tiwa when Espejo arrived.\(^{59}\) This would have left many women and children vulnerable if the best warriors had been away. As they advanced into Piro territory, they found the pueblos inhabited, here the people offered them turkey, pinole, beans, and corn. Traveling east, they possibly encountered eastern Piro or Tigua, most of whom initially fled and then returned and offered them turkeys and corn.\(^{60}\)
As Espejo entered Tigua country, the people fled from the first two pueblos into the surrounding mountains and did not return. George P. Hammond and Agapito Rey believe that one of these pueblos may have been Isleta. This pattern continued as they passed through various pueblos, helping themselves to food that had been left behind. Upon reaching Puaray, where the friars from Chamusco’s party had been killed, the people fled to the mountains. Some of Espejo’s soldiers followed and found about eight-thousand people. Despite the cold, the Tigua did not return to Puaray until Espejo went to visit the Hopi and Zuni pueblos. After a series of violent incidents in which Acoma Indians killed a soldier’s Indian servant, Espejo’s group retreated to the Tigua region. Diego Pérez de Luxán accounted for thirteen Tigua pueblos at war at that time: “Poguana, Comise, Achine, Guagua, Gagose, Simassa, Suyte, Nocoche, Hacala, Tiara, Taycios, Casa, and Paula (Pauray). In Puaray, the few Tigua that remained refused to give food to Espejo’s group. When the others refused to return, Espejo’s soldiers killed many Tigua and set fire to the pueblo. After news of the violence spread, other pueblos, such as Quires, greeted Espejo’s group with gifts in order to avoid any violence. Unsuccessful at finding mineral wealth, Espejo returned to Mexico in late 1583. There the authorities arrested them for fleeing arrest the previous year. Clearly, the Tigua feared the Spaniards. Yet the fact that Espejo’s group had accepted gifts and hospitality from their enemies, the Piro, served as another reason why the Tigua did not return to their villages after Espejo’s peace offerings.

In 1590, Gaspar Castaño de Sosa led the next foray into Pueblo territory. An Indian slave trader from Nuevo Leon, Castaño de Sosa conducted an illegal expedition with around 170 people, and a caravan of wagons and livestock, in search of mineral wealth and Indian captives. De Sousa’s expedition did not impact Tigua society as much as the previous entradas. Yet it does evidence the idea that the Tigua feared the Spanish and also experienced a significant amount of warfare with
neighboring pueblos at that time. For example, Castaño de Sosa noted that upon their arrival to Tigua country, they entered Puaray and another pueblo and found that they had “been deserted a few days earlier on account of wars with other pueblos which forced the inhabitants to leave their homes. This was the explanation given the Indians who accompanied us, and we ourselves could see plainly that it was true, because there were signs of many having been killed. In these towns we found an abundance of corn and beans.”66

As they ventured farther into the Tigua village complex, they found many abandoned pueblos. Upon witnessing the people abandoning one pueblo, Castaño de Sosa crossed the flooded river and persuaded them to return, taking possession of the pueblo for the Crown, erecting a large cross and naming an alcalde and alguacil.67 After finding many more abandoned pueblos, de Sosa claimed another occupied pueblo. Subsequently, a contingency sent by the viceroy arrested de Sosa, thus ending his expedition.68 Although it is often assumed that the Tigua fled in fear of colonial reprisals for the killing of the two priests, it is more likely that they sought to avoid being captured and enslaved as tribute laborers in colonial mines and plantations. The fact that the leader of the next expedition, Don Juan de Oñate, owned several mines in Zacatecas reveals that New Mexico’s Indigenous peoples had good cause to be wary.

The Oñate expedition significantly impacted the destiny of the Tigua and all other Pueblos in the region. In 1585, the Spanish crown appointed Oñate governor, capitán general, and caudillo of New Mexico for the purpose of establishing a colony and pacifying the “many large settlements of heathen Indians.”69 This expedition consisted of about 500 people, including 130 soldiers and ten Franciscans, with some women and children, as well as servants and slaves.70 On April 30, 1598, near present day El Paso, Oñate claimed “all the kingdoms and provinces of New Mexico” for Spain.71 In this way, they altered the course of history for the Tigua.
Yet Oñate only made minimal contact with the Tigua, and his expedition is largely famous for establishing place names for the project of colonization. In May, Oñate reached the first Piro settlement, possibly Amo, and found it abandoned. When he reached the second Piro village, Qualacu, it had also been abandoned. Finding its people outside the pueblo, Oñate offered gifts and trinkets, and then camped nearby on the riverbank in order not to frighten them. By June, Oñate’s group reached a third Piro pueblo called Teypana, which they named Socorro, where the people brought them corn, and a chief named Letoc told them of more pueblos. Continuing north, they entered a small Piro village and named it Nueva Sevilla, or Sevilleta, where they took refuge in the homes of the people to avoid raiding parties at night. Continuing north, they found San Juan Bautista pueblo totally abandoned: so named because they stayed there on Saint John the Baptist’s day.

During Oñate’s entrada, the Tigua received the name of their patron saint, Saint Anthony. In late June, Oñate entered into Tigua country and found many abandoned pueblos. This is likely the area of Isleta, which Oñate described as having “many pueblos, farms, and planted fields on both banks of the river.” Then, after traveling ten leagues north, they passed through a large corn field and encountered the Tigua pueblo of Puaray. Importantly, on June 27, 1598, Oñate’s expedition named “Saint Anthony of Padua” the patron saint of Puaray. Puaray, a principal Tigua pueblo at this time, existed near Alameda and Sandia in the Tiguex region. Next Oñate traveled to the Keresan pueblo of Santo Domingo, where seven Pueblo Indian chiefs of various provinces “voluntarily pledged allegiance to his majesty.” From there, Oñate established his headquarters in the Tewa pueblo of Caypa, which he named San Juan. Although Oñate is well known for his acts of colonial oppression against the people of Acoma, his entrada is also significant because it introduced the Tigua to their patron saint, Saint Anthony.
Aside from naming villages, Oñate’s expedition also contributed significantly to the colonial process of documenting and categorizing the regions' Indigenous peoples. For example, in May of 1598 as they traveled north from El Paso, Oñate’s group encountered a group of about forty Manso Indians with “Turkish bows, long hair cut to resemble little Milan caps, headgear made to hold down the hair and colored with blood and paint.” Illustrating how the colonial naming process actualized itself through the association of language and initial contact interaction, Oñate’s itinerary stated that:

Their first words were *manxo, manxo, micos, micos*, by which they meant “peaceful ones” and “friends.” They make the sign of the cross by raising their thumbs. They told us very clearly by signs that the settlements were six days distant, or eight days along the road. They mark the day by the course of the sun; in these things they are like ourselves. We gave them many presents and they helped us to transport the sheep across the river, which was forded on this day at the crossing which we named Los Puertos, because it is used by them to go inland.

In this case, the greeting words of the Manso served as a signifier for their identity as perceived by Oñate’s group and other colonists. Patrick H. Beckett and Terry L. Corbett illustrate how this process unfolded for the Manso by noting that by 1630, as colonial contact increased and the name Manso became associated with these people, Fray Alonso de Benavides suggested a mission for the Mansos.

Thus, during this early period of colonization, naming and categorizing the region’s peoples in association with place involved a confusing process. When Oñate’s group encountered the Tigua, they did not identify the people of Puaray as Tigua or Tiwa. Instead, they identified them as Cheguas, and later as Teoas and Tioas. When addressing the people who lived in the first province coming from New Spain, they identified them as Piguis. This name likely signifies the Piro, who lived in the southernmost settlements on the Rio Del Norte. When addressing the Tewa, Oñate’s group recorded them as Teguas. Similarly, Oñate’s expedition recorded the names of
numerous Tigua and Piro villages that have been lost in time. Anthropologist Frederick W. Hodge argues that around thirty-five Tigua pueblos had been observed and documented during Oñate’s expedition, with names such as Axauti, Cheálo, and Quiyaco. Illustrating that many of these names overlapped with those of other pueblos, and that for some pueblos it is uncertain whether the Tigua, Piro, or Tewa lived there, for example, Hodge wrote that this confusion occurred because Oñate’s group documented information about the region from various Pueblo groups who all spoke different languages. Also, during this early stage of colonization, Spaniards did not understand Pueblo customs and languages, and their nuanced complexities, making it seemingly impossible to associate people with place. Although Oñate did not record much historical data about the Tigua, he did alter their historical trajectory by connecting them with the Spanish colonial project.

Spanish Colonization

Between 1600 and 1680, colonial Spain’s demands for resources, labor, and new converts to Christianity greatly influenced its policies for New Mexico’s missions, presidios and settlements. Often known as the Franciscan period, a bitter contestation existed between Church and colonial society in this era. European diseases such as smallpox, a worsening regional drought, and conflicts over resources with groups like the Apache also played a major role in reshaping New Mexico’s Pueblo communities. During the period leading up to the Pueblo Revolt of 1680, New Mexico’s Tigua pueblos transitioned into, accommodated, and sometimes resisted colonial society.

New Mexico’s Tigua of Puaray and other pueblos who had fled in advance of Spanish arrival had good cause to be wary. This is because Spain viewed its colonial expansion into the
Americas as a continuation of the \textit{reconquista}, in which Christian Spain united, defeated the Moors, and expelled all Muslims and Jews. In 1492, Christopher Columbus’s arrival to the Caribbean spearheaded imperial Spain’s plan to Christianize Indigenous peoples and use them as coerced laborers for the extraction of natural resources. This process entailed the use of military force in which \textit{encomienda} grants rewarded conquerors by granting them rights to Indian labor and tribute, thus creating an elite colonial aristocracy that exploited Indigenous peoples and often conflicted with the interests of church and state. In northern New Spain, this policy influenced Oñate and others to take captives to work as slave laborers in Nueva Vizcaya’s mines and plantations. Yet groups like the Apache suffered more under this system than New Mexico’s Pueblos.\textsuperscript{85}

One reason New Mexico’s Pueblos suffered less is because early colonial missionaries like Bartolomé de Las Casas recognized the atrocities of the \textit{encomienda} system and advocated for a more peaceful approach in which missionaries worked without soldiers and treated Indians as humans. In 1542, Spain acknowledged these views and enacted a series of New Laws that sought to gradually eliminate the \textit{encomienda} system. These New Laws intended to eliminate Indian slavery, limit tribute payments to \textit{encomenderos}, and prohibit new \textit{encomienda} grants.\textsuperscript{86} Yet they created a dilemma for colonial elites because of the high labor demands in agriculture and mining. In response, Spain created a policy called \textit{repartimiento}, which replaced \textit{encomienda} and continued to coerce Indians into forced labor. Although the \textit{repartimiento} system paid Indigenous workers for their labor, colonial elites abused this system by cheating Indians out of their wages, forcing them to purchase goods at high prices and extracting monetary tribute in place of produced goods, such as textiles and agricultural products. Colonial Spain also used \textit{reducción} and
congragación programs to force Indigenous peoples into crowded villages near the missions so that they could be controlled and monitored as coerced laborers.\textsuperscript{87}

Colonial Spain did not force New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians into these \textit{reducción} and \textit{congragación} settlements because they already lived in established pueblos, thus the reason the Spanish called them the Pueblo Indians. Moreover, these Pueblos lived in already established farming villages. This made it easier for Franciscan missionaries and Indians alike as it avoided the need for forced relocation.\textsuperscript{88} It also made it easier for colonists to extract tribute payments. As Myra E. Jenkins points out, New Mexico’s Pueblos experienced a revised type of \textit{encomienda} system as well as \textit{repartimiento}.\textsuperscript{89} According to Jenkins, Oñate’s soldiers collected tribute payments from Pueblo Indians, but did not collect labor tributes (servants) because Spain viewed these Indians as vassals of the Crown. New Mexico’s subsequent administration honored these \textit{encomienda} grants and issued more to colonial settlers who served in the military. Yet Franciscan missionaries often accused these \textit{encomenderos} of illegally using the system.\textsuperscript{90} For example, they acquired land grants near tribute paying Indians in order to encroach on their land and obtain \textit{repartimiento} labor.\textsuperscript{91} Friars also accused colonial authorities of abusing the \textit{repartimiento} system.

In 1621, New Spain’s viceroy ordered that \textit{repartimiento} labor

\begin{quote}
Be used only for tilling and herding of Spanish owned livestock by Indians close to the lands of the Spaniards involved; that only two percent of the Indians of any pueblo were to be used at one time; that levies should not be made when the Indians were sowing or reaping their own crops; that the Indians should be paid half a real daily and properly fed; that there would be no allotment of Indian women for house service unless the women were accompanied by their husbands and performed such labor voluntarily.\textsuperscript{92}
\end{quote}

The viceroy’s policy not only illustrates some of the tasks that Indians performed during this period, it also reveals the tension that existed between church and civil-society in colonial New Mexico, as well as some of the possible ways that settlers abused \textit{repartimiento}. David J. Weber explained that these tensions between the Franciscans and local government began in 1608,
when colonial Spain changed New Mexico from a proprietary colony to a Crown colony, funded by the royal treasury, in response to Church demands. Thus, as colonists and clergy competed for Indian labor, missionaries viewed Indians as workers and converts. In the Franciscan missions, Indians built the churches and convents as well as worked the fields and ranches around them.

The historical record suggests that the formation of the Isleta, New Mexico mission involved a gradual process that finished by 1630. When the first Spanish explorers encountered Isleta, it may have been one of the abandoned pueblos that they mentioned in passing, or it is possible that they passed it altogether. In September 1598, Oñate’s group distributed various field assignments to missionaries. Among these, they sent Fray Juan Claros to the Tigua district in the middle Rio Grande valley, which had fifteen pueblos, including Alameda, Puaráy, Sandía, and Isleta. In 1612, the Church assigned Juan de Salas to Isleta, where he founded the Isleta mission and built an exemplary church and convent named San Antonio de Padua, or Saint Anthony. It is believed that they finished building the convent between 1627 and 1628. Robert H. Jackson explains that it took Indian workers long periods of time to build churches and convents. Describing these as “fortress convents,” Jackson noted that New Mexico’s Pueblos often connected these missions on the edge of their own buildings and that this conformed well with Franciscan objectives to re-center the Pueblo village around the mission’s central plaza.

Yet the Franciscans often viewed things through an ethno-centric lens as their primary purpose involved proselytizing Indigenous peoples into the Catholic faith. In 1634, Fray Alonso de Benavides illustrated his views as he described the church and convent of the “Tioas Nation,” of San Antonio de la Isleta as “very spacious and attractive.” Looking at the Tigua, Benavides wrote that “they were great sorcerers, superstitious, and very belligerent. Today they [the friars] have them very docile, all baptized and well instructed, not only in their living and all kinds of
Benavides reveals that the Tigua adapted well to the mission. He also illustrates how the swiftness and flash floods of the Rio Del Norte were difficult obstacles for the friars to overcome as they conducted their daily tasks. Somehow, one cannot help but wonder if Benavides’s account of the river is a metaphor for what is unsaid in his writing.

Pueblo-Franciscan contact relations rested upon a set of mismatched values and expectations. Ramón A. Gutiérrez explains that because the Friars often gave gifts such as European livestock and manufactured goods, the Pueblos worked for them in return. For the Franciscans, mysticism, discipline, self-denial, and poverty underscored their agenda to give freely and convert the Pueblos. For the Pueblos, gift giving always involved reciprocity, or giving back. Yet colonial encomenderos often misunderstood this dynamic and mistook reciprocity for tribute. Also, Pueblo sexuality that accepted polygamy and viewed copulation in a spiritual way conflicted with Franciscan values of chastity and monogamy. In the way that many cultures incorporate outsiders, Pueblo Indians used sexual relations to regenerate their communities, Gutiérrez elucidates that “[t]hrough intercourse, outsiders (men from other towns or clans) became insiders (household community members).” Surely colonial soldiers and settlers who sexually abused Pueblo women had no intentions of assimilating into Pueblo society. In this way, mismatched values and expectations influenced Pueblo-Spanish perceptions of gift-giving, tribute, and sexual relations in pre-1680 colonial New Mexico.

During the mid-seventeenth-century, a combination of factors caused the Tigua and other Pueblos to increasingly resist colonization. European diseases such as smallpox decimated Pueblo communities. Historical records indicate that between 1598 and 1679, New Mexico’s Pueblo population decreased from between 80,000 and 100,000 to 17,000 people. Considering this
population decline with the Pueblo abandonment of between thirty and fifty villages between 1590 and 1643 suggests that diseases may have immensely affected the people.\textsuperscript{106} This may explain why several Tigua villages had been abandoned when colonists arrived in the late 1500s.

By the mid-1600s, extreme encomienda demands combined with drought, and tensions with Apaches and other Native groups also played a role in instigating rebellion among the Pueblos. Normally, the Pueblos agriculturally produced enough to sustain their communities during droughts. Yet when colonists demanded their surplus crops as tribute, this surely stretched the people’s patience to the breaking point. These encomienda demands also reduced Pueblo trade relations with their Apache and Navajo neighbors, and many of these latter groups resorted to plundering both Spanish and Pueblo communities. To make matters worse, Spanish settlers and soldiers conducted captive slave raids against their Apache and Navajo neighbors, who retaliated by increasingly attacking various pueblos. For the Pueblos, these Indian incursions devastated fields and livestock and increased the hardships brought on by drought and colonial tribute demands.\textsuperscript{107}

In response to the hardships brought on by Spanish colonization, many of the Pueblos, including the Tigua planned to rebel against the Spanish during the mid-seventeenth-century. Yet by 1680, Isleta’s Tigua had formed new alliances with their Piro and Tompiro neighbors in response to increased war with the Apache. In 1640, the Pueblos of Isleta, Alameda, San Felipe, Cochiti, and Jemez united with the Navajo and planned to drive out the Spanish. When the Spanish discovered the plot, they hanged nine of the revolt’s leaders and sold the rest into slavery. In 1650, Pueblos at Taos planned another rebellion. This plan also failed because the Hopi did not join.\textsuperscript{108} Then in 1667, the Piro and Tompiro allied with the Apache and rebelled against the Spanish. After the Spanish crushed the uprising, they hung six Indians at Senecú (New Mexico), burned others
alive, and sold others into slavery. In spite of this defeat, some northern Pueblos still allied with the Apache, whose offensive shifted from one of quick invasions to one in which they destroyed whole villages. Explaining the gravity of this situation, Jack D. Forbes wrote that

The two regions that suffered the greatest damage from the Athapaskans between 1668 and 1680 were the Piro and Tompiro areas. The explanation probably lies in the fact that the Spaniards, after crushing the rebellions of these tribes, destroyed their alliances with the Apaches and used Piro and Tompiro warriors in campaigns against the Athapaskans. Thus the Athapaskans would have regarded their former allies as traitors and enemies to be destroyed with the Europeans. In addition to this situation, the Piros and Tompiros were exposed to easy attack, and the famines and epidemics had weakened their pueblos. For three years it was said that no crops were harvested and many Indians perished of hunger.

In response to the increased violence, a group of encomenderos met in Isleta in 1669 to plan for the defense of southern New Mexico. At this meeting, they coerced Tigua, Piro, and Tompiro warriors into siding with them by giving them an ultimatum: either they join them against the Apache or be considered in rebellion. Despite their past history of fighting with each other and resisting the Spanish, the Tigua, Piro, and Tompiro likely appeased the Spanish to avoid further violence. Being the best possible decision at that time, this alliance bought each group some time and allowed them to join together and defend their homes against a common enemy: the Apache.

Efforts to defend against the Apache proved futile during the decade before the Pueblo Revolt. The conflict with the Apache combined with severe drought and famine caused many Tiguas, Piros, and Tompiros from the eastern Manzano Mountains to migrate and settle in Isleta’s mission-Indian community. Between 1669 and 1674, the Tiguas abandoned the pueblo of Chililí and moved to the pueblo of Tajique. In 1674, Tiguas abandoned the Quarái mission for the same reason and also moved to Tajique. Soon after, they all abandoned Tajique and moved to “Sheee-huib-bac,” otherwise known as Isleta. Similarly, the Piro-Tompiro of the Manzano Plains abandoned the pueblos of Abó, Jumancas, and Tabirá and either fled to Isleta or moved to El Paso Del Norte, where they eventually settled in the Senecú mission. Ethnographer Charles Lummis
wrote that the Gran Quivíra is said to have been located near Tabirá, and that Tigua oral traditions stated that all of their fathers originated from the Manzano Plain’s area. Thus, on the eve of the Pueblo Revolt, Tigua people from various pueblos along with some Piro and Tompiro had migrated to Isleta to find security from increased violence with the peoples of the Southwestern Plains.

By 1680, the region’s pueblos had solidified into various geographical factions that had been influenced by the pressures of Spanish colonization, and Apache and Comanche raids. Spanish colonization and its *encomienda* system combined with Church labor demands and strained Pueblo resources and patience beyond reason. Apache alliances with northeastern and northwestern Pueblos still remained despite increased tensions with the Pueblos of the southern Rio Grande, such as the Tigua, Piro, and Tompiro. In addition, Comanche migrations into the Southwestern Plains that bordered Pueblo country to the east put increased pressure on Apaches, placing them in a two front war with Spanish colonists and their Pueblo auxiliaries to the south and Comanches to the north. Thus, both Apaches and Comanches fought for access to trade with northern Pueblos as well as access to raiding opportunities in colonial settlements and their adjacent Indigenous pueblos, especially those in the south. Surely the drought of the 1870s affected these Indians as well, giving them good cause to increase their captive and livestock raiding so that they could trade with the other Indigenous groups who bordered their large Apacheria and Comancheria territories to the north and east.  

While the northern Pueblos continued to trade with the Apache, the southern Pueblos had been coerced away from their pre-existing trade relationships with the Apache. Defensively aligned against the latter because of their alliances, they found themselves becoming more dependent on demanding *encomenderos* and missionaries. In fact, the Franciscans had placed an immensely burdensome and unrealistic expectation upon the
Pueblos by attempting to indoctrinate them into a belief system that seemed totally incompatible with traditional Pueblo spiritual mores. As such, Pueblo and Apache desires to restore trade relations and an increasing Pueblo desire for religious freedom served as the main determinants for the Pueblo Revolt. In this way, these historical actors set the stage for an immense turning point in Tigua history.

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 did not occur in isolation. Various Indigenous revolts against Spain’s colonial project occurred in New Mexico as well as other regions along New Spain’s northern colonial frontier. Before 1680, eight well documented revolts occurred in New Mexico. In 1623 the Jemez people burned two missions. Subsequently, Zuni revolted in 1632, Taos in 1639, and Jemez between 1644 and 1647. Also during this time the southern Tigua planned to rebel along with their Jemez, Keres, and Apache neighbors. Between 1665 and 1668, some Piros and Apaches united in resistance. Subsequently, Pueblo chief Esteban Clemente organized the first pan-Pueblo coalition. In 1675, a Tewa revolt in which Pueblo holy men bewitched colonists and missionaries served as a significant precursor to the 1680 revolt because in its aftermath, the Spanish accused four Pueblo leaders of sorcery and hung three of them at Tewa, Keres, and Towas pueblos, while the fourth committed suicide. As they had done with captive rebels throughout the seventeenth-century, colonial solders imprisoned, whipped, and sold everyone involved into slavery.

During the sixteenth-century, a series of Indigenous revolts occurred along New Spain’s northern frontier in unison with the Pueblo Revolt. Jack D. Forbes referred to them collectively as “The Great Southwestern Revolt,” pointing out that between 1684 and 1685, various Janos, Sumas,
Conchos, Mansos, Julimes, and Tobosos abandoned Spanish missions in Janos, Casas Grandes, and El Paso in violent rebellion. Forbes also evidenced Indigenous resistance as an ongoing process, writing that after 1685, the “Tobosos, Chisos, and their allies continued to fight on, using their dry mountainous homeland as a base for frequent raids. Likewise, the Apaches of the Gila and Siete Ríos regions, along with the Jocomes, Janos, and free Mansos and Sumas, kept up a determined war against the frontier.”

In this way, resistance to Spanish colonization also fragmented other Indigenous communities besides that of New Mexico’s Tigua, such as the Mansos and Sumas, some of whom remained outside of the mission communities during the late 1600s.

Similarly, various Indigenous revolts occurred in Nueva Vizcaya during the seventeenth-century. The Xixime Revolt of 1610, the Tepehuan rebellions of 1616 and 1635, and Tarahumara attacks on Jesuit missions in 1648 all exemplify Indigenous resistance efforts against Spanish colonization. Illuminating similarities between these revolts and the Pueblo revolts, Susan M. Deeds described them as Indigenous responses to sustained colonial pressures involving labor demands, coerced relocations, diseases and death, and new social norms. These revolts did not occur in isolation: Indigenous ties and communication networks distantly connected them. For example, in 1697, on the northwestern border of their territory, the Tarahumara conspired with various others, fugitive Pima, Jovas, Opatas, Tubares and Conchos who had fled the missions, as well as Apaches and mission Indians from Janos and Jocomes. One common factor that connected these revolts with the Pueblo revolt involved the participation and leadership of various religious shamans. For New Mexico’s Pueblos, Po’pay filled this role and led the first successful large scale revolt against Spanish colonization.
Environmental factors also inspired the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. During the early summer of 1680, freezing temperatures in northern New Mexico destroyed that season’s harvest. Being too late in the growing season to replant, inevitable starvation plagued the pueblos. Because the Pueblos connected the environment with their spirituality, Po’ pay, a Tewa religious leader and war captain, and other Pueblos surely took this as a cosmological sign that their balance with nature had been disrupted. They blamed Spanish encomenderos and missionaries, who had increasingly made unreasonable demands on the people’s resources. Po’ pay had good cause to resent the Spanish. Because of his involvement in the 1675 Tewa rebellion, the Spanish whipped him and many other Pueblo spiritual leaders. During the great freeze of 1680, Po’ pay had been at the northern Tiwa kiva at Taos pueblo, where he communicated with spiritual beings and claimed that they told him to rebel against the Spanish and bring the people back to their traditional ways.

From the Tiwa kiva at Taos pueblo, Po’ pay organized a large scale revolt to expel the Spanish. Pueblo leaders planned to revolt on August 12. To inform each pueblo of the revolt, Po’ pay sent runners from Taos to each pueblo with a knotted cord. To show their allegiance, the participating pueblos needed to untie the first knot. The other knots signified the amount of days left before the revolt. Although they included the Tigua of Isleta, they did not include the Piros because of their ties with the Spanish. Here it is apparent that the Pueblos also did not include the Piro because of northern Pueblo alliances with the Apache, and the fact that the Piro often assisted the colonial army on raids against the Apache. Things became complicated for the Tigua of Isleta when the runner carrying the cord for that pueblo never arrived.

During the revolt itself, the Pueblos easily overwhelmed the Spanish. The Pueblos killed twenty-one of thirty-three Franciscan priests, and around 400 Spanish colonists. Many mixed blood mestizos sided with the Pueblos. In the north, colonial refugees fled to Santa Fe, where
they held out in the Spanish citadel with Governor Antonio de Otermín. Unable to attack this fortress, the Pueblos cut off their water supply. When Otermín and the refugees vacated this sanctuary and headed south, the Pueblos looked on, having had accomplished their goal. In the south, refugees fled to Isleta pueblo with lieutenant general Alonso Garcia, where they regrouped for their retreat to El Paso.

Incidents on the ground during the revolt greatly impacted the Tigua of Isleta by dividing them and separating some of them from the other pueblos. At this time, the northern Tigua lived in pueblos at Taos and Picurís. The southern Tigua lived in the pueblos of Puaráy, Sandia, Alameda, and Isleta. Puaráy had a population of about two-hundred Tigua, Alameda had three hundred, and Sandia three-thousand. According to Charles W. Hackett, “[e]ight leagues south of Alameda, where a small stream, with the Rio Grande, inclosed [sic] a fertile tract containing seven Spanish ranchos, was the pueblo and Spanish convent of Isleta, containing a native population of two thousand Indians.” While Tiguas in Puaráy, Sandia, and Alameda participated in the revolt, the Tigua of the southernmost pueblo, Isleta, did not.

This is often a point of contention because it is easy to assume that they did not participate because they had been allied with the Spanish. Yet Randy L. Eickhoff’s illustration of Tigua oral history refutes this account, contending that Po’ pay began the revolt earlier than planned and that his messenger never arrived to Isleta. According to Eickhoff, Isleta’s leader (cacique or war captain), Tilagua slowly evacuated people from the pueblo to avoid suspicion. And, Alonso Garcia’s surprisingly early arrival caused many people to flee. Subsequently, Spanish soldiers killed some Tigua as they fled and then captured Tilagua. At this point things get historically messy because Eickhoff’s version seemingly victimized Isleta’s Tigua, while the accounts of a respected member of Garcia’s party suggests that the Tiguas resisted Garcia’s group of refugees
that gathered at Isleta. More specifically, Hackett revealed that the Maestre de Campo Thome Dominguez de Mendoza “told how many citizens of the province had been killed, and how the Rio Abajo survivors had been able only ‘by the very skin of their teeth’ to assemble in Isleta. He told how, after the Spaniards had collected there, the natives of that pueblo had become warlike, and how the refugees, fearing death, had held a consultation and decided to retreat toward Mexico.”

Mendoza’s testimony reveals that not all Tigua left with the Spanish when they retreated from Isleta, which is surely the case because at that time Isleta’s population consisted of around two-thousand people. It also shows that the Tigua did not act in a docile manner and willingly submit to the refugees. Instead, it illustrates that by August 14, the Tigua’s “warlike” disposition greatly influenced the refugees’ decision to continue on. Interestingly, the documentation illustrates that hundreds of women and children left Isleta without food or clothing, and that they hastily “abandoned” the pueblo. These accounts suggest that while most Tiguas resisted the Spanish, others accompanied them south as captives and burden bearers, or coerced laborers. Although the Spanish refugees experienced hostile responses to their presence in Isleta, they also encountered continued lack of cooperation and hostility as they retreated south.

As Garcia’s group of refugees moved south, they also encountered opposition in Piro territory. When they arrived to the Piro pueblo of Sevilleta, the Indians there peacefully welcomed them, abandoned the pueblo, and joined them on their journey into the Piro nation. However, when Garcia’s group reached the Piro pueblo of Socorro on August 24, the Indians there became increasingly hostile after the Spanish discovered a northern Pueblo messenger, who the Piro had hidden for three days. In addition, the Piro’s unfriendly disposition towards the refugees increased after a group of Apaches had been sighted on the horizon. At this point, fear of an allied Piro and Apache attack against the exposed refugees influenced Garcia to continue south. The reasons
for the Piro’s hostile attitude towards the Spanish are uncertain. Houser suggests that fear of retaliation from northern Pueblos may have been the reason. Another reason may have been a change in attitude among the Piro towards the Spanish after hearing that they had been routed by Po’pay’s forces—surely the Tiguas in Garcia’s group and the captured messenger from the north had informed them of how easily the Spanish had been expelled. Or possibly, the Piro could have been also negotiating with the Apache who had followed the Spanish to Socorro. Regardless of the reasons for Piro unfriendliness towards the Spanish, it is important to remember that not all Piros hated the Spanish, and a good number of them followed Garcia’s group—if somewhat reluctantly—south to El Paso del Norte.

The number of Tigua who accompanied Garcia south to El Paso is highly ambiguous. After the Pueblos defeated the Spanish, the historical record suggests that no less than 317 Tiguas and Piros migrated south in 1680. On this, the numbers are very obscure. By September 29, Garcia’s and Otermin’s two groups met just north of El Paso at La Salineta, where the Spanish officially counted the refugees. Upon their arrival, they estimated around 2,500 people. From here the colonial record is messy because several hundred refugees left La Salineta before they officially counted everyone. Initially, they only listed 1,946 refugees of which only 155 could men could bear arms. According to Hackett, Otermín only counted 317 Piro Indians from Senecú, Socorro, Alamillo, and Sevilleta. However, Anne E. Hughes points to the presence of the Tigua at La Salineta through Governor Otermin’s October 2 count, which recognized “three hundred and seventeen” Christian Indian men, women, and children from “the pueblos of La Isleta, Sevilleta, Alamillo, Socorro, and Senecú.” Considering the scarcity of documents, the amount of Tigua who left Isleta with Garcia’s group is unknown. Yet it is certain that numerous Tigua refugees did settle in the El Paso region in the aftermath of all of this.
Settlement in Ysleta Del Sur

By December 1680, this diverse group of Tigua and Piro Indians, as well as Spanish and mestizo colonial refugees, formed temporary settlements in the El Paso Del Norte region. Here they lived among numerous Sumas, Mansos, and others in the Guadalupe Mission and in a series of small settlements in which they built *jacales*, or small hut like houses made from adobe and branches. Beginning twelve leagues east of the already established mission called Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Mansos in El Paso del Norte, these settlements spanned two leagues from each other to the north and west, on the south side of the Rio Del Norte. Thus twelve leagues south of El Paso, Otermín settled in San Lorenzo. Two leagues northwest of there, four friars established the settlement of Real de San Pedro Alcántara with some Piros. Two leagues from there, about six leagues southeast of El Paso, many Tiguas, Piros, and Tompiros settled in the Real del Santísimo Sacramento with Fray Alvaro Zavaleta. Many Piros formed their own settlement downriver from El Paso Del Norte in an ambiguous location, and many colonial settlers from New Mexico moved into the countryside further downriver from all of these settlements.

In these early settlements, some Tiguas resisted the Spanish as others built allegiances. In March 1681, two Tiguas, Alonso Shimitigua and Baltasar de la Cruz, and a Piro named Thomas, returned to New Mexico, where Po’ pay held them captive as Spanish sympathizers. To appease Po’ pay, they told him that they had initially tried to form a Tigua, Piro, and Manso alliance to overthrow the Spanish, yet it failed because the Tigua governor, Juan Moro, and several other Indian intermediaries had sabotaged the plan. In response, Po’ pay planned to send Baltasar and Thomas to overthrow El Paso with the help of the Tiguas, Piros, Mansos, and Sumas. This fell through when Shimitigua escaped and all three returned to El Paso. That July, tensions increased when Baltasar and Thomas tried to convince Tiguas and Piros to revolt against the colonists and
their Manso allies. Yet after two Piros, Diego Guayquiolí and Ursula, testified against them, the Spaniards uncovered the plot and tortured those involved into a forced confession. In the documents, the Spanish used the term “tormento de lección” as a synonym for torture, in which they cut off and burned the fingertips of some of those involved as a “forma de sacar la verdad.” Subsequently, tensions continued as the revolt lost its impetus.

Although Baltasar and Thomas’s conspiracy did not succeed, it exemplified an internal division in El Paso’s Tigua society in 1681. This division is evidenced by the fact that Baltasar had tried to incite Tiguas and Piros to return to New Mexico, where the people lived in religious freedom away from the Spanish priests. Thomas, a Piro, likely did not want to return to New Mexico, as is shown by his testimony against Baltasar, as well as his position as sacristan or assistant to Guayquiolí in the Church. Surely some Tiguas and Piros liked Baltasar’s idea of returning to their homeland, unoccupied by the Spanish. While others likely found refuge among their immediate family members who survived the journey south from Isleta pueblo. Moreover, many Tiguas and Piros surely learned of Po’pay’s punishments for those who appeared to be allied with the Spanish from Baltasar and the others who ventured to return to New Mexico. In this tense context, the formation of El Paso’s Tigua community continued.

Between November 1681 and February 1682, Otermín’s attempted reconquest of New Mexico significantly impacted the Tigua communities in Isleta and El Paso. In November, Otermín left El Paso with 146 colonial soldiers, many of them vecinos and genizaros. In addition, this expedition contained 112 Indian axillaries: 20 Mansos led by a Spanish speaking Manso named Don Luis; 54 Piros led by Alonso Puñi and Pedro Techa; eight Jemez Pueblo Indians led by their governor, Francisco; and 30 Christian Tiguas, led by war captain, Bartolo Pique. Eickhoff states that the Tiguas had been coerced into cooperating with the Spanish as their families had been taken
hostage and moved to San Pedro de Alcántara.\textsuperscript{156} Vina Walz, author of a little known history of the region during the late 17\textsuperscript{th} century pointed out that Otermín threatened all Indians, “who had become idlers and vagabonds” to report for military service or suffer “one hundred lashes.”\textsuperscript{157} According to Walz, Otermín believed that El Paso’s Indians had warned New Mexico’s Pueblos, and as a precaution, he moved the families of his Indian axillaries to San Lorenzo, where “the convent area had neither wood nor pastures for their convenience.”\textsuperscript{158} In this way, the Spanish coerced the Tigua and others into military service. Yet this Indigenous participation involved more than coercion, it also included the choices of Indigenous peoples seeking to negotiate their circumstances to the best possible advantage.

By December, Otermín’s expedition reached the southernmost Piro pueblos, finding them deserted with churches and missions burned and abandoned. When they arrived to Isleta on December 6, the Indians there initially attacked them, and then surrendered peacefully, explaining that they mistook Otermín’s force for Apaches. When Otermín ordered the people there to gather in the plaza, he counted 511 individuals, including Tiguas and Piros from Socorro, Alamillo, and Sevilleta.\textsuperscript{159} Subsequently, on December 20, after advancing north in the cold of winter, Otermín regrouped two leagues north of Puaray and decided it best to return to Isleta.\textsuperscript{160} Ten days later, Otermín arrived to Isleta and found that many Tiguas and Piros had fled the pueblo. On December 31, Otermín’s officers ordered that all Indians in Isleta pueblo “be brought out and carried with the army, with all security, so that they might not run away, and that the march should begin at once.”\textsuperscript{161} Otermín ordered the people to take as much food as possible and destroyed what could not be carried. In this forced migration, the Spanish coerced the remaining 385 people in Isleta to march with them back to El Paso. One Tigua from Puaray named Jerónimo said he joined the procession because his wife lived in the El Paso settlement of San Lorenzo.\textsuperscript{162} Thus, the second
wave of Tigua who migrated from New Mexico with Otermín in 1682 did so as captives. Yet some Tigua likely choose to go with the Spanish to be with family members who were part of the first wave of migrations south.

Finding New Mexico too unpredictable and unstable, Otermín resettled the people of Isleta with those Indians of New Mexico’s pueblos who had survived the first migration. In February, 1682, many Tiguas resettled in the newly formed pueblo of Sacramento de la Ysleta, on the fertile banks of the Rio Del Norte. Bertha P. Dutton points out that one reason the Tigua maintained a strong sense of community at this time stems from the fact that a large faction of Tiwa speaking leaders had been in the groups that migrated south with the Spanish, bringing five official leadership canes with them. These canes had been granted to them by the Spanish, and Dutton contends that five leaders of this caliber possessed the power to easily recreate the “social fabric” of the pueblo in the closely connected Tigua community that existed in Ysleta. Thus, this leadership helped perpetuate Tigua identity in a new and somewhat uncertain environment.

El Paso’s original settlements can be described as somewhat overlapping clusters of family and kinship based communities that experienced a good amount of interaction with each other. The experience of forced migration and social disruption served as a common bond for many of the Tigua, Piro, and Tompiro peoples in this new environment. Seeing themselves as people in a place with a common experience among kin and family members, the Tigua, Piro, and Tompiro in these settlements cast aside many of their internal differences in order to develop a cohesive sense of oneness and maintain their survival in the midst of their new neighbors, such as the Suma and Manso. Thus by 1682, the Tigua identity that emerged in El Paso’s settlements signified continuity and change in opposition to contesting groups who lived in close proximity. As Indigenous group identities emerged in this context, the solidification of the area’s missions followed, bringing stable
housing, as well as agriculture and livestock to these settlements, thus connecting them with Spain’s ongoing colonial project.

In this messy context, Otermín and his successor, Don Domingo Jironza Petris de Cruzante, established the region’s first mission-settlements. In 1682, after conferring with the region’s Indians and settlers, Otermín settled the Spaniards in San Lorenzo, more than twelve leagues east of El Paso, about a league and a half west of the mission San Francisco de los Sumas. Two leagues downriver from El Paso, he established the mission of San Antonio de Senecú for the Piros and Tontiros. A league and a half east, the Tigua pueblo of Sacramento de la Ysleta became Corpus Christi de la Ysleta de los Tiguas. About seven and a half leagues further, he established the mission of Nuestra Senora de la Concepción del Socorro de los Piros, for the area’s Piros, Thanos, and Gemex peoples. In 1683, Cruzante established El Paso’s first presidio seven leagues east of the Guadalupe mission. Also, Fray Nicolás López reorganized the region’s pueblos and established the Suma mission of Santa Gertrudis, twelve leagues southwest of El Paso. López also established seven new missions in the La Junta area at the junction of the Conchos and Rio Del Norte.

By July 1684, unrest and turbulence in the region had caused Cruzante to move the mission-pueblos closer to El Paso. Due to increased pressure from the Apache, and the Manso Revolt, Cruzante moved the presidio to El Paso to offer the pueblos more protection. Then he moved San Lorenzo a league and a half from El Paso, Senecú two leagues away, Ysleta three, and Socorro four. These pueblos have remained in these locations since then. The Suma and Manso revolts of 1684-1686 connected with a series of uprisings that spanned from La Junta to Santa Gertrudis, Janos, and Casas Grandes. These uprisings involved various Apaches, Manso, Sumas, Janos, Jocomes, Julimes, Conchos, Chinarse, Dientes Negros, and Salineros of the region. This series
of Indigenous resistance is what caused the 1684 reconsolidation of El Paso’s mission-Indian settlements.

As members of the region’s emerging pueblos, the Tigua did not revolt. Instead they helped the Spanish quell the revolts and defend their home settlements. For example, in March 1684, Manso and Apache leaders approached a Piro father and son, Pedro and Ventura, asking them to convince the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur to revolt. After Pedro and Ventura informed Tigua governor Francisco Tilagua, and lieutenant governor Juan de Ortega, Tilagua decided that they all inform Cruzante of the planned revolt. That July, ten Tiguas captured a Manso messenger who sought to incite New Mexico’s Pueblos to join the revolt. And that September, over one hundred Tiguas and Piros, along with two hundred Indians from Sonora, helped the Spanish defeat a group of Mansos, Apaches, and Tanos in Casas Grandes. In this way, Tigua involvement in defending against these revolts affirmed their safety and status in the region.

This involvement exemplifies that by 1684, Tiguas and Piros in El Paso’s settlements viewed themselves as interactive members of a community that coexisted in common cause with the Spanish. Seemingly exiled by New Mexico’s Pueblos, these Tiguas and Piros surely sought to defend their families and kinship ties, as well as their access to resources. As new arrivals to the region, they found themselves competing for natural resources with the Mansos and Sumas who already lived there. After experiencing so much disruption, chaos, and violence, the Tiguas and Piros who settled in El Paso’s mission pueblos surely wanted to avoid any further upheavals. Bearing names such as Dúran, Truxillo, Archuleta, and Granillo, 109 families lived in Ysleta in 1684. Compared to life in the mission pueblos of Socorro, Ysleta, Senecú and El Paso, the Manso offer of their safe return to New Mexico surely seemed like a false promise full of unwanted uncertainty.
By 1692, the cohesion that supported the Revolt of 1680 unraveled and New Mexico’s Pueblos faced new challenges among themselves and their Apache neighbors. Taking advantage of this disunity, New Mexico’s new governor, Don Diego de Vargas reclaimed the region’s pueblos for Spain. In October, Diego de Vargas entered Isleta, New Mexico and found the pueblo abandoned and destroyed. Many of the Tigua who escaped Garcia’s and Otermín’s forced migrations had fled to the Hopi region. By 1718, they had returned to Isleta (New Mexico) and helped establish a new mission in which Saint Augustine became their patron saint. The Tigua of Ysleta del Sur retained the original patron saint, Saint Anthony.

Various Tigua and Piros accompanied Diego de Vargas on his 1692 expedition northward. Many of them did so to recover loved ones and family members, some of whom had been captured and held in New Mexico’s pueblos. That August, De Vargas summoned all soldiers and Indians from El Paso’s pueblos, ordering the alcalde mayor and war captain of Socorro, Senecú, and Ysleta, José de Padilla, to gather the governors and warriors of the pueblos to prepare for the expedition. That October, a Tigua from Ysleta named Juan Moro found his brother in San Juan pueblo. In San Cristóbal, another Tigua rescued his wife along with two small children, as well as a Piro woman married to an Indian in El Paso. And in Taos, they found a free Tigua on his way to El Paso. Subsequently, the expedition brought seventeen Tigua to Ysleta and three Piros to El Paso to be reunited with family and begin new lives. In this way, many of the people whose lives had been uprooted over the last twelve years found a sense of closure and a new beginning in Ysleta and other El Paso settlements.
The Hinojosa Grant

In May of 1692, before Governor Diego de Vargas left El Paso to reclaim New Mexico for colonial Spain, he proclaimed all of the lands outside of the immediate vicinities and necessities of El Paso’s missions as communal land to be used by the region’s Indians and settlers. Moreover, he recognized the grant’s parameters as “how far the inhabited land extended at the time of the flight from New Mexico,” in 1680, instead of the boundaries as defined in the 1684 resettlements.181 This land grant resulted from Diego de Vargas’s reaction to the petitions of newly arrived Fray Francisco de Vargas and Fray Joaquín de Hinojosa, being that the latter sought to possess the churches, convents, and land around the region’s newly established missions. However, Diego de Vargas recognized that Hinojosa sought to implement a reducción or congregación program in order to force the region’s Indians into servitude to the missions. Also, instead of communal land, Hinojosa proposed that land be granted to individual Indians through royal cedulas.182 Governor de Vargas had another plan.

In response, De Vargas granted Hinojosa the churches and convents, but denied his request that all of the land go to the Church. Although he granted Hinojosa the immediate lands around the missions that he deemed necessary to grow enough crops and raise enough livestock to sustain them, he granted the rest of the land to the region’s Indians and citizens.183 De Vargas explained that “[g]iven the Tranquility that the Indians enjoy, and since the Spaniards act harmoniously toward them, one could neither support nor maintain itself, or even live in this kingdom, without the other. It would do serious harm to introduce mistrust between them. Thus, I again order my secretary of government and war to inform the very reverend father to refrain from getting involved in more than what concerns him and is his responsibility.”184
Illuminating the tensions between Church and Crown, De Vargas’s response also reveals a desire to avoid the types of situations that led the Pueblos to revolt in 1680. On May 19, 1692, De Vargas granted Hinojosa possession of Ysleta’s church, sacristy, and convent. He then granted him around 5 fanegas of land for crops to sustain the mission. Then in the name of the king, he gave him the surrounding land with the stipulation that preference be given to Indians and citizens, allowing them access to the best irrigated land and acequia to ensure a rich harvest. Over the next two days, he did the same for the pueblo of Socorro, Senecú, and San Lorenzo. Previously, he granted him possession of El Paso’s presidio. In all instances, De Vargas made clear that Indians and citizens had first choice to the land. Describing how the region’s Indians and settlers mutually worked and enjoyed the land “in peace and friendship,” De Vargas sought to avoid conflict between the region’s peoples, concluding that “I could not have made a grant of lands that had been taken from and adjudicated to be the possession on the missions.” Thus, De Vargas acted pragmatically in an effort to establish an environment in which Indians and settlers could flourish and develop a stable sense of community.

Conclusion

From time immemorial to 1692, the descendants of the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur experienced numerous upheavals and transitions. Beginning with migrations from Chaco Canyon and Mesa Verde, and the amalgamation of Mogollon and Anasazi peoples in the Rio Grande area, warfare and environmental factors such as drought greatly influenced these transitions. Subsequently, this diverse group of people emerged as the inhabitants of a series of pueblos that experienced a significant amount of conflict and collusion over such things as defense, resources, and trade. Outside pressures also disrupted the balance of relations between these communities, which is
evidenced by Athapaskan migrations from the north, and Spanish arrival from the south. For the Tigua, contact with the Spanish dramatically disrupted and reshaped their communities. From the destruction of Tiguex to the abandonment of Isleta, New Mexico, the Tigua migrated, settled, and resettled numerous times in various pueblos that emerged in the wake of chaos, tragedy and famine and ultimately settled in the Ysleta mission-pueblo near El Paso del Norte.

During this transitory and often volatile period, various signifiers and external pressures enabled the Tigua to negotiate and make meaning of the changes they experienced in a way that enhanced and reinforced their community identity. Initially, their common lived experience of social upheaval in New Mexico’s northern pueblos during Coronado’s destruction of Tiguex in 1541 and the disintegration of Isleta pueblo in the Pueblo Revolt during the early 1680s both divided and united diverse segments of Tigua society. Bringing together various individuals from pueblos such as Puaráy, Quarái, and Tajique, drought and warfare influenced their relocation into Isleta’s Tigua community. By 1684, these people, along with various Piros and Tompiros had migrated to Ysleta and other mission-pueblos in Paso del Norte, where they developed new ties with groups of Sumas and Mansos. As El Paso’s mission-pueblos solidified, so did the identities of their diverse Indigenous populations.

One way that Ysleta’s Tigua negotiated external pressures in their new environment involved making alliances with colonial Spanish settlers, and some Sumas and Mansos, in defense against other Indigenous groups who threatened their well-being. During the Manso and Suma revolts of the 1680s, these alliances enhanced their connection to people and place in a way that exemplified previous patterns of behavior in new social contexts. In the same way that they allied with the Spanish and other Pueblos in opposition to Apaches and others before their migration to
Ysleta, they subsequently allied with them again in the El Paso area. In this context, community membership in collusion with others enhanced the Tigua’s local identity.

The continuity of their tribal governmental structure also symbolized what it meant to be Tigua in their new mission-pueblo. This occurred largely because the main faction of Tigua leadership migrated to Ysleta, bringing with them the five leadership canes that the Spanish had given to the tribe’s highest ranking members. These leaders possessed enough knowledge, authority, and respect among community members to create a following and maintain the traditional social organization that had been used in Isleta del Norte. They also held enough influence over Spanish colonial officials to maintain the group’s identity as Tiguas despite the high amount of heterogeneity in the community. This is one of the main reasons for the continuity of one’s identity as Tigua in Ysleta during the colonial period.187

Knowledge of shared sacred traditions also significantly influenced one’s identity as being Tigua in Ysleta. In addition to knowledge of cultural traditions such as dancing and chanting, the war captain held various sacred objects such as the tribal drum. The fact that the tribal drum had been brought with the five leadership canes suggests that the war captain had migrated to Ysleta with other tribal leaders and that his presence bonded the community identity during public gatherings such as Saint Anthony’s Day.188

Another factor that reinforced Tigua identity in connection to place involved the land grant that they received from Governor De Vargas in 1692. Known as the Hinojosa Grant, De Vargas’s policy saved the Tiguas from the rigors of confragación and repartimiento and gave them enough sovereignty to continue their cultural traditions in a less oppressive environment than that of other missions on New Spain’s northern frontier. In a sense, it bureaucratically reinforced their connection to the land, which in turn helped them maintain their old cosmological worldview in a
new social setting along the Rio Grande. In this way, the Tigua’s ability to negotiate their situation and form alliances with outsiders helped them adapt to their coerced migration from Isleta del Norte to Ysleta del Sur. As Tigua leaders participated in this migration, they carried sacred knowledge of their traditional culture that enabled Ysleta’s Tiguas to maintain their identity as Tiguas in the midst of a very diverse and heterogeneous Indigenous community in El Paso del Norte’s mission-pueblo.
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Chapter 2:

Life in Colonial Ysleta

Los del Paso que se componen de varias naciones no tiene mas idiomas que el castellano y lo mismo sucede a los de Socorro; Los del real son Sumas pero muy pocos, y aunque entienden su idioma hablan mejor el Castellano; Los a Senecú son Piros, los de Ysleta, Tiguas, unos y otros hablar también su idioma como el castellano.¹

Those in El Paso who are composed of various nations do not speak more than Castilian and the same goes for those in Socorro; Those in San Lorenzo del Real are the very few Sumas who, although they understand their own language, speak better Castilian; Those at Senecú are Piros, those of Ysleta, Tiguas, both of these speak their own language as well as Castilian.

Colonial Census of 1793

The Long Eighteenth-Century

After the Tigua resettled in Ysleta del Sur, they formed a dynamic community that interacted significantly with their Indigenous and Spanish neighbors. Because of the stability offered through the Ysleta mission and De Vargas’s land grant, the pueblo attracted new arrivals, and many amalgamated into Tigua society. I define this period as the long eighteenth-century because it spans from resettlement in 1692 to secularization in 1817 and Mexican independence in 1821. Considering Howard Campbell’s notion of “tribal synthesis,” I argue that the Tigua experienced a form of ethnogenesis in which some community members merged with colonial
society and identified as vecinos or citizens, while others retained their Indigenous identity as residents of the mission pueblo. Many of the Piros, Tompiros, Mansos, and Sumas in surrounding missions experienced a similar process, yet more of them blended into colonial society as vecinos or paseños than did the Tigua.² In this context, intermarriage and kinship ties significantly influenced the continuity of the Tigua Indian community around the Ysleta mission.

As Christian Indian residents in the Corpus Christi de la Ysleta de los Tiguas mission, their mission-Indian status and military alliances with El Paso’s presidios empowered the Tigua by creating a social space for them to continue their traditions despite the pressures of Spanish colonization. The Franciscans enabled this type of cultural semi-sovereignty by keeping Indians separate from colonial society in order to convert, protect, and eventually preserve them in efforts to maintain their missions and resist secularization. In this colonial context, Franciscan missionaries protected Indian land from squatters and land grabbers and acted as agents of colonization for the state in fulfillment of its ultimate objective to civilize Indigenous peoples on New Spain’s northern frontier and assimilate them into colonial society.³ In Ysleta, colonial New Spain granted the Tigua more freedoms than mission-Indians in other colonial contexts because officials like De Vargas valued their military service and wanted to avoid another full scale Indian revolt like that of 1680 by not recreating the conditions that caused it.⁴

Another reason the Tiguas experienced a good degree of semi-sovereignty in the Ysleta mission involved colonial views towards mission-Indians. Colonial Spanish viewpoints towards Indians like the Tigua involved a dichotomy that positioned Hispanics and Hispanicized vecinos or mestizos at one end, and Indians like the Apache and Comanche, who lived outside the orbit of colonial society on the other. Considering these latter groups as Indios Bárbaros, colonial Spaniards viewed groups like the Tigua who lived in the missions and appeared to adopt
Christianity as *Indio Civilizados*, or civilized Indians.\(^5\) In this way, the Tiguas geographically and culturally maintained a “middle ground” status during the colonial period because they rested within the Spanish taxonomy between the categories of Hispanicized citizens and savage *Indios Bárbaros*.\(^6\) Although the Tiguas resided at the lower end of colonial Spain’s caste system taxonomy, their status as mission-Indians allowed them enough cultural autonomy to maintain their identity among the region’s Indigenous peoples and colonial settlers. This status made Ysleta an attractive safe place to Indians from fragmented communities, such as the region’s Sumas and Mansos, who in turn offered the Tigua the ability to regenerate their population through intermarriage, kinship ties and shared resources.\(^7\)

During this period, the Tigua pueblo of Ysleta del Sur solidified into a dynamic and semi-autonomous mission-Indian community. Houser described this era as “a stable period of Indian possession and domination,” in which the Tigua held unchallenged sovereignty over the land.\(^8\) Secularization and Mexico’s independence from Spain, however, opened the door to land privatization and increased colonization. By 1821, the meaning of what it meant to be a community member had shifted significantly from what it had been in 1692. Although the Tigua still identified as Indigenous peoples, Hispanic and Catholic cultural norms, such as language and religious practices had created a continuum of regional identities that spanned from citizen, vecino, and mestizo to Indian, reshaping the meaning of that identity.

**Ethnogenesis and Tribal Synthesis**

The Tigua of Ysleta del Sur experienced a process of ethnogenesis somewhat different than that of other Indigenous communities who assimilated into colonial society on New Spain’s northern frontier. Yet the dynamics of this process show some similarities, to lesser degrees, with
that of other Indigenous groups in the region. Considering the term “ethnogenesis” in relation to Indigenous communities in Sonora, Cynthia Radding viewed it as a convergence of Indian and Spanish traditions. This convergence caused Indigenous communities to “create new modes of cultural expression through internal pressures and external linkages with the wider society of which they are a part.” Radding explained that as ethnic affiliations in Indigenous communities “evolved over time in reference to diverse criteria of race, language, territory, kinship, and lineage; the meaning of these affiliations changed in the course of successive alliances and confrontations that gave expression to distinct cultural values which, in turn, were grounded in material life in the communities.”

Radding’s explanation of evolving ethnic affiliations illuminates a reciprocal relationship between community and identity, as these factors changed the meanings of one’s place in society over time. Similarly, older collective values and meanings of past experiences also influenced this process of identity formation by facilitating the changing self-concepts of some individuals wherein they adopt new practices and behaviors, or by enabling others to resist the acceptance of new customs and traditions.

The process of ethnogenesis that the Tigua experienced differed from those in similar mission-Indian contexts in which Indigenous peoples identified as vecinos and transitioned into colonial society. This process was hegemonic and reflective of church and state objectives to assimilate Indigenous peoples. By 1800, various Indians and Spanish colonists had intermarried and produced mestizo offspring. Colonial Spain culturally identified both Hispanicized Indians and mixed blood Indians as vecinos instead of earlier racial classifications such as Genízaro, Casta, and Color Quebrado, creating a dichotomy between Indios naturales, Indians before conversion, and vecinos. As mission-Indians, the Tiguas sat somewhere in the middle of this dichotomy in the same way that they did between the classification of vecino and bárbaro.
This interstitial positioning caused some Tiguas to identify as vecinos in order to attain social mobility in the expanding colonial economy. Looking at census data, Adolph Greenburg pointed out that in 1799, 236 Tiguas and 138 Hispanics lived in Ysleta. However, by 1806, 226 Indians lived among 260 Hispanics and mestizos in Ysleta. Greenburg questioned this decrease in Ysleta’s Indian population but could not explain it. Yet this discrepancy likely stemmed from the desire of those on the lower levels of the colonial hierarchy to improve their social and economic status by becoming classified as vecino or mestizo. Being more closely aligned with the status of españole or gente de razón in colonial Spain’s racial classification system, this allowed for increased social mobility, or at least participation in the expanding colonial economy.

Gerald also attributed Ysleta’s shifting population figures to the expanding colonial economy:

These population figures do not reflect simply the biological success of the human breeding population in Ysleta, of course, but rather they also reflect the advantages and disadvantages of being identified with the subordinate ethnic group. The rapid growth of the non-Indian segment of the Ysleta population is not to be explained solely by the acceptance of non-Indian strangers into this relatively closed Indian society and the unrestricted fragmentation of their subsistence base, the irrigable land. Much of this growth was due to the voluntary rejection of Indian status by full and mixed blooded individuals such as is documented in the 1794 petition by two Indians of the Guadalupe mission to have their status changed to that of “vecino” or non-Indian citizen.

This reveals how colonial Spain recategorized some Tigua and other Indigenous peoples in their census, dissolved them into colonial society, and reified the notion that they were disappearing. It also shows that Indians often chose to be listed as vecino. Yet unlike the numerous mission Opata, Pima, and Eudeve peoples from Sonora’s highlands who integrated into colonial society, most Tiguas retained their Indigenous identity and culture and regenerated their community through intermarriage with other Indians because of the limited sovereignty that Franciscan oversight offered. In these contexts, some Indigenous societies experienced the type
of ethnogenesis in which they assimilated into colonial society, while others absorbed outsiders in order to regenerate or repopulate their communities. To various degrees, the Tiguas fell into the latter category.

Looking at how Indigenous groups amalgamated with one another as a survival strategy, Pekka Hämäläinen discussed how the Comanche absorbed numerous outsiders into their community. In this process the Comanche integrated various Wichita, Apache, and Caddo peoples, as well as some *genizaros* from Texas and New Mexico. Hämäläinen explained that most voluntary immigrants as well as captives “married into Comanche families, adopted Comanche customs and language, relinquished outward signs of their former identity, and were eventually Comancheanized.”¹⁷ This integration of outsiders increased community labor, opened up new trade networks, and brought new warriors to the community.

Indigenous groups fragmented by disease, raiding, and warfare, often relished the prospect of integrating into a community that appeared stable and secure. Explaining how this type of ethnogenesis applied to mission-Indian communities, Gary Clayton Anderson wrote that “Spanish missionaries experienced only limited success in converting native societies. Yet, ironically, the missions did further the process of native ethnogenesis and cultural reinvention, for the stations became staging areas where small, fractured bands joined others in like circumstances, intermarried, and attempted to rebuild themselves. Some succeeded in this cultural reconstruction, and some failed, for it remained difficult to sustain populations in the missions.”¹⁸

In this way, mission-Indian communities absorbed Indian groups and families in the same way that larger groups like the Comanche did, although they did so at a smaller scale. Looking specifically at the El Paso region, various Indigenous groups had been fragmented due to the Manso and Suma revolts, colonial Spain’s reoccupation of New Mexico, and other occurrences of
disease and warfare that plagued the region. For example, a typhus epidemic (1760-1765) reduced the Tigua population by 20%, and a colonial census indicated three Suma families living among 91 Tigua and 26 Spanish families. Although some Sumas had lived in Ysleta since the early eighteenth-century, the Spanish rarely mentioned them in the census data. Thus, Ysleta’s mission-Indian community may have appeared an attractive alternative for these people in the wake of the 1751 Ysleta land grant and the Suma Revolt of 1745.19

Howard Campbell defined this assimilation of other Indians into Tigua society as “tribal synthesis.” For Campbell, this phenomenon describes how “Indigenous groups have combined and rearticulated cultural elements and subsistence strategies from multiple sources over long stretches of time.”20 Campbell explained that [t]he concept of ‘tribal synthesis’ emphasizes process, interdependency, agency, and changing cultural and political repertoires as native people have sought survival amidst political economic domination and internal conflict.21 Campbell asserts that Indigenous groups are not purely homogeneous entities and that their lineage involves various strands of interaction. Yet this synthesis of Indigenous peoples over long periods of time does not detract from a group’s Indigeneity; it is part of the process of community formation.22 In relation to the Tigua, Campbell wrote that some Piros and Mansos blended into “one loosely connected multi-ethnic Indian population from which the Tigua Indian tribe and PMT [Piro, Manso, Tigua] tribe emerged.”23 During the colonial period many of the Piros, Mansos, and Tiguas in El Paso’s missions experienced this process. While some of them identified as mestizos, vecinos, or paseños and blended into colonial society, others retained their Indigenous identity. Colonial Spain’s objective to Christianize Indigenous peoples, ethnically re-categorize them, and integrate them into the colonial political economy fueled this type of ethnogenesis throughout the colonial
Yet as the main instrument for colonization in the Tigua case, the Church gave them a great degree of sovereignty.

This cultural sovereignty also resulted from the inability of the Church to strictly enforce religious mores, giving the Tigua more social space to continue their traditions. This is exemplified by fray Rafael Benavides’s 1787 report to the Bishop in Durango, in which he complained about a shortage of priests in El Paso’s missions, noting that Ysleta did not then have a priest, and the closest priest resided in Senecú. Because of this, many Tiguas strayed from the church and showed contempt towards visiting priests. In this context, the removal of parish priest, Father Dueñas, in 1791 because he tried to restrict the Tigua from hunting and performing ceremonial dances exemplifies how they enjoyed their autonomy as well as how church officials respected their wishes. Similarly in 1797, Tiguas protested the transfer of a priest from Socorro to Ysleta, preferring that he remain. Yet colonial officials turned down this request. Thus, Tigua attitudes towards the church reflect that they enjoyed significant amounts of autonomy, which they used to maintain their own cultural traditions.

In this way, the Tigua experienced a unique form of ethnogenesis in which they maintained their culture and identity within the semi-sovereign space offered by the Ysleta mission. In El Paso del Norte, the Tigua, along with the Piro, Manso, and Suma peoples, interacted with each other, as well as with the emerging Hispanic and mestizo society in which they lived. In this dynamic context, intermarriage between Indigenous peoples likely served as a necessary way to negotiate survival in colonial society. This cooperation is essential to understanding how ethnogenesis and tribal synthesis influenced the development of Ysleta and El Paso’s other mission-Indian communities. Yet its discussion is seemingly hollow without considering how kinship and intermarriage played into life in Ysleta during the period of Spanish colonization.
Kinship and Intermarriage

Kinship and intermarriage played a major role in the continuity of the Tigua community. As residents of an interconnected chain of mission-Indian settlements, the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur interacted with their Spanish, Indian, and vecino neighbors to various degrees. Kinship ties formed the basis for most of these interactions. In fact, kinship networks empowered Indigenous communities beyond the confines of the Spanish missions and presidios, allowing them to classify others in relation to rights, obligations, and access to shared resources such as land. This system excluded enemies and welcomed friends to various degrees. Kinship rested at the heart of all Indigenous social, political, and economic relationships.  

Juliana Barr explained that interactions such as military alliances and trade bonded Indians and non-Indians alike into fictive kinship networks in which reciprocity and gift giving played a major role. As relationships grew, intermarriage and entry into an Indian community increased one’s obligations and furthered the kinship bonds, moving people from semi-outsider status to insider status. In this way, kinship served as a “meta-institution,” upon which all relationships with Indigenous communities rested.  

In the missions, Franciscans sought to inculcate patriarchal values on matriarchal societies through formal marriages and *compradazgo* or godparenthood of an Indian child. *Compradazgo* often connected colonial Spanish settlers and vecinos with Indian families though baptism ceremonies, in which they became godparents to Indian children. This relationship likely brought these colonial outsiders into fictive kinship relationships with Indigenous families and communities. Intermarriages between the Tigua and other Indians also enhanced kinship ties and built new alliances that strengthened the community.  

Marriage and baptism records from the eighteenth-century are sparse and fragmented. The documentation that is available reveals that Indians from various groups intermarried and built
kinship ties in El Paso’s missions. For example, various intermarriages took place near El Paso at the Suma mission of Santa Maria de Las Caldas. In 1733, an Apache worker named Domingo de la Cruz married Angela Rosa, a recently widowed Suma from Las Caldas. In 1734, Apache servant José de la Cruz married fifteen year old Josefa de la Cruz, a Piro of Las Caldas. In 1736, free mulatto Cayetano de la Rosa of Santa Fe married an Ysleta Indian named Maria Persingula. Also in 1736, coyote Miguel del Río married a Suma named Juana, both of San Lorenzo.  

These types of intermarriages also occurred in El Paso del Norte. For example, in 1734, Manuel de la Mora, a coyote (offspring of Indian and mestizo parents) from Ysleta, married thirteen year old Maria Casmira López, a coyote citizen from the presidio of El Paso. And, Francisco Osuna, a mestizo from Guadalajara, married an Apache named Isabel de Olivares, who worked as a servant for Bernardino de Olivares. This pattern repeats itself throughout the diligencias matrimoniales recorded in the mid-eighteenth century. Although these examples offer only a glimpse into the larger processes of colonization, acculturation, and the ethnic reclassification of Indigenous peoples, they do elucidate the types of kinship connections that existed in the region at this time.

It is difficult to speculate the actual amount of intermarriage that occurred in Ysleta because of ambiguities and gaps in the historical record. Yet the documentation that is available reveals that it did occur and that the region’s kinship networks extended into the Tigua community as well. Although the Tigua preferred to marry within their community, they also participated in intermarriage with other Indians. Rex Gerald points out that between 1707 and 1728, missionaries recorded eleven marriages in which four Piro men, two Manso women, two Apaches, one Suma, a mulatto, and an unidentified Indians intermarried with the Tigua. Traces of kinship are also revealed by the lists of witnesses to these types of unions. For example, in 1692 Francisco de
Apodaca, a native of La Cañada, New Mexico who resided in Ysleta, married Maria López de Luna, a native of Isleta, New Mexico. Matías Lujan and Juan Trujillo of Ysleta served among others as witnesses. In 1714, Francisco Gamos, a native of New Mexico who lived in Ysleta, married Francisca Olguín, a native of El Paso. Interestingly, Gamos had been widowed four times, and one of his former wives, a Panana Indian named Gertrudis, died in Ysleta two years earlier. Gerónimo Moreno verified this along with two witnesses from Socorro, Juan de Archuleta and Juan Jurado. And, in 1733, Parral native José Antonio, who lived in El Paso, married a Tigua woman named Juana from Ysleta. Ysleta natives Bernardo José and Diego Santiago both served as witnesses to this union, which took place at the Las Caldas mission. The fact that much intermarriage between Indigenous peoples went unrecorded obscures the degree to which one can empirically quantify them. This is compounded by the fact that Spanish laws forbid intermarriage between castes and Indians. In addition, the way that the Church dictated colonial Spain’s ethnic caste categorization scheme obscured the Indigeneity of those involved through the use of terms like coyote and native.

Ysleta baptismal records also offer various snapshots of kinship relations. Yet they are somewhat ambiguous because many children had unknown parents, and the friars either used the terms “Indian” and “resident,” or listed no ethnic label at all in their descriptions of the participants. For example, in 1792, Fray Franco Dueñas named and baptized Vizente Raymundo, of unknown parents, informing his unspecified Godparents of their spiritual and material obligations. Fray José de Vega baptized and named Juana Marcela, the daughter of two Indians named Rafael and Bernarda. Two Ysleta Indians served as Juana’s Godparents, and it is uncertain where her unrecorded parents came from. In 1793, Fray José Lopez baptized and named another infant Juana, of unknown parents, listing Ysleta residents Ramon Duran and Maria de los Angeles Colmenero.
as her sponsors. In this way, the Church swept various Indigenous peoples in Ysleta into one broad category as Indians and residents.

These records also illustrate how kinship ties existed within Ysleta’s mission and Indian community. For example, in 1792, Fray Dueñas named and baptized María Juliana, the daughter of two Indians of the Ysleta mission, also noting her sponsors as Indians of this pueblo. In 1793, Dueñas named and baptized María de la Encarnación Benedicta. Although María’s racial classification in not stated, the friar listed her sponsors, Thomas Gomez and Maria Simona, as Indians of the mission. Fray José Lopez baptized and named the daughter of Juan Asencio and Maria Fabiana, María Regina, and listed her sponsors as Martin Piarote and Antonia Teresa, noting that they all resided in Ysleta. Then Lopez baptized Juana Lorenza, the daughter of Domingo and Maria Andrea, noting her sponsors as Alexo and Barbara Gomez. Interestingly, Lopez listed all the participants in Juana’s baptism as Tigua Indians. This suggests that perhaps the classification of Indian encompassed people from other Indigenous groups.

For the most part, the friars overlooked Indigenous group distinctions, possibly lumping Tiguas in with people from other groups, such as the Piro, or classifying them simply as Indians. In 1794, Lopez baptized Juana Vicente, noting her parents, Rafael Gomez and Maria Bernarda, and her sponsors, Domingo Miguel and Antonia Olaya, as Indians of the mission. That same year, Lopez baptized the daughter of Juan Franco Holguin and Maria Augustina Duran and named her Josefa Gabriella. Noting Josepha’s sponsors as Franco Xavier and Franca Gertrudis, Lopez classified everyone involved as mission Indians. It may be that Lopez and other friars did not see much importance in distinguishing between Indigenous groups because the Church’s main objective involved acculturation and assimilation into colonial society. Or it may be that recording the group distinctions of Indigenous peoples who lived in and around Ysleta proved too exhausting
a task for the friars, who instead found it easier to broad-brush everyone into one lump category as Indians or residents of the mission.

Other peripheral evidence reveals that church officials often confused Tiguas for Piros and suggests a strong connection between them in which they experienced strong kinship bonds in Ysleta. For example, Bishop Tamaron visited Ysleta in 1760 and recorded 85 Piro families. Tamaron then wrote that the Tigua lived on the side of the pueblo that borders the river. Historians view Tamaron’s mention of the Piro as a mistake. His mentioning of the two groups suggests that Piros and Tiguas may have cohabitated in Ysleta and that he found it difficult to distinguish between the two. It also suggests that strong kinship bonds between these two groups increased internal community cohesion and synthesis. Yet this is difficult to prove because the documentary record is vague in this area.

These records also indicate that kinship ties extended from Ysleta to the surrounding pueblos. For example, in 1793, Dueñas baptized Juan Simon, son of Sebastian and Maria Paula, Indians of the Ysleta mission. Here he noted that Juan’s sponsors, Jose Mariano and Ana Maria, were Indians from Senecú. In 1794, Lopez baptized Maria Antonia Eulalia, and listed her parents, Paulin Olguin and Guardelupe Alderete as residents of the Ysleta mission. He then listed her sponsors, Antonio Costales and Petra Garcia, as residents of El Paso. Then Lopez baptized Maria Nicolosa Juliana, the daughter of Ysleta Indians Juan Martin and Maria Estefana. Here Lopez recorded Maria’s sponsors as Senecú Indians Juan Trinidad and Maria Lorenza Monaga. Later that year, Lopez recorded various baptisms in which Indians and residents of Senecú sponsored Ysleta Indians. Similarly in 1795, Fray Jose Martinez Bravo baptized an Indian boy in Ysleta and listed his sponsors, Jose Franco Bachelor and Maria Antonia, as “residents of San Antonio de Senecú.”
These relationships between the Indians of Senecú and Ysleta suggest that Tiguas and Piros experienced strong kinship bonds by 1800.

Kinship may have extended to some captive Apache. As the Apache and Comanche battled over control of the Southwest Plains, the Socorro mission obtained numerous Apache captives from the Comanches. Colonial militias also brought numerous Apache captives into the region.\(^{43}\) By the 1770s, many of these captive Apache *genízaros* lived in and around the Socorro mission. Hendricks pointed out that this influx of Apaches likely caused many of the Piros from Socorro to move to Ysleta and join the Tigua.\(^{44}\) Friars also baptized some captive Apaches in Ysleta. In 1799, Fray Rafael Benavides baptized and named Josefa Francisca Bibiana, an infant of the Apache nation. This baby may have been a captive since there are no parents listed, and her sponsors, Don Franco Montes de Mendosa and Doña Maria Rufina Gonzales de Castro, have Spanish surnames that exemplify wealth and status in colonial society. In 1801, Benavides baptized Jose Deonis, an Apache of an unspecified age and noted him as being retained by Don Francisco Carbajal.\(^{45}\) That same year in Ysleta, Benavides baptized Maria Francisca Ygnacia, a six year old Apache girl, also sponsored by Francisco Montes de Mendoza and Doña Maria Rufina Gonzales de Castro. Over time, genízaro captives integrated into colonial society as laborers and servants. Some attained citizen status and others served as intermediaries between Spaniards and Indians. In 1765, genízaros made up twelve percent of the El Paso region’s population.\(^{46}\) Thus, it is likely that kinship ties existed between Tiguas, Piros, and some Apaches. As evidenced above, some Piros, Sumas and Apaches intermarried, and various ties existed between Tiguas, Piros, and Sumas.

In this context, kinship and intermarriage played an integral role in the development of the Tigua community of Ysleta del Sur. The fact that the majority of baptisms and compradazgo relations occurred in the pueblo reveals that a strong community cohesion existed between its
Indigenous residents. Yet these ties extended into neighboring settlements as well, revealing that Ysleta’s people did not live in isolation.

Table 1.1: Ysleta Mission Baptism Records, 1792-1803.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total baptisms recorded in Ysleta mission 1792-1803</th>
<th>Baptisms in which residency or ethnicity of participants is unstated</th>
<th>Baptisms in which participants are from Ysleta and identified as Indians</th>
<th>Baptisms in which participants are from Ysleta and neighboring pueblos and identified as Indians</th>
<th>Baptisms in which participants are from Ysleta and Senecú and identified as Indians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisms in which participants are from Ysleta and are identified as residents, coyotes, citizens, or españoles</td>
<td>Baptisms in which participants are from Ysleta and neighboring pueblos and are identified as native, resident, mestizo, or citizen</td>
<td>Baptisms in which participants are identified as Tigua</td>
<td>Baptisms of Apache</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baptisms from this period fit into multiple categories which often overlap one another. Drawing connections between baptism sponsorship and kinship, this data indicates that the majority of Tigua kinship relations existed within the Ysleta community at this time. It also shows that a direct relationship existed between Indians in Ysleta and Senecú. 47

This analysis reveals that the majority of interaction between groups occurred between Tiguas and Piros. It also shows that kinship and intermarriage existed between the Tigua and other Indians of the region, such as the Manso. These interactions are ambiguous in the historical record because church and civil officials often defined Indians as “natives” and “residents,” integrating them into colonial society and obscuring their Indigenous identity in the process. The classification of Indians as residents, natives, and citizens in Table 1.1 blurs the connections between Tiguas and Indians of other pueblos. Church documentation in which ethnicity is unstated also distorts these interactions. Between 1798 and 1803, Fray Rafael Benavides did not record any locations and caste categories for baptism sponsors, regardless of the child’s caste classification. 48 Thus, these baptismal records illustrate the different ways that each friar recorded and classified Indians, some using more detail than others. As such, these interactions offer significant inroads into some of the
ways in which Ysleta’s Tigua absorbed their Indigenous neighbors through kinship and intermarriage and retained their identity in the process.

Census Data

Since Ysleta del Sur was originally located in the province of New Mexico, early census data before 1730 is meager at best. In 1680, Fray Juan de la Peña visited Ysleta and noted that many Tigua lived there. De la Peña also noted that numerous Piros lived in Senecú, Sumas and Piros lived in Socorro, and Mansos, Piros, and Janos lived in El Paso. In 1692, Diego de Vargas took a census of El Paso’s settlements for the purpose of relocating settlers to New Mexico to improve their living conditions. At this time, exiles from New Mexico lived in extreme poverty, lacking basic needs such as clothing and livestock. In Ysleta, the Tigua lived in wood huts called *jacales*. Looking at Ysleta, de Vargas focused on colonial settlers who intended on moving back to New Mexico. Although he only mentioned Indians in passing, such as a woman named Juana Martin, many of the names he recorded, such as Apodaca and Truxillo, are still prominent in today’s Tigua community. In 1706, Fray Juan Álvarez visited New Mexico’s twenty-one missions but did not record how many Indians lived in them because of rapid population increases. Álvarez did document what tribes lived in each mission, noting that Piros and Sumas lived in El Paso, Spaniards in San Lorenzo, Piros in Senecú, Tiguas in Ysleta, and Piros and Sumas in Socorro. In 1726, General Pedro Rivera similarly reported that Indians of the Tigua, Piro, and Suma Nations lived in Ysleta, Senecú, and San Lorenzo. Rivera noted that these people used acequias to fertilize the land and produce wheat, corn, beans, and wine. Then in 1730, the Bishop of Durango, Benito Crespo y Monroy, took Ysleta’s first numerical census, reporting fifty-one Tigua families of approximately 300 people. Thus, the presence and recognition of the Tigua in
Ysleta during the early eighteenth-century signifies that they maintained a predominant social identity within the community.

In 1744, Fray Miguel de Menchero conducted a broad numerical census of the region. Menchero did not record all the specific tribal identities of Indians in the missions; he either noted the inhabitants of each pueblo as either Indian or Spaniard, or made no reference to ethnic identity at all. Instead of listing the number of individuals, he recorded the number of families in each pueblo. Menchero’s census is also ambiguous because he generalized the people of Ysleta into one obscure figure of “ninety families.” Yet in relation to the above census data, it does illustrate the demographics of Indigenous people in the El Paso area’s missions and pueblos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1744</th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Spaniards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe del Paso</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>180 / 40 Soldiers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real de San Lorenzo</td>
<td>50 Suma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio de Senecú</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5 individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio de Ysleta</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuestra Señora de Socorro</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuestra Señora de Las Caldas</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>198 / 45 individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers represent the amount of families who lived in each mission pueblo in El Paso del Norte.

One ambiguity that scholars have overlooked involves the numbers of Spanish families in Senecú. Although it appears that five Spanish families lived there, Menchero actually wrote that “[i]t is administered by a father who has five Spanish companions.” Oakah Jones suggested that roughly 3000 people lived in the region and that Spaniards and mestizos made up between one third and one half of these. Although Menchero did not specifically mention the Tigua, his data presented Ysleta as the largest Indian pueblo in the area.

Subsequently in 1749, Franciscan Custodian Andrés Varo conducted a census of individuals in the El Paso area’s missions that included the language group for each pueblo. Like
the Menchero census, Varo conflated the area’s residents into the categories of Indian and Spanish, overlooking the mixed classifications of mestizo and genízaro. He also mistakenly identified Tiguas as Tewas when assessing Ysleta’s language group. Interestingly, Varo did not list the Las Caldas mission because it had been destroyed by the Suma during the uprising of 1745. However, as figure 3 indicates, Varo clearly revealed that Ysleta had emerged as the area’s predominant Indian community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1749</th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Spaniards</th>
<th>Language Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>Tewa (Tigua), Piro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Suma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Piro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Tewa (Tigua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers represent the amount of individuals who lived in each pueblo. This census serves as a high point in Tigua population during the eighteenth-century.

Between 1751 and 1752, New Mexico’s Governor, Thomas Vélez Cachupín, conducted a census of the area to access its military and economic capacities. Cachupin described Ysleta as one of “four Indian towns” within the Paso del Norte settlement. Like de Vargas, Cachupín swept everyone in the area into one nameless ethnic category. At first glance, his population totals are much lower than Varo’s. This is likely because Cachupín added eligible heads of family into the category of arms bearing men and excluded women. When comparing his totals for each pueblo, his figures are higher than that of heads of family and children combined. This suggests that women are the difference here. His higher numbers for arms bearing men is also likely part of the difference. Also, he either overlooked San Lorenzo or may have included it in the figures for El Paso. In any case, Cachupín’s population count is lower than Varo’s.
Table 1.4: Governor Cachupín Census, 1751.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heads of Family</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total People</th>
<th>Arms Bearing Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecu</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are vague because these categories seem to overlap and women may have been excluded. Notwithstanding, they show a significant population decrease from 1749.62

The decrease in population is due to infectious diseases such as smallpox and typhus that hit the region in 1750. Hendricks described this as one of two waves of diseases that attacked El Paso between 1748 and 1750. The first mainly killed Indians, mostly Piros, and twice as many women. The second killed twice as many Indians as it did Spaniards. Hendrix reported that “[i]n addition to the toll exacted by disease, unusually severe flooding and Indian uprisings in 1749-50 marked the beginning of El Paso’s decline in importance relative to such population centers as Albuquerque and Santa Fe.”63 Interestingly, Hendrix is the only scholar who noticed this demographic catastrophe. These figures illustrate that many Tigua died at this time. They also show that these diseases impacted Paso de Norte the most, reducing its population from 1,290 to approximately 234 people.

Bishop Tamaron conducted the area’s next census in 1760. Although he categorized the region’s inhabitants as Indians and Spaniards, Tamaron, like Varo, tried to record the group affiliations of each mission-Indian community.64 Tamaron obscured the Indigenous identity of Senecú families by noting them as “citizens and Europeanized mixtures.”65 His figures for Socorro are somewhat misleading because they included the population of Tiburcios and overlooked the pueblo’s Apaches and Genízaros. His notation of Piros instead of Tiguas in Ysleta signifies the connection between these peoples, as well as his lack of education in Indigenous ways as a secular priest.66
Table 1.5: Bishop Tamarón Census of 1760.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indians Families</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Spanish and Citizens Families</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>2479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú</td>
<td>111 Piro, 18 Suma</td>
<td>425 Piro, 80 Suma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>80 Piro (Tigua)</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>18 citizens</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>46 Suma</td>
<td>182 Suma</td>
<td>82 citizens</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>3367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tamarón counted families and individuals and tried to distinguish Indigenous groups. For El Paso, he noted “354 families of Spanish and Europeanized citizens.”

By 1760, the area’s population had rebounded, and the majority of its Indians lived in Senecú and Ysleta. This increase in population illuminates the area’s ethnogenesis in which increased birth rates likely resulted from various intermarriages and adoptions, as mission-Indian pueblos absorbed outsiders and captives into their communities.

In 1765, the Marqués de Rubí inspected New Spain’s northern frontier and produced an anonymous census. This census is associated with the reports of Nicolás de la Flora, who served as Rubí’s mapmaker. It eliminated some of the ambiguities of Tamarón’s census and revealed the diversity of Indians in El Paso’s pueblos at this time. It also revealed how a typhus epidemic reduced Ysleta’s Tigua population from 429 to 339 between 1760 and 1765. The 1765 census reveals the proximity in which Piros, Sumas, and Tiguas lived in Socorro, Ysleta, and Senecú. It invokes the heterogeneity of El Paso’s pueblos and illustrates the spatial group cohesion within them. Here the Piro of Senecú and Tigua of Ysleta appear as the leading demographic groups.

Between 1765 and 1784 the number of Tiguas in Ysleta decreased dramatically due to another severe typhus and smallpox epidemic that plagued the region. In 1784, the region’s lieutenant governor, Eugenio Fernández recorded a census that included the race, occupation, marital status, and number of children in each pueblo. Fernández, like his predecessors, classified
Hispanicized Indians as Spaniards. Nevertheless, the low numbers of this census reveals how diseases decimated Ysleta and the surrounding pueblos.

Table 1.6: Census of 1765.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place / Ethnicity</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Paso</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genizaro</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genizaros with citizen status</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers in Presidio</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Lorenzo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suma</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senecú</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piro</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ysleta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigua</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socorro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piro</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suma</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tirburicios</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genizaro Indians</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>4750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This census is the most detailed census of El Paso’s settlements. It shows the complexity of El Paso’s mission and Indian communities.

Table 1.7: Fernández Census of 1784.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Mestizos</th>
<th>Genizaros</th>
<th>Spaniard</th>
<th>Coyotes</th>
<th>Mulattoes</th>
<th>Negroes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This census shows how smallpox decreased the region’s population from 4,750 in 1765 to 1,006 in 1784.
The 1784 census represents a low point in the region’s population. Ysleta dropped from 475 to 98 people in less than twenty years. This epidemic killed thousands and ranged from central Mexico to northern New Mexico.\textsuperscript{73}

By the last decade of the eighteenth-century, the region’s population had rebounded. In 1793, Ysleta’s Tigua population of 239 did not equal its 1749 level of 500. Yet this disparity is likely the result of colonial efforts to Hispanicize Indians. Alicia V. Tjarks reported that by 1790, New Mexico had experienced a significant amount of miscegenation. Although half of its population identified as Spanish, they likely belonged in the mestizo category. This phenomenon is especially accurate for El Paso’s 1790 census because colonial census takers (alcaldes and missionaries) sought to conceal castes, such as mestizo, by classifying more people as Spaniards.\textsuperscript{74} Yet missionaries still recognized Indians in this period’s censuses. Tjarks explained that agriculturally sedentary Indigenous peoples “remained in the missions, engaging in endogamic unions stimulated by the teaching of the missionaries, who zealously tried to preserve ethnic unity in their villages. Only later the progressive incorporation of Spaniards and castes to some of these towns—especially those endowed with rich fertile lands—altered the racial unity of the Indians.”\textsuperscript{75}

Table 1.8: 1793 Census.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Spanish/ mixed classes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real de San Lorenzo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This census lumped mestizos, genizarios, and other mixed classes into the category of Spanish.\textsuperscript{76}

In the context of repopulation after serious epidemics and increasing tensions between Franciscans, secular clergy, and colonial civil society, missionaries sought to preserve mission-
Indian cohesion and likely downplayed intermarriage between members of different Indigenous groups, such as the Tigua, Piro, and Suma. El Paso’s 1893 census reveals this tension, showing the divisions between Spanish and Indian. This census shows that of 441 people in Ysleta, 239 are identified as Indians. Although Ysleta’s population did rebound by 1793, this listing of the pueblo’s Indigenous peoples created the appearance that the actual number of Indians had decreased. This disparity resulted more from the re-categorization of the people as Spanish.

Noting that Tiguas and Piros had retained their native languages, the 1793 census evidences Tigua cultural continuity and group cohesion in relation to their neighbors in Senecú. That the Tigua had retained their identity and that the name Tigua had emerged as the signifier for being Indian in Ysleta is evidenced in the Ysleta census of 1790, which listed “Yndios Tiguas,” mestizos, and españoles in its racial taxonomy. Noting all Tiguas as being from Ysleta, it illustrated that mestizos and españoles from Senecú, El Paso, and Socorro also resided in Ysleta. By the end of the eighteenth-century, the Tigua of Ysleta and Piro of Senecú had emerged as the area’s predominant Indian pueblos.

In this era, the Tigua found new meanings for self-definition in relation to various challenges, such as caste classification, disease and depopulation. During the eighteenth-century, three waves of diseases hit Ysleta and reduced its population. Between 1748 and 1751, smallpox and typhus reduced the Tigua population from 500 to 353. Then, after the community had regenerated somewhat, typhus reduced it from 429 to 339 between 1760 and 1765. The third wave of diseases occurred during 1779 and 1780, when smallpox devastated the region, reducing Ysleta’s Indian population to 64 people by 1784, a low point during the colonial era.
These figures show how diseases such as smallpox and typhus reduced the Tigua population in Ysleta del Sur. They also show that the Tigua regenerated their population after each epidemic. In the wake of this tragedy, Ysleta’s Tigua population recovered to 239 by 1793. The regeneration that followed in the wake of these epidemics gives credence to the dynamics of tribal synthesis in that births and reclassifications cannot fully account for the rapid population increase, suggesting a possible increase in immigration from other pueblos. Yet the 1793 figure also illuminates how colonial documentation racialized the Tigua by categorizing them as españoles. Considering the implications of this colonial reclassification scheme, the 1793 figure for Ysleta Indians is more likely closer to the total of 441.

### Table 1.9: Religious Census of El Paso Missions, 1805.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Spanish / other classes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4690</td>
<td>4912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>6101</td>
<td>6945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This census of 1805 reveals Ysleta, Senecú, and El Paso as the main Indian pueblos in the El Paso region.
This racialized polarization is also present in an 1805 religious census, which listed Ysleta’s total population as 486, with 226 Indians and 260 españoles, the latter including those of “other classes.”\textsuperscript{81} By the end of the colonial period, a balanced dichotomy between Tiguas and vecinos had established itself in Ysleta. This is evidenced in an 1814 census, which listed 226 Indians and 227 vecinos.\textsuperscript{82} Yet it is likely that this number of vecinos included many Tiguas who had been racially reclassified by the Church and willingly embraced their increased status in colonial society. In this way, the census data reveals that Ysleta’s Tigua community experienced a dual process of ethnogenesis in which some Indians retained their identities while others became reclassified as non-Indian vecinos.

**Agriculture and Economic Activities**

During the colonial period, land and water played an integral role in the Tigua economy. Although some Tigua agricultural and economic activities revolved around the Ysleta mission, the people experienced a significant amount of socio-economic autonomy, which enabled them to develop a subsistence economy based on hunting, gathering, and farming. One reason for this autonomy involved De Vargas’s 1692 land grants to area missions, which gave first priority to their Indigenous inhabitants for farming and livestock. Another reason involved the fact that Tiguas and Piros had already lived in large complex communities based on agricultural production well before colonial contact.\textsuperscript{83} Tigua labor also contributed to the construction of the region’s churches, missions, and presidios. Although the Tigua developed a sustenance economy based on hunting and agriculture, their economic activities often interconnected with Spanish colonization.

While the Tigua did not pay obventions for church services, such as marriages and baptisms, they provided missionaries with food and labor by working the plots of land that De
Vargas had designated to support the missions with appropriate amounts of corn, beans, and squash. Tiguas also worked as servants in the Ysleta mission. For example, women used metates to grind corn and wheat into flour for tortillas and bread, and men sowed the fields and supplied firewood. In addition, Tiguas worked in the mission as porters, bell ringers, and sacristans. Because of the poverty that existed in colonial Ysleta, missionaries depended on Tigua labor for their survival, often using profits from any surplus crops to aid impoverished Indians.84

Tigua farmers industriously worked the land surrounding the Ysleta mission. In July 1754, Father Trigo visited Ysleta and wrote that “[t]he Indians of this mission have their gardens adorned with beautiful grapevines, peach trees, apple trees, and good vegetables, and the garden of the convent imitates them in providing delight to the eyes and satisfaction to the taste.”85 This mélange of Tigua agriculture included corn, wheat, beans, chick peas, anise, onions, grapes, pears, apricots, apples, peaches, and various other fruits and vegetables.86 Tigua oral traditions contend that the people in early Ysleta grew cotton, separated the seeds from the fiber by candlelight, spun the fiber into thread and wove it into cloth.87 In fact, the Tigua had been producing cotton clothing even before colonial contact. The Tigua also contributed to the region’s wine production. In 1774, Pedro Alonso O’Crouley pointed out that the region’s Indians produced most of the grapes for El Paso’s well known wine and liquor industry.88 In this context, it becomes apparent that the river itself contributed greatly to the Tigua agricultural economy.

The Tigua built acequias and maintained the water flow into Ysleta, using the ebbs and flows of the river to their advantage. Pre-colonial Tigua knowledge of water management and irrigation paralleled that of agricultural production.89 In El Paso’s pueblos, the river usually flooded during May, June, and July. These freshets fertilized the land adjacent to the river and made its seasonal agricultural production possible. In order to bring water farther inland from the
river, the Tigua built acequias, or irrigation canals. Eight of these acequias are evidenced by place names in the 1751 Ysleta grant and still recognized today. These are the acequias of Madre de Ysleta, La Vieja de Ysleta, Abones, Las Padillas, De Los Piros (or De Socorro), De Ragadillo, Del Bosque, and De La Dura. In 1726, Pedro de Rivera documented the existence of acequias in Ysleta, yet the Tigua had likely built them long before then.

Due to the threat of flooding, the Tigua worked as laborers in the construction of the area’s first major water management project. Between 1740 and 1744, flooding destroyed the Ysleta and Socorro missions. Subsequently, colonial officials feared the possibility of a major flood engulfing Ysleta, Socorro, and the Hacienda de Tiburcios and sought to build a dam. Instead, Indians from Senecú, Ysleta, and Socorro constructed a series of channels that diverted water to the fields away from the settlements between 1764 and 1766.

In addition to water management, Tigua laborers helped build various structures. For example, between 1763 and 1766, Tiguas worked with Piros, and Sumas as adobe makers, block layers, and carpenters in the construction of El Paso’s casas reales. Colonial records indicate that caciques from these groups, such as Juan Domingo from Ysleta, petitioned New Mexico’s colonial government for payments. Greenberg points out that this lack of payment resulted from the death of a colonial administrator. Realizing the crucial roles that Tiguas and other Indians played in this mass construction project, colonial officials eventually paid them with commodities like liquor, wine, shoes, and chocolate. Projects like these helped reaffirm group identity and community solidarity.

Tigua laborers also helped build the San Elizario presidio. By 1773, Apache raids caused colonial officials to restructure the region’s presidios. That year, the Marquis de Rubí, lieutenant colonel Hugh O’Connor, and lieutenant governor Antonio Maria de Daroca relocated the El Paso
presidio to Carrizal in Nueva Vizcaya. In 1774 they moved the presidio of Guajoquilla in Nueva Vizcaya to San Elceario, a site located about forty miles downriver from Tiburcios (present day San Elizario). To build this early presidio, Daroca employed thirty-five Indians from El Paso, Senecú, and Ysleta, nine from each pueblo, and eight from Socorro. Then in 1788, after this early presidio proved ineffective, El Paso’s lieutenant governor, Javier de Uranga, decided to move the presidio to Tiburcios, near present day San Elizario. Once again, the people of Ysleta and Senecú agreed to help build the new presidio, working twelve days each. Hendricks reported that Socorro Indians supplied adobe blocks and that by 1790, labor crews as large as thirty men worked on the new presidio. By 1793, numerous Indians from El Paso’s mission pueblos had helped build the San Elizario presidio.

The Tigua also hunted and gathered various faunal and floral resources within and beyond the El Paso region. Adolph M. Greenberg described Tigua subsistence as an equally balanced “mixed system” that combined hunting, fishing, and gathering with agriculture and limited animal husbandry. The Hueco Bolson served as their main hunting area. This area ranged from the Franklin Mountains to the Hueco and Finley Mountains and included the Guadalupe Mountains. Here they hunted for deer, bear, rabbits, wild pigs, sheep, geese, quail, and duck. The Tigua usually hunted during the winter, or during slow agricultural periods. They sometimes traveled as far as the Pecos River Valley while hunting buffalo. It is likely that the Tigua learned about regional hunting though their interactions with the Sumas and Mansos. According to Tigua oral traditions, “Great herds of antelope then roved over those plains, and we hunted them every year as soon as the cold season began; they, and the deer that were plentiful in the foothills, furnished us with meat through winter, and plenty of buckskin.” This testimony evidences how the Tigua balanced hunting with agriculture according to seasonal changes in their economic cycle.
In addition to hunting, the Tigua gathered various plants and other natural resources. They collected various types of wood, such as mesquite, cottonwood, pine, and cedar, traveling as far as the Finlay and Sacramento Mountains. They gathered medicinal plants in the Hueco and Guadalupe mountains, such as manzanilla, ocotillo (to treat gonorrhea), peyote, sangre de Cristo (for cancer and heart problems), and yerba buena. They traveled to Carlsbad Caverns and Big Bend to gather tobacco for religious and tribal ceremonies and likely traded tobacco with Jumano people who also utilized this region. The Tigua also utilized salt and gypsum from the Guadalupe Salt Flats. They used salt for preserving food, seasoning, trading, making drums, and tanning hides. Gypsum was collected in the Guadalupe Mountains near the salt basin and used for pottery and home building. They went to the Salt Flats twice a year during the spring and fall and returned with salt, gypsum, and various types of herbs and wood, which they shared, sold, and traded with the community and its neighbors.

This analysis of Tigua agriculture and economic activity during the colonial period illustrates how the people interacted with Spain’s colonial project and simultaneously developed their own subsistence based economy. This subsistence network solidified their relationship with the water and the land. While some agricultural activity involved their relationship with the mission, collective land use gave the Tigua enough space and freedom to work the land for their own benefit. This collective land use extended beyond the immediate proximity of the Ysleta mission into the surrounding mountain ranges and involved mutual kinship relations and reciprocity with the Sumas, Mansos, and Jumanos, who shared their knowledge of the region’s flora, fauna, and other natural resources with them. Involvement in the construction of colonial irrigation projects and presidios presents how they worked as coerced laborers alongside Indians from neighboring pueblos and likely increased their ties with them in the process. Experiencing
common cause with their Indian, Spanish, and mixed blood neighbors, the Tigua increasingly identified as community members of El Paso’s mission-Indian pueblos. One factor that enhanced this sense of belonging involved military collusion with these neighbors in opposition to those who threatened their well-being.

**Military Activities**

While connections with the Ysleta mission and the area’s emerging colonial economy did much to benefit the Tigua, their involvement in defense of the area’s pueblos and missions greatly contributed to their status in colonial society. Tigua involvement with colonial Spain’s military activities began during the aftermath of the Pueblo Revolt. In 1681, thirty Tiguas served as auxiliaries during Antonio de Otermín’s failed attempt to re-conquer New Mexico. Although Otermín coerced many of these Indigenous auxiliaries, some likely went willingly to find family members. During the Apache, Manso, and Suma revolts that ensued after 1684, the Tigua found common cause with the Spanish in protecting settlements and missions. As Tiguas, Piros, and Mansos in El Paso’s mission pueblos competed for natural resources with Sumas and Mansos from outside the missions, tensions increased, and many Tigua helped the Spanish quell these rebellions. When Diego de Vargas reentered New Mexico in 1692, numerous Tiguas and other Indigenous auxiliaries accompanied him. Although De Vargas had coerced many Indians and colonial settlers into military service, several Tiguas went along to find missing family members. Tigua military involvement with colonial Spaniards established an increasing interdependency between these two groups. De Vargas and other colonial leaders surely realized the value of the Tigua as Indigenous auxiliaries during this period and allowed them a significant
amount of autonomy by exempting them from the rigors of *contragación* and giving them first preference to the lands surrounding the mission.\textsuperscript{108}

The Tigua and other Indians in El Paso’s mission settlements had a good reason to build military alliances with colonial Spain. During the eighteenth-century, this string of mission pueblos along the Rio del Norte appeared as an island in the middle of a much larger Indigenous zone of interaction, which included the Apacheria and Comancheria. Bordered by Gilénos Apaches to the west, Conchos, and Julimes to the South, and Faraónes, Mescaleros, Natagés, and Lipones Apaches, as well as Comanches and Utes, to the north and east, El Paso’s pueblos geographically resided on the fringes of various subsistence zones in which groups like the Apaches survived through hunting, gathering, and raiding.\textsuperscript{109}

In particular, Apaches absconding with livestock caused a significant amount of violence in the region. After the revolts of the 1680s, many Sumas and Mansos amalgamated with the Apache instead of moving into El Paso’s mission pueblos, taking their resentments of colonial society with them. By the mid-1700s, tensions increased as Comanches moved south into the Apacheria and disrupted traditional Apache subsistence patterns, such as buffalo hunting. This pushed the Apache closer to New Spain’s northern frontier and made them more dependent on colonial settlements for livestock raiding. Comanches also attacked El Paso’s pueblos, yet not as often as the Apache. Colonial Spain initially responded to these *Indios Bárbaros* with military force. When that approach failed, they adopted an appeasement policy that conformed to Apache and Comanche notions of gift giving and reciprocity.\textsuperscript{110}

Colonial Spain responded slowly and ineffectively to the presence of groups like the Apache and Comanche. In 1681, governor Otermin formed a presidio with fifty soldiers in San Lorenzo. Two years later, Cruzante authorized paid Indian labor to build an adobe presidio about
seven leagues south of El Paso. Then in 1684, he moved the presidio to El Paso in response to the Suma and Manso revolts.\textsuperscript{111} During the early 1700s, raiding appeared moderate. In 1724, Pedro de Rivera inspected New Spain’s northern presidios and underestimated the Apache and Comanche, perceiving them as cattle thieves who could be easily converted to Christianity. As such, Rivera only made modest economic reforms to the region’s presidios.\textsuperscript{112}

In 1766, Spain adopted a policy of military force to deal with Apache and Comanche raiders. That year, the Marqués de Rubí and his mapmaker Nicolás de Lafora inspected the region and found that Apache raids had increased and destroyed numerous settlements. De Lafora viewed the Apache as the main threat and recommended El Paso and Janos as perfect defense locations.\textsuperscript{113} Rubí’s 1772 reforms emphasized military force and placed presidios at forty league intervals across New Spain’s northern frontier, moving El Paso’s presidio to Carrizal and Guajoquilla’s to San Elceario. These relocations proved futile against the Apache, who easily bypassed the presidios and continued entering unprotected settlements south of Rubí’s line of defense.\textsuperscript{114}

Apache and Comanche pressure decreased after 1779 when Spain changed its strategy from military force to gift giving, diplomacy, and trade. That year, Secretary of the Indies José de Galvez recommended a combination of military force, alliances, and appeasement through gifts. By 1786, this carrot and stick approach became Spain’s official policy until the end of the colonial period.\textsuperscript{115} By the 1790s, raids against colonial settlements had slowed down, and nearly 2,000 Apaches had moved into Spanish peace establishments, establecimientos de paz, such as the one near the new San Elizario presidio. Although raids ended in many areas, some Apaches, like the Faraón and Mescalero, as well as Comanches, hit El Paso’s settlements throughout the colonial period. Many of these forays focused specifically on San Elizario’s peaceful Apaches.\textsuperscript{116}
Throughout the colonial period, Tiguas participated in various military campaigns in retaliation against Apaches and Comanches. Although fragmented and vague, evidence of Tigua military activities increasingly appears after the 1760s, as tensions with the equestrian tribes increased. In 1765, El Paso’s presidio captain, Pedro José de la Fuente, noted an incident in which Indian war captains, likely Tigua or Piro, tracked Apaches into the Sierra Blanca region after they had raided El Paso’s Indian pueblos. This encounter led to a peace agreement with Apache chief Vigotes.117 Illustrating that Tiguas often tracked Apaches into the Organ Mountains near present day Las Cruces, De la Fuente acknowledged that Apaches often escaped and outnumbered the Tigua. Yet in one campaign, eighty-six Indians from El Paso’s pueblos accompanied De la Fuente in the retrieval of numerous horses and livestock, as well as the capture of about twenty Apache women and children. Upon their return, De la Fuente distributed horses and livestock to Tigua and Piro war captains until their owners could be found.118

Although the Tigua and other Indians from El Paso greatly assisted the Spanish as scouts, trackers, guides, and auxiliary militia, their forays into Apache country rarely accomplished more than acquiring information about Apache movements and possible threats against the pueblos. In 1777, Hugh O’Connor praised El Paso’s Piros, Mansos, Sumas, and Tiguas for their farming abilities, in particular the production of grapes, and also acknowledged them for their knowledge of the region’s mountains and waterways.119 He commended them for their bravery as volunteers and their ability as guides and trackers in campaigns against the Apache. O’Connor also complained that these campaigns never produced favorable results because of the inferior numbers of presidio soldiers.120 Yet the Tigua did experience some success in maintaining and protecting their status as semi-separate peoples through this military service.
Tigua oral traditions account for one successful campaign against the Comanche towards the end of the colonial period. According to tribal cacique Manuel Ortega, a group of Tigua pottery traders returning from Carrizal encountered soldiers from San Elizario, who told them that a group of Comanche captives had escaped from them. Subsequently, the Tiguas made an agreement with the presidio commander to capture and replace the Comanche captives that had escaped. Soon after, some Comanches attacked the valley and captured some horses and cattle. In response, Tigua volunteers and presidio soldiers tracked the Comanches for two days and then attacked them as they slept. Ortega stated that “very few got away, many were captured and many killed. The pursuing party had not lost a man; a number of scalps were taken, and nearly all the stolen stock was recovered, and the expedition returned in high spirits to San Elizario. More than double the number of captives promised by the Indians were delivered to the Commandant.”

Ortega’s account illustrates the relationship that existed between the Tigua and the presidio. The number of Apache and Comanche captives that passed through San Elizario during the late colonial period suggests that the Tigua played a significant role in these campaigns. That Tiguas captured Apaches shows that they acted reciprocally in an ongoing process of retaliation for incursions such as one in 1784, in which Apaches captured nine Tiguas. Ortega claimed that because of this campaign against the Comanche, Spain granted the Tigua possession of the “plains that lie north of the valley, including everything from the edge of the mesa to beyond Cerro Alto.” Thus, Ortega’s testimony implies that the Tigua military involvement with colonial officials facilitated an ongoing and beneficial relationship between these two factions of El Paso’s colonial society.

Colonial documentation on Tigua military activities into the nineteenth century is especially sparse and vague. An 1806 military census of the El Paso area, however, reveals that
numerous Indians served as volunteer auxiliaries by the end of the colonial era. Although raiding subsided in much of New Spain’s northern frontier after Galvez’s *Instructions of 1786*, which emphasized peace through gift giving, trade, and alliances, the Faraón, Mescalero, and Lipan Apaches of southeastern New Mexico still sporadically raided El Paso pueblos. This census shows that many Tiguas, Piros, Mansos and Sumas bore arms in defense of the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vecinos</th>
<th>Indians</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Muskets</th>
<th>Pistols</th>
<th>Lances</th>
<th>Bows/Arrows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socorro</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>7312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from revealing how many Indians could bear arms in El Paso’s mission pueblos, this census shows the transition in ethnic identity that had occurred by the end of the colonial period, as the majority of those able to bear arms are listed as vecinos. Thus, by onset of the nineteenth-century, more Indians had retained their ethnic-cultural identities in Senecú, Ysleta, and El Paso, while San Lorenzo and Socorro had become predominantly vecino.

Allied with colonial settlers, presidio officers and their Indigenous neighbors, the Tiguas of Ysleta maintained military traditions as they formed new notions of themselves in connection to place and people in opposition to outsiders who threatened the well-being of their families and kinfolk. While these new self-conceptions likely caused some Ysleta Indians to integrate into colonial society as vecinos, possibly maintaining their cultural identities as Indians, many others
held on to their cultural and ethnic identities as Tiguas. Considering that Tiguas served as volunteer auxiliaries in collusion with Spaniards, vecinos, and neighboring Piros, Mansos, and Sumas illuminates how common cause between these peoples strengthened their interdependent relationships with each other. In this context, new self-definitions in relation to local allies and enemies worked in unison with emerging attachments to place throughout the colonial period.

**Land Tenure**

Early forms of land tenure for the Tigua in the El Paso area involved an array of pre-existing Indigenous subsistence patterns in which people searched for stability after the volatile migrations from New Mexico during the 1680s. From the camp at La Salineta to the *jacalitos* near Real del Santísimo Sacramento (1680) and Sacramento de la Ysleta (1682), to Ysleta’s current location (1684), most Tigua accepted life as they adapted to their new environment.\(^{129}\) Despite occasional tensions over access to natural resources, this process involved amalgamation and the formation of kinship ties with some of the area’s Sumas, Mansos, and Piros.\(^{130}\) Even before the Tiguas arrived, the mission of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Mansos del Paso had become a heterogeneous community in which Mansos, Sumas, Piros, Tanos, Apaches and others intermarried and built ties throughout the region that offered maximum use of the land and its resources.\(^{131}\)

In this dynamic context, Tigua kinship ties and intermarriage with the region’s Sumas and Mansos gave them communal access to their land and its natural resources through Indigenous customs of reciprocity and exchange, such as the shared knowledge of buffalo hunting in the Davis Range and Pecos River Valley, which runs through eastern New Mexico and West Texas east of the Rio Grande.\(^{132}\) Greenberg describes this region as part of a “cross utilization” zone in which
the Tigua shared resources with other groups like the Apache. Greenberg also presented that Tigua territory extended from the Franklin Mountains, down the Rio Grande River into present day Presidio County, and included Hueco Tanks as well as the land adjacent to the river from twenty to forty miles inland.\textsuperscript{133}

Thus in 1692, when De Vargas granted Hinojosa possession of lands surrounding El Paso’s missions and gave preference to the region’s Indians, he recognized the spatial dynamics of pre-existing Suma and Manso subsistence patterns, and the way in which recently arrived Tiguas, Piros, and Tompiros had blended them into their emerging cultural and geographical lifeways. This is evidenced by the fact that De Vargas allowed El Paso’s Indians a great amount of geo-economic autonomy in the 1692 Hinojosa Grant, which corresponds with the boundaries of
Figure 1.3: Indians of the Rio Grande, 1598-1690. This map shows Manso and Suma territory upon the Tiguas’ arrival to the area during the 1680s and illustrates the diverse groups that inhabited the region upon the Tiguas’ settlement in the El Paso del Norte area.135
Greenberg’s map of Tigua territory and those of a map by Fray Gerard Decorme that illustrates Manso and Suma territory from 1598 to 1690.

Together, these maps show that Tigua territory and land in the Hinojosa Grant both overlap pre-existing Manso and Suma territory. In this way, Tigua land tenure began through connections with other Indians in the region as well as colonial Spain’s recognition of their communal land rights. Although not the same as Indigenous notions of collective land tenure, colonial Spain’s idea of Indian land rights enabled the Tigua’s unique relationship with the land to flourish. The Tiguas benefitted greatly from the Hinojosa Grant because it encompassed 360 square miles, and colonial Spain recognized usufruct land rights. In the usufruct system, Spain
claimed dominion over the land, water, and mineral resources, but allowed Indigenous wards to access those resources. During the Spanish colonial period, the Tigua settlement and the Ysleta mission were both located on the south side of the Rio Grande River. It was not until the river shifted during the nineteenth century that they were located in the river’s north side.

By the mid-eighteenth century, tensions between the Catholic Church and colonial civil authorities along with vague and inconsistent parameters for land tenure between the pueblos caused New Mexico’s governor, Tomás Velez Cachupín, to issue a series of land grants. Although Otermín had initially sought to settle Indians and colonial settlers in the same pueblos in the 1680s, the Franciscans and the Viceroy segregated them by ethnicity because of the threat of diseases. Over time, ethnic tribal affiliations with the landscape around each pueblo led to territorial disputes with neighboring groups. Jurisdictional disagreements, like the one in 1692 between Ysleta and Socorro, combined with tensions between Church and state and within the Church itself (between Franciscan and secular clergy), causing Spain to issue a series of land grants to Paso del Norte, Ysleta, Senecú, and Socorro beginning in 1751. Of these, only the grant to Paso del Norte’s pueblo still remains, while the documents acknowledging the others have been lost. Yet evidence of the 1751 Ysleta Grant exists throughout the historical record and supports the contention that these grants extended from the churches and missions four leagues in each direction, thus creating four square leagues or thirty-six square miles of land (See Figure 14).

The 1751 Ysleta Grant is based upon a colonial Spanish land grant system that is unique to New Mexico’s pueblos and known as the “Pueblo League.” It is believed that this system existed prior to the revolt of 1680. The pueblo league sought to preserve communal Pueblo land tenure, especially where agriculture rested in the immediate land surrounding a pueblo. The historical record shows that colonial officials in New Mexico first issued these types of grants during the
1680s after De Vargas’s reconquest. By 1704, this system had become rule of law in New Mexico, and it was well understood that these grants were based on a royal decree issued by the King of Spain.\textsuperscript{142} Extending four square leagues from the door of the church, the pueblo league protected mission-Indian fields and acequias from encroachment by Hispanic ranchers and their livestock. Seeking to protect Indian land and water rights, this grant system emerged from the \textit{Recopilación de las Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias}. One clause in particular forbid cattle ranches from existing less than a league and a half from any Indian community, and sheep ranches a half a league. Indians who possessed these grants well understood their rights to the land and asserted them whenever necessary. By the late 1700s, various Indians had issued lawsuits against colonial settlers who had encroached upon their land\textsuperscript{143}

In addition, Spanish law considered land that extended beyond the initial grant as grazing land, \textit{ejido} or \textit{monte} land, which collectively belonged to the pueblo’s Indians. Between 1751 and 1831, most Tigua lived around the pueblo on the south side of the river, and most \textit{ejido} land existed north of the river. Although pueblo league grants extended north, south, east, and west, one squire league in each direction from the church, the Ysleta grant and other grants in the El Paso area varied in that they followed the northeast to southwest axis of the Rio Grande Valley. This made the east and west boundaries of the Ysleta Grant also run from northeast to southwest. The land south of the river around the mission may have been divided into \textit{solares} and \textit{suertes} in which each family received around twenty-three acres. In addition to land in the grant itself, the Tiguas used these \textit{ejidos} for their subsistence activities and shared them with their Indigenous neighbors in a way that correlated well with pre-existing Indigenous notions of communal land tenure from their relationships with the Spanish before the 1680 revolt.\textsuperscript{144}
The Ysleta Grant of 1751 defined the parameters of community land well into the nineteenth century. For the Tigua, it is more than just a piece of paper: it set policies, protected rights, and lived long after the paper disappeared. Although the original document no longer exists, evidence of the grant shaping Spanish policy, local laws, and regulations regarding land tenure and resource allocation are present in the historical record as well as in Tigua oral traditions. In 1825, the Mexican State of Chihuahua confirmed the grant and sent the parish priest of Ysleta, Socorro, and Senecú with El Paso’s mayor and various vecinos from these pueblos to resurvey the grant. They began their survey at the northwest corner of the grant area in a place called Los Valencios. Then they traveled roughly 10,111 yards south to Loma de Barro, a clay hill near a glen called Cañada de Suma Muerto. Here people from Socorro claimed a willow grove that resided in the Ysleta grant. Ysleta residents responded by excluding the grove from the grant. Then they traveled 4,070 yards west to Cerrito Colorado, near Salamayuca Spring, and completed the southern line of the survey. From Cerrito Colorado they went 9,900 yards north to a small hill located 300 yards west of Loma de Tigua. Then they surveyed the grant’s northern boundary, which ran 10,592 yards east along the desert, from the small hill near Loma de la Tigua to their initial starting point at Los Valencios. These figures suggest that the area of this survey encompassed about twenty-four square miles, while four square leagues are roughly 36 square miles. This difference and the fact that residents from Ysleta, Socorro, and Senecú agreed to some changes in the boundaries during the survey suggests that vecinos from Ysleta had conceded about twelve square miles of land to their neighbors in Senecú and Socorro.

Despite these variations, the Tigua held constant land possession after 1684 in the area of the Ysleta grant during the Spanish colonial period. Houser pointed out that aside from the conveyances made to the churches in 1692, the only land transfer of this period occurred in 1820,
when Victoriano Vigil, possibly an Indian because of his Tigua surname, granted (sold) some land to a vecino named Jacinto Télles. Télles had inherited a plot of land and a house from his two brothers adjacent to Vigil’s and sought to increase its size.\textsuperscript{149} Spanish law protected Tigua land because it prohibited the sale of land without a license, and only allowed land to be transferred through inheritance. By the end of the colonial period, however, census data indicates that the increase of some non-Indians in Ysleta, Senecú, and Socorro likely stemmed from settlers encroaching on Indian land.\textsuperscript{150}

Thus, Tigua land tenure in Ysleta involved a combination in which colonial Spanish land policy protected local Indigenous subsistence patterns. As new arrivals to the region during the turbulent 1680s, friendship, kinship, and some intermarriage with Sumas, Mansos, and others gave the Tiguas access to funds of local knowledge about the region’s landscape. Governor De Vargas reinforced their relationship with the land in 1692 though the Hinojosa grant, which gave the Indians of the pueblos preference to all of the land beyond the missions. This immense communal land system persisted until 1751, when governor Cachupín issued the Ysleta Grant as well as other land grants to the area’s pueblos in order to clarify territorial ambiguities. At this time, the Ysleta grant ushered in a new phase of Tigua land tenure during the colonial period that involved the recognition of tribal ejidos, solares, and suertes. Cachupín’s reforms, like those of De Vargas, overlapped with the geographical dimensions of Tigua society in a way that acknowledged their status in the region’s mission pueblos. Their position as residents of a Franciscan mission pueblo protected their land rights and gave them the space they needed to preserve their cultural traditions as they negotiated their relationships with colonial settlers and other Indigenous people in the region. By the end of the colonial period, however, the specter of secularization threatened their
secure status as tensions between Franciscans, secular clergy, and civil elites rearticulated the social dynamics that underscored their community.

**Secularization of the Ysleta Mission**

The secularization of the Ysleta mission involved a series of events that occurred between the 1750s and the 1820s. On New Spain’s northern frontier, missions served as the primary instruments of colonization alongside conquistadors and presidio soldiers. As agencies of Church and State, missionaries sought to convert, civilize, and exploit Indigenous peoples. Protected by presidios and paid by the State, Franciscans served as the primary clergy in New Mexico’s missions before secularization. Spain did not intend for the Franciscan missions to be permanent. Spanish law dictated that Franciscans be replaced by secular clergy after ten years and that all mission lands be turned over to their Indian residents. Due to a lack of Spanish settlers in New Mexico, this process took much longer because Spain sought to colonize its northern frontier with “civilized Indians.” Thus, Franciscans played a dual role in which they elevated many Indians to the status of limited citizenship while protecting others, seeking to preserve them within an autonomous space near the missions. All successful missions had Indian villages called pueblos. Pueblo Indians like the Tigua found life in the mission pueblos easier than the more mobile groups like the Apache. Franciscans in New Mexico often taught Indians to speak Spanish because they found it difficult to learn myriad Indigenous languages. In the Rio Grande region, Indians spoke over 200 dialects. The fact that Indians spoke Spanish seemingly validated the padres’ success at conversion and cultural assimilation. The friars primarily served as teachers and did not control the Indigenous economy. In New Mexico’s Franciscan missions, Indians worked their own plots independent from the church milpas, which they cultivated to meet the needs of the church.
Apart from the colonial State, the Franciscans operated within their own realm apart from civil society and the secular clergy. In the Franciscan mission system, the Custodia of Saint Paul controlled three districts: the northern Rio Grande, El Paso del Norte, and La Junta de los Rios. All of these resided within the larger Province of the Holy Gospel. By 1749, the El Paso district consisted of five missions in El Paso, San Lorenzo, Senecú, Ysleta, and Socorro. Colonial Spain initially intended the pueblos of Ysleta, Senecú, and Socorro for Indians only, and Spanish law prohibited intermarriage between Indians and non-Indians, such as Spaniards and Castas. At the end of the colonial period, however, numerous Spanish citizens and vecinos lived in the mission pueblos, many of them Indians who had been elevated in status by the missionaries. While Indians in Ysleta, Socorro and Senecú had no income and did not pay obvention fees for marriages, baptisms, and burials, vecinos and Spaniards paid the friars with agricultural products such as seeds and wine. These missions sought to be economically self-supporting through Indian agricultural labor, and the Tiguas, Piros, and others who lived there lived in extreme poverty. Nevertheless, as residents of the pueblos, they worked the fields diligently and regularly attended mass.

Although tensions between Church and State existed in New Mexico throughout the colonial period, they increased during the mid-eighteenth-century. In 1749, governor Cachupín and presidio inspector Juan Antonio de Ornedal wrote a scathing report that denounced New Mexico’s Franciscan missions, accusing the friars of being ignorant of Indian languages, failing to teach Indians Spanish, and deserting their posts to conduct trade for surplus revenue. In addition, Ornedal accused the padres of entering Indian homes and stealing grain as well as sheep and forcing them to weave wool and cotton cloth. Ultimately, Ornedal recommended that El Paso and
Santa Fe’s missions be secularized and turned over to parish priests under the direction of the bishop of Durango.\textsuperscript{159}

In response, Fray Andres Varo and other Franciscans wrote a series of reports defending the missions, contesting that they only left their posts for military expeditions and other authorized reasons and that neighboring friars watched the missions in their absence. They argued that the Indians knew Spanish and often used it in their confessions and that they never stole from the Indians.\textsuperscript{160} Declaring that Indians willingly supplied them with some livestock and wool, they explained that not enough sheep existed to produce wool in large quantities. They also attacked colonial governors and \textit{alcades} for forcing Indians to work as woodcutters, household servants, and farmers, and various other tasks such as clearing \textit{acequias}. They also accused Franciscans of hoarding corn, blankets, and livestock and selling them in Chihuahua. Between 1750 and 1760, Cachupín censured and suppressed the Franciscan’s reports, which did not reach the viceroy until a decade after they had been written.\textsuperscript{161}

Struggles between the Franciscans and secular clergy compounded the tensions between Church and State. As early as 1725, the bishop of Durango sought to take over New Mexico’s missions. By 1750, some secular clergy had already moved into El Paso and collected tithes.\textsuperscript{162} Yet the secular clergy did not understand the degree of poverty and peril that existed in New Mexico’s distantly located missions, which could not realistically afford to support them. Because of this poverty, Ormedal showed more leniency towards El Paso’s missions by emphasizing secularization in northern New Mexico’s missions instead. Nevertheless, the 1750s served as a turning point for the Franciscans in which secularization appeared inevitable.\textsuperscript{163}

In addition, Cachupin reorganized the mission landscape by issuing the Ysleta Grant in 1751, which may have been an attempt on his part to accelerate secularization. In this context, the
Ysleta grant exemplifies a first step in the processes of secularization and land redistribution, as mission land would be given to the pueblo’s Indigenous inhabitants, the Tigua. In 1757, King Ferdinand VI ordered that retiring Franciscans only be replaced by secular clergy. Franciscan opposition, however, and the secular clergy’s inability to speak Indian languages stalled this attempt at secularization and bought the Franciscans more time.

Between 1760 and 1776, Franciscan power in New Mexico deteriorated as tensions between the diocese of Durango and the Franciscans increased. At this time, Bourbon reforms and the emerging ideals of enlightenment steered Church and State relations and led to the expulsion of the Jesuits from New Spain in 1767. In 1760, Bishop Tamaron visited New Mexico’s missions and complained about kivas near the missions and the lack of Franciscan knowledge of Indian languages. Seeking diocesan control of New Mexico’s missions, Tamaron petitioned the Crown to secularize all three districts in 1765. Franciscans protested vigorously, and the viceroy, Marques de Croix ultimately denied Tamaron’s request.

During the 1770s, the Franciscans struggled to maintain New Mexico’s missions. Challenged by a severe drought, Apache and Comanche raids, and scandals in the missions, Franciscan power waned as the adobe missions decayed, many of them in bad condition. Yet in 1775-1776, the Franciscans attempted to reform New Mexico’s missions and sent Fray Francisco Domínguez to inspect them. Dominguez found that the friars in Socorro had not kept records of marriages, baptisms, and burials for five years. He also found instances of friars benefitting from Indian labor and hoarding material goods. Examining El Paso, Senecù, Ysleta, and Socorro, he described these missions as in poor condition. According to Jim Norris, Domínguez wrote that the El Paso district missionaries were not teaching their neophytes anything. The Franciscans there wanted only to obtain ‘temporal goods’ for themselves and procure luxuries ‘at the cost of the poor Indians’ sweat and labor.’ Several missionaries had gone into debt to support their extravagant lifestyles…Such worldly activities meant that mission
duties were ignored; Domínguez found some parish books in which no entries had been made in over five years. Worse still for Franciscan records, he found pages from mission registers and books used to seal holes in some convento windows. And finally, according to Domínguez, it was common knowledge that some of the El Paso friars were engaged in carnal relations with women who worked in the conventos.  

In this context, Domínguez found that many friars had not kept their vows of poverty and participated in trade instead. Between 1777 and 1779 the Order sent many new friars to New Mexico to replace those found to be problematic. Yet Domínguez’s reforms did not restore the Franciscan presence there to its former status. Soon afterwards in 1780, smallpox devastated the region and undermined Franciscan efforts. Thus, Domínguez’s reforms signify the last high point in Franciscan attempts to maintain their status in the region.

The Franciscans did not give up easily, however, and in 1795 they sent Fray Jose Bravo to inspect the missions of Ysleta, Senecú, and Socorro. In Ysleta, Bravo found the inside of the church in good condition and noted that the church’s outside adobe walls needed repair because salt had concentrated on them and crystalized. Thus, as the salt broke down the adobe’s cohesive properties, it attracted any available moister and further eroded the church’s walls. During the colonial period, Ysleta had its own salt beds that the Tigua used for their subsistence. Bravo also noted that although Ysleta did not have its own minister, the Tigua always attended mass. At this time, the priest at Senecú gave services in Ysleta. In Senecú, Bravo wrote that the church and mission had both deteriorated and collapsed somewhat due to excessive rain wearing away at the adobe. And for Socorro, he described the convent as very ruined. Subsequently, the Crown secularized El Paso’s missions in 1797. Yet the diocese of Durango had no secular priests available, so some Franciscans remained in the missions into the nineteenth-century.

The 1797 decision signifies a first step in the final stage of secularizing El Paso’s missions. Another shift in this direction occurred in 1806, when secular education replaced Franciscan
schools. At this time, Ysleta had forty-five students, Senecú thirty-seven, Socorro thirty-seven, and San Lorenzo twenty-nine. Between 1807 and 1817, El Paso’s Franciscans did not make any reports. Then on December 17, 1817, the bishop of Durango sent priests and ecclesiastical judges to El Paso’s missions and finalized their secularization.174

After secularization in 1817, two Franciscan priests remained in El Paso’s missions. One served in El Paso and San Lorenzo, and the other in Ysleta and Socorro. In Senecú, the Piros had already taken over the mission’s lands.175 That year, the bishop of Durango inspected the Ysleta mission and wrote that although the San Antonio church is in ruins, the Tigua promised to repair it. Soon after the bishop’s visit, the two remaining Franciscans resigned. Yet another friar replaced them and stayed in Ysleta until 1825, when he helped the Tigua demarcate their land in the Ysleta grant. After secularization, the Tigua remained in control of Ysleta’s land and moved into the mission plots that De Vargas had granted to Hinojosa in 1692. Franciscans remained in the El Paso area until 1852, when secular clergy replaced the last of them.176

For the Tigua, the implications of the Franciscan era involved a paradox in which the friars sought to preserve them as semi-separate Indigenous communities and at the same time assimilate them into colonial society. Secularization ended this era, in which the Franciscans helped the Tigua survive in the face of disease and poverty and also worked as colonial administrators who socially reclassified some Tiguas as citizens and vecinos. In the wake of secularization, the Tigua remained in control of their land and retained their identity as Indians of the pueblo. By the early nineteenth-century, Tiguas in Ysleta likely viewed themselves much differently than those who had migrated there a century earlier. Although the Ysleta mission had been secularized, it still played a major role in Tigua culture and cosmology, and would remain a fundamental pillar in Tigua society and identity. By this time, Tigua identity had become rooted in the local mission-pueblo landscape,
and the church and its grounds likely held different meanings for them than it did for the departing Franciscans. This is especially evident when one considers how they had eluded assimilation into colonial society and continued practicing their traditional rituals and dances within the semi-sovereign space offered by the Ysleta mission.

Conclusion

The Spanish colonial period between 1692 and 1817 involved a balance between group cohesion and ethnogenesis within the mission-pueblo of San Antonio de Ysleta. During this period, various factors enhanced and reshaped Tigua identity from what it had been upon their arrival to the El Paso area during the Pueblo Revolt, when “Tigua-ness” involved the recent trauma of being uprooted from their homes as refugees and captives, status as new arrivals to a region full of new tensions, challenges, and uncertainties, and making on the ground decisions in order to ensure the survival of family and kin in a new and often hostile environment.

Various factors caused the shift in Tigua identity during the long colonial era in Paso del Norte. The Hinojosa grant had given Tiguas enough space to continue their cultural traditions in the midst of Franciscan oversight and to adjust to the changes of life in colonial society. As they comingled with their Indigenous neighbors, the Tiguas absorbed Indians from other groups into their community, such as Sumas, Piros, and Mansos, and built ties with them through intermarriage and kinship in order to ward off the devastating impacts of disease and depopulation.¹⁷⁷

Tigua contributions to agricultural production in both the mission and throughout the region enabled new associations with place as they increasingly became familiar with the landscape and its resources. As these new connections invoked familiar knowledge of land and water management, and its application in a new environment, the Tigua likely experienced a sense
of social stability and belonging that solidified their emerging identities in relation to place. This interplay between change and continuity illustrates that their participation in agricultural activities brought them together in face to face situations that enhanced their social identities as they maintained and developed friendships and found familiarity in new social spaces as they acclimated and rearticulated themselves. Whether working in the fields, farming corn and squash, building an acequia, or buffalo hunting with their Suma and Manso neighbors, they transposed old activities to new social settings.\(^{178}\)

Although the Franciscans reclassified some Tiguas as Spanish citizens and vecinos, many individuals likely accepted these new social categories willingly in order to improve their status in colonial society. In hindsight this recategorization implies that they assimilated into Spanish society and shed themselves of Indigenous affiliations, kin-networks and family ties. Yet this action signifies identity choice as an act of self-determination and agency that defies present moral impositions on the past. Looking at these racialized classifications in colonial documents does not allow for a clear picture of historical reality. While it is easy to assume cultural erasure through the colonial discourse, it may be that these social and ethnic labels meant nothing to people after they walked home from the mission. It may also be that they implicitly perceived their own Indigeneity as inescapable and accepted these new social labels in order to better negotiate the colonial world as mediators between colonial society and individuals in their own community. This identity choice also enabled Indigenous vecinos to serve as god-parents to lower class Tiguas as well as escape the constant gaze of the Spanish and Franciscans.\(^{179}\) In this social context, clusters of material culture and essential characteristics did not define what it meant to be Tigua. Here it meant maintaining social ties with kin, working and being together.
Through traditions of kinship, intermarriage, and notions of reciprocity, the Tigua adapted to the regional subsistence landscapes and hunting patterns of the Indigenous neighbors and selectively absorbed them into their community. This allowed them shared access to communal land and resources and helped them regenerate their population after encounters with warfare and disease. Considering land tenure in relation to kinship and reciprocity, Suma and Manso kinship relations with the Tigua likely allowed the latter complete access to the region’s subsistence landscape. Intermarriage with these groups likely sustained the Tigua population during the colonial era. In particular, smallpox reduced the Tigua population to sixty-four people in 1784. Yet thirteen years later, 239 Indians lived in Ysleta. Although the Tigua preferred to marry within their community, they accepted some outside Indians into their circles to regenerate their population after this crisis. In this volatile social context, new identities emerged in which place and belonging to a community formed the basis of one’s self-awareness. Although identity manifested itself in myriad ways, they remained together and constructed their identities within new and changing contexts.

Military alliances with the Spanish and other Indians from El Paso’s missions also influenced identity formation during the colonial period. As Tiguas joined ranks with colonial settlers and other Indians from El Paso’s mission pueblos, they found common cause in opposition to the Apache and Comanche who threatened their livelihood and well-being. They helped build the San Elizario presidio and served alongside its soldiers as auxiliaries, scouts, trackers, and guides in defense of El Paso’s pueblos. Through these military experiences, they attained enough social status to provide benefits for their families, attain resources, and make demands upon the Spanish. Military service also gave them enough political leverage to demand reciprocity in terms of family protection and land rights. Also, as the Tigua increasingly developed mutual bonds of
friendship and kinship with their neighbors, military service strengthened their sense of belonging to place and community.¹⁸¹

Secularization did not negatively impact Tigua land ownership; instead, it gave them possession of the whole Ysleta Grant. As the Franciscans left, the Tiguas even occupied all of the land that De Vargas had granted to the church in 1692. It is difficult to speculate what may have happened if the Franciscans had stayed. Their goal of preserving Indians in the missions seemingly clashed with their objective to civilize and assimilate Indians into colonial society. In Ysleta, this paradox may have been the main reason why the ratio of Indians to Spaniards and vecinos remained relatively even during the last decades of Spanish colonization. While some Spaniards and vecinos may have encroached on Tigua land in Ysleta, others likely just identified as vecino or Spaniard on paper and identified as Tigua in the community, living there among their families and kinfolk.¹⁸²

Despite secularization, Mexico’s independence from Spain held larger implications for the Tigua. The Franciscans and the Spanish had enabled the Tigua to experience a large amount of social and cultural autonomy. This space enabled them some hegemony and agency through identity choices, military service, and participation in local Indigenous subsistence networks and the colonial political economy. This autonomy also allowed the Tigua a space to continue their cultural traditions and steer Indian identity in the Ysleta pueblo as its lawful and ecclesiastical wards. If the Franciscan period can be described as a time of Tigua hegemony and agency, the Mexican period is better explained as the beginning of their journey into an unpredictable future fraught with assaults upon their land and identity.
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Chapter 3:
Land Dispossession and Sovereignty during the Nineteenth-Century

I know that the Tiguas own much of the old land around here and I believe that the northwest corner was marked by the Loma de la Tigua. The boundary extended from the Loma de la Tigua to the Paulo Calavado. Then from these two markers down to the river. This amount of land constituted the immediate Pueblo of the Tiguas of Ysleta, Texas. The land just described was of course Pueblo, but the Tiguas also claimed much more land which they would hunt on. Much of the hunting ground even extended into the Waco Mountains. As I understand it, the Indians owned this land from time in memorial and were free to use it for whatever use they needed. I don’t exactly know what means they used, but the white people came in and took over the land which belonged to the Indians.¹

Spanish, Mexican, and American Colonization

During the nineteenth century, the Tigua community of Ysleta del Sur experienced a significant amount of social change as Mexican independence, geographical shifts in the river, and United States expansion placed an extreme amount of pressure on the Ysleta pueblo. These pressures included land encroachments by non-Indians during the Mexican period and land dispossession during the American period. After Mexico gained its independence from Spain in 1821, the new nation viewed the church’s excessive land ownership and preservation of the caste hierarchy that led to much inequality in Mexico in a negative way. As such, they declared all Indians to be Mexican citizens and opened up communal mission land to settlement by private individuals. These policies enabled local vecinos to encroach upon land in Ysleta and increase
their population. While this pressure likely reinforced Tigua identity in opposition to an increased number of outsiders, it also set in motion a process of land dispossession that increased during the American period.

After Texas attained independence from Mexico in 1836 and statehood in 1845, it had its claim to El Paso validated by Congress in 1850. State Indian policy marginalized the Tigua because Texas sovereignty excluded them from federal jurisdiction and policies that recognized New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians. This exclusion isolated Texas Indians, making them extremely vulnerable. As such, Texas instituted a campaign of genocide against Indians that forced many from their land. While the Tiguas avoided much of the violence associated with this forced removal of Indians from their land, they did not avoid land dispossession. The Tigua land dispossession involved a series of encroachments during the Mexican period and accelerated after American arrival and the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. From the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth centuries, local elites worked in collusion with state officials and the railroad and bureaucratically dispossessed the Tigua of most of their land within the Ysleta Grant, as well as their subsistence landscape and cultural lifeways that extended beyond it.

In addition to land dispossession, many Americans viewed Tiguas as Mexicans because of their association with the region’s people, its social economy, and various material and cultural traits such as the Catholic Church and the Spanish language. While this confusion may have excluded the Tiguas from much of the violence towards Native Americans at that time, “Mexican-ness” did not fully protect them from either. It also exposed them to violence and marginalized their community identity as an Indian pueblo. This is because the popular assumption among Americans that viewed Indians as “nomadic” made it difficult for them to accept sedentary and civilized groups like the Tigua as real Indians. In this context, Americans imposed their own
notions of race and nation upon the Tigua without regard for the systems of kinship and land tenure that existed before their arrival. Also, many Americans did not fully understand the dynamics of mission-Indian communities and their connection to place, instead viewing Indians through tropes of savagery and assumptions of Indianness that conformed to contemporary popular stereotypes. Thus, these views obscured the Tiguas and their rights to the land, rationalizing and greatly enabling the Tigua Indian land dispossession.

**Mexican Period**

In August 1821, the Treaty of Córdova granted Mexico independence from Spain. Mexican independence impacted the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur by incrementally altering the colonial Spanish institutions that had preserved the pueblo and its peoples. Broad-brushing the Tigua into a national identity by recognizing them as Mexican citizens, the new nation-state both preserved and undermined the Tigua community by setting the terms for future recognition by the United States. This is because Mexican citizenship erased a community’s Indianness just enough for the U.S. to deny them federal protection of their land, as they had with New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians in the Supreme Court case of *United States v. Joseph* (1876). Yet Mexican citizenship also preserved their land and made them eligible for the rights and benefits enjoyed by U.S. citizens per the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This was because their status as Mexican citizens made them potentially white and thus non-Indian. In this way, Mexican citizenship placed the Tigua within a quandary in which two very different racial regimes undermined their Indigenous identity in relation to land rights. While the U.S., at least in theory, recognized their land rights as Mexican citizens, it would not recognize them according to nineteenth-century federal Indian policy. In this way, Mexico’s policies towards Indians set the stage for events later in the nineteenth-century.
During the Mexican period, vecino land encroachments, land transfers to non-Indians, and boundary disputes over the Ysleta grant defined Tigua challenges in maintaining sovereignty during this period. Conflicts with Apaches and Comanches, as well as a major shift in the river that began in the 1820s, significantly altered the historical trajectory of the community by geographically and politically placing much of the Tigua land in the Ysleta Grant within United States territory after the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.⁵

From the perspective of the state, Mexico’s policies sought to improve life for Indians like the Tigua. Yet Mexican citizenship politically diluted tribal identities in the process. During this time, more non-Indian vecinos moved into the area and boundaries between these two groups increasingly solidified, as Tiguas viewed vecinos as non-Indian residents of the pueblo.⁶ In February 1821, the “Plan de Iguala” proclaimed Mexican sovereignty, established Catholicism as the national religion, and declared racial equality among its citizens.⁷ In particular, Article 12 granted citizenship status, “without distinction,” to Indians, Africans, and Europeans. It also stated that the government would protect the property of every citizen. Then in September 1822, Mexico mandated that any racial or ethnic distinctions be erased or omitted from any government documents. In 1824, Mexico created the state of Chihuahua and wrote a federal constitution that declared all inhabitants citizens.⁸

Mexico’s move towards equality stemmed from Bourbon Spanish enlightenment policy that sought to integrate Indians into mainstream society as taxpaying citizens. Although these new racial codes gave non-Christian Indians like the Comanche, Apache, and Kiowa citizenship, these groups had no desire to acculturate into Mexican society.⁹ Moreover, after Mexican independence, these groups increased their attacks on Mexican settlements. Yet Mexico could not finance military campaigns, so the new nation encouraged citizens on its northern frontier to form local militias to
defend against them. By 1824, the Comanche threat had become so great that it caused Mexican officials to recruit United States citizens to settle in Texas. In this context, the Tiguas helped the San Elizario presidio defend the Paso del Norte region as they had in the past.

After independence, Mexico bureaucratically imposed a national identity upon numerous Indigenous peoples by labeling them as gente de razón. Yet they still culturally and politically recognized some Indians under certain criteria that included language, homogeneous descent, culture, and community membership under two sovereign entities: the tribe and the government. Under this criteria, many officials on Mexico’s northern frontier still recorded the presence of Indigenous peoples. In Chihuahua and El Paso, local government officials often documented the presence of the Tigua, affirming their sovereignty and identity. As such, Mexico’s policies towards the Tigua enabled them to retain most of their land during the Mexican period.

**Mexican Period Census Data and Social Environment**

Despite the fact that Mexico sought to nationalize all of its citizens after 1821, the Tigua retained their ethnic sovereignty. As the rightful heirs to the land in Ysleta, state and local officials identified them as Indians and documented them as such. In particular, Felix Pasos’s 1825 survey of the Ysleta grant and an 1841 census for Socorro, Ysleta, and San Elizario both distinguished between Indian and non-Indian residents in Ysleta. These documents illustrate that the Tigua retained both ethnic and geographical sovereignty during the Mexican period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ysleta</th>
<th>Tigua Individuals</th>
<th>Vecino Individuals</th>
<th>Tigua heads of families</th>
<th>Vecino heads of families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures illustrate that, although vecinos outnumbered Tiguas in Ysleta during the Mexican period, Mexican officials distinguished them from vecinos. These distinctions occurred because the Tigua retained their ethnic sovereignty in relation to their vecino neighbors.
The fact that Mexican officials did not mention Indians in Socorro and San Elizario suggests that by this time, most of their Indigenous residents had either assimilated into vecino society or avoided the census. In 1841, Socorro had 1,101 individuals and 229 heads of families, San Elizario had 1,048 individuals with 195 heads of families, and Ysleta had 157 heads of families. In Ysleta, fifty-seven heads of families and 275 individuals are listed as “Indios.” Timmons described this census as more comprehensive than most for this period. In 1844 another census identified 201 Indian males in Ysleta, and 794 men and women in Senecú. Although it specifically noted Indians in Ysleta, it listed everyone in Senecú as inhabitants. Thus, in spite of vecino incursions on their land and state defined identities, the Tigua in Ysleta retained their status as Indians in El Paso’s larger vecino community.

These documents also illustrate that Tigua and vecino society had become significantly intertwined in Ysleta during the Mexican period. Timmons’s description of the socio-economic conditions in Ysleta and its neighboring pueblos illustrates how contemporary paseño culture influenced and changed Tigua society by this time.

The average size of the family was five, and there is no noticeable difference in the size of the Indian family and that of others. No doubt the two room adobe structure was the general pattern for all. Most heads of families were farm workers, with servants running second. Each settlement had a silversmith, an iron worker, several foremen, a hat maker, a shoemaker, several carpenters, and mule drivers. There was some poverty, as a number of names in each settlement were labeled as beggars, or as poor and needy.

Because the Tigua did not live in isolation from vecino society, they adopted some of its cultural traits and blended them with their own traditional subsistence patterns. This acculturation occurred to various degrees and involved changes in clothing, tools, and food, as well as livestock ranching. In this context, Tigua acculturation is better described as a process of biculturalism in which they retained many of their traditional cultural traits and adopted others in order to better
negotiate their changing social environment. Over time, as new cultural traits became part of their everyday norm, the Tigua likely viewed themselves as Indians who lived in a larger paseño or vecino society. Thus, as the world around them changed, it incrementally altered their culture as well as their social environment.

Agriculture still served as the main activity in Ysleta. During this period, most Tiguas and vecinos in Ysleta worked as field laborers. During the 1820s, local merchants increasingly exported raisins, wine, and onions to Chihuahua, and corn, beans, and wheat increasingly replaced grapes as the area’s primary cash crops. After 1829, intense flooding of the river created a new channel just south of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario, placing these communities on an island between the river’s old channel and new channel. As such, they possessed the most fertile land in the region. Here herdsmen tended mostly goats and some cattle alongside vineyards and fields of wheat and corn. Acequias also supplied fruit orchards that produced peaches, pears, plums, and apricots. In the mid-1800s, one observer described the island’s inhabitants as “Mexicans with high sombreros, wide-flowing drawers, and leather breeches.” Accounts such as these illuminate how vecino society and influence increased on “La Isla” after Mexican independence. For the Tiguas, this increase held numerous implications.

**Mexican Period Land Encroachments**

Although Mexico recognized Tigua land rights in the Ysleta grant, encroachments on Tigua land and sovereignty increased during the Mexican period. In 1825, Chihuahua’s Colonization Law declared all *terrenos baldios* (open land) in the frontier zone eligible for public auction. Yet it exempted all federally owned land, privately owned land, and land that belonged to “ancient communities” from this policy. This policy protected the Ysleta grant because Chihuahua
considered it an “ancient community.” In compliance with this law, an 1825 survey defined and confirmed the boundaries of the Ysleta grant. One clause in the law protected ejidos in the Ysleta grant. Another clause opened up the door to privatization by converting unoccupied land and land legally owned by Indians into private property and returning that land to the same Indians, who now could sell it as excess land and give the profits to the community. Ambiguities in the law over Indian land led to various interpretations, and by 1835, El Paso’s jefe político, Julian Bernal, determined that Indians could not sell land to non-Indians in an effort to protect Tigua land in Ysleta.

By the mid-1830s, vecino encroachments had increased in Ysleta, and the Tiguas had sold various plots of land from the grant to non-Indian vecinos. Houser points out that during the Mexican period, twenty-six land conveyances occurred in Ysleta. Although ten of these involved unspecified transactions between Tiguas and vecinos, sixteen are recorded transaction in which Tiguas and vecinos granted land to other vecinos. In 1835, Bernal and the governor of Chihuahua reacted to this by declaring all previous land transactions from “natives” to non-Indians null and void, reaffirming their rights to transfer land to Indians only. Yet vecinos had established themselves as residents on Tigua land well beforehand, and had begun to sell untitled land to other vecinos. In 1825, when El Paso’s Alcalde, Felix Pasos surveyed the Ysleta grant, he counted fifty-five Indian and seventy-two vecino families in Ysleta, noting 226 individual Indians. Due to the sporadic nature of the river by the 1830s, once flooded lands became open, and vecino squatters sold this newly available land to other vecinos in an attempt to establish a title chain to the land. In response, Tiguas petitioned the government for relief because they used this newly irrigated land to grow crops as other land became either depleted or flooded. These grievances reflect the
Tigua’s desire to retain their sovereignty and traditional subsistence cycles as vecino encroachments increased during the Mexican period.

In addition to altering Tigua agricultural patterns, vecino settlement in Ysleta also affected Tigua livestock raising. In an 1835 letter to the governor, Bernal illustrated Tigua anger and demanded the criminal prosecution of vecinos who had branded and stole Indian livestock that had been left to graze in open *ejido* land. Bernal’s petition reflects the clash between Tigua notions of communal land and vecino ideas of private property, as the latter increasingly impinged upon their traditional landscape and subsistence economy. As Tiguas defended their land rights within Ysleta, they also asserted their territorial sovereignty in relation to neighboring pueblos.

Boundary disputes between Ysleta and the neighboring pueblos of Socorro and Senecú reaffirmed Tigua sovereignty during the Mexican period. In 1825, a boundary dispute between Ysleta and Socorro resulted in the land survey that reaffirmed the parameters of the 1751 Ysleta grant. These disputes usually stemmed from the destruction of boundary markers caused by shifts in the river and intense flooding. In 1829, some Ysleta residents laid claim to *ejido* land in Senecú. El Paso’s Alcalde approved these claims and government officials redrew the boundaries between Ysleta and Senecú 300 varas south of Loma Tigua. However, Bernal and other local officials reapproved this agreement in 1841 because they initially had not included the Tiguas and Piros in the 1825 and 1829 agreements. In this way, local Mexican officials recognized Tigua land rights and validated their sovereign status by doing so. During the Mexican period, Tigua connections to the land in Ysleta reaffirmed their identity in relation to place. Another factor that strengthened Tigua self-awareness as members of the larger vecino community involved a resurgence in the ongoing conflict with the region’s Apaches and Comanches.
Tigua Military Activities during the Mexican Period

Between the 1790s and 1810s, colonial Spain had appeased Apaches and Comanches along its northern frontier by supplying them with food and gifts and resettling some of them in *establecimientos de paz*, or peace establishments. Although some raids sporadically continued in west Texas, this policy ended large scale raiding in Chihuahua, New Mexico, and Sonora, opening up niches for trade and increased colonial settler expansion.\(^{37}\) Mexican independence consequently disrupted this fragile relationship and ushered in a new era of instability. By the 1830s, Mexico stopped giving food and gifts to Apaches in peace settlements, and Apache and Comanche raids increased into Chihuahua and other parts of Mexico.\(^{38}\) Apaches abandoned the peace establishment at San Elizario and dispersed into New Mexico and the surrounding countryside. El Paso soon found itself on the front line of defense against bands of Apache and Comanche raiders.\(^{39}\)

The violence along Mexico’s northern frontier during the 1830s and 1840s dramatically impacted Ysleta’s Tigua, as well as many other communities in the region’s shifting borderlands. During this period, Apaches, Comanches, Kiowas, and Navajos intensified raids in northern Mexico and caused a great amount of socio-economic instability and depopulation. In response, many rural vecinos fled to larger settlements, such as those in El Paso, or further south into Mexico.\(^{40}\) Yet unlike the eighteenth-century, these raids evolved into full blown warfare as these Indians sought revenge and reciprocity for those killed and taken captive by Mexicans.\(^{41}\) José Velasco Avila argued that Texas won its independence in 1836 because Mexico had been engaged in three conflicts during this period: one with Anglo-Texans, another between Federalists and Centralists, and a third with Comanches, Apaches, and other groups in its northern borderlands.\(^{42}\)

In response to increased Apache and Comanche hostilities, Tigua warriors joined ranks with the area’s Piros and vecinos as scouts and militia in order help defend the pueblos. In 1834,
a military census of Ysleta listed 57 Tiguas as eligible for military service. Similarly, it listed 89 Indians from Senecú. According to Houser, Tiguas and Piros scouted along the river as well as the surrounding desert for signs of Comanches and Apaches. In 1835, Bernal warned El Paso’s pueblos of to be vigilant of Apache raiders and ordered both Ysleta and Socorro to send fifteen men to San Elizario for military service. Later that year, he ordered twenty men from Ysleta to join a contingency in pursuit of a band of unidentified “enemy” cattle thieves. Like Spain, Mexico ordered Tigua scouts and other local militia to avoid engagements with larger Comanche raiding parties. This policy protected scouts and militia and also protected innocent people on the frontier from the violent repercussions that such encounters always instigated.

Increased Apache and Comanche hostilities in Chihuahua influenced relations between the Tigua and El Paso’s local government. In 1835, Bernal fearfully ordered scouts in Ysleta and San Lorenzo to observe both sides of the river for threats, or pay fifty-pesos or spend three months in prison. On the other hand, he made concessions to the Tigua in consideration of their military service. For example, after Bernal ordered that all illegal tobacco fields in Ysleta be burned, Tigua Cacique Ygnacio Duran objected that the people only grew it for personal use, such as smoking while out on scouting missions. In response, Bernal exempted the Tigua from the order, writing that they sacrificed greatly for the security of the community. Tigua service in the militia also inspired Bernal to protect Tigua land from vecinos. In this way, Apaches and Comanches indirectly influenced Tigua relations with Mexico’s civil authorities by creating a pattern of interdependency between them.

The most famous Tigua battle of the Mexican period occurred at Hueco Tanks with the Kiowa. In 1837, a group of Kiowa stole a goat from Ysleta. Some Tiguas chased them and killed some of them at the sand hills, near Hueco Tanks. The other Kiowa fled to a cave at Hueco
Tanks. The Tigua waited outside the cave for about ten days, throwing rattlesnakes and shooting into the cave. Then they set two large sacks of red chile on fire and threw them into the cave.\textsuperscript{49} That night, the Tiguas shot two Kiowas and captured a third as the others escaped.\textsuperscript{50} According to oral traditions, the Kiowas believed that they had been fighting with Mexicans, and the Tigua thought that they had been chasing Apaches or Comanches. When the two groups visited Hueco Tanks during the 1970s, they compared their accounts and realized what had really happened.\textsuperscript{51}

Raiding and warfare between nomadic Indians, Hispanic settlers, vecinos, and mission-Indians along Mexico’s northern frontier not only reshaped Tigua history, it reshaped North American history. This is because Apaches, Comanches, and other nomadic groups had already paved the way for U.S. victory during the U.S.-Mexico War (1846-1848) by weakening Mexico’s military resources and overextending them over a vast amount of territory in the region along the present day border.\textsuperscript{52} The immensity of this Indigenous agency is exemplified in Article 11 of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, in which the United States agreed to stop Indian raids into Mexico and rescue Mexican captives held by Indians in U.S. territory.\textsuperscript{53} In this way, Indian raiding and warfare caused Mexico to relinquish its whole northwestern territory to the United States. While these geo-political conflicts altered the borderlands, environmental changes on the ground implicated the Tigua as new political boundaries became intertwined with ecological changes in the landscape.

**The River Shift and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo**

Between 1829 and 1849, a series of floods caused the Rio Grande River to change course and altered the trajectory of history for the Tigua. Originally, El Paso’s pueblos all resided southwest of the river (in present day Mexico), and flooding usually occurred annually between
May and July. These floods always posed a threat to the pueblos, yet they also played an essential role in the region’s agricultural economy. In 1770, they destroyed the missions of Ysleta and Socorro. Yet in 1829, another more intense flood destroyed the missions at Senecú, Ysleta, and Socorro, as well as the San Elizario presidio. Between 1844 and 1852, various Tiguas and vecinos rebuilt the Ysleta mission on higher ground. These floods also created a new channel in the river that placed Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario on an island between the old and new river channels. This not only placed the Tigua between two rivers, it placed them between two countries.

After the U.S.–Mexico War, the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo declared the Rio Grande as the political border separating the United States from Mexico. The treaty stipulated the deepest channel of the river as the border. Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario resided on “La Isla,” an island between two channels of the river that rested to the north and east of the deepest channel, placing it in United States territory. In 1848, United States soldiers occupied and took possession of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario. The state of Chihuahua protested La Isla’s designation as U.S. territory because it deprived the Tigua access to their ejido land in Mexico. After the treaty, most Tiguas remained in Ysleta, which became part of the state of Texas in 1850. Thus, the new political border and Texas jurisdiction held significant implications for the Tigua.

In order to validate its claim to “La Isla,” the United States sent Boundary Commissioner John Russell Bartlett to survey the area and establish that the deepest channel of the two river channels existed west (southwest) of the island, placing it in U.S. territory. Bartlett urgently noted that because of fluctuations in the river “the survey of the Rio Grande should be commenced at once.” For Bartlett, the permanent U.S. acquisition of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario depended upon immediate action because the Rio Grande’s main channel, which had been previously located
east of the island had moved west of it. “But with the constant changes of this river at its annual overflows, it may abandon its present and resume its former channel, thereby transferring this valuable island and its population to Mexico. In this way, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo placed Ysleta in an ambiguous position between Mexico and the United States. It also shows how changes in the river itself determined the historical trajectory of Ysleta’s Tigua community. As such, the United States used the River and the Treaty in order to acquire La Isla.

Thus, the Treaty redefined the border and enveloped everything and everyone north of the Rio Grande River into United States territory. It divided Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario from the rest of El Paso Del Norte’s Mexican pueblos and politically set the stage for the dispossession of Tigua land and the alteration of numerous longstanding socio-economic subsistence patterns and kinship networks. Acknowledging the land rights of Ysleta’s Mexican inhabitants, Article VIII of the Treaty declared that “[i]n the said territories, property of every kind, now belonging to Mexicans, not established there, shall be inviolably respected. The present owners, the heirs of these, and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said property by contract, shall enjoy with respect to it guarantees equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United States.”

In theory, the treaty should have recognized Tigua land rights in Ysleta because Mexico’s 1821 “Plan de Iguala” gave Indians citizenship status, and Article IX granted all Mexican citizens in the ceded territories the same rights as U.S. citizens under the Constitution, protecting their rights to “the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and…the free exercise of their religion without restriction.” Yet subsequent events marginalized the people and set the stage for even more incursions on their land than they had experienced during the Mexican period.

Addressing Indians in the new territory, the treaty created a false distinction between Mexicans and Indians that reflected contemporary notions of race and marginalized Tigua
indigeneity. The mesticized nature of Mexico’s vecino community baffled many Americans, who viewed race and identity in dichotomized terms of black and white. This viewpoint led to the vilification of Indians as savages, as described in Article XI of the treaty. It also led to the de-Indianization of mission-Indian communities like Ysleta as Anglos viewed Indigenous peoples as mixed blooded Mexicans, and thus potentially white in a strict legal sense. For example, in 1851, U.S. Boundary Commissioner John Russell Bartlett described the people of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario as primarily Mexican. Illuminating how contemporary Euro-Americans racially perceived El Paso’s Mexican vecinos, Bartlett wrote that

> the Paseños were a most primitive people…a mixed breed, possessing none of the virtues of their European ancestors, but all of the vices with those of the aborigines superadded. The Indian physiognomy is indelibly stamped upon them; and it requires little sagacity to discriminate between the pure and the mixed race. The latter are generally very dark, though some are of the fairer complexion.

Although Bartlett negatively depicted Indians as vice ridden peoples without virtue, his statement validated the indigeneity of the region’s population and shows how generations of Spanish colonization influenced the ethnogenesis of most of the area’s people. Viewpoints such as Bartlett’s proved problematic for Ysleta’s Tigua because they myopically disregarded their cultural identity as Indians and racially recategorized them as mixed blooded Mexicans. In this way, Anglo views on race abstractly threatened the community’s cultural sovereignty and served as a precursor to the physical dispossession of its land and resources.

While many Anglos myopically viewed Tiguas as Mexicans, others realized the difference between Pueblo Indians who lived in mission pueblos and other Native American groups who had remained on the periphery of Spanish colonization. The closing paragraph of Article XI of the treaty implied that the United States did not seek to remove Indians from their homelands. In accordance with this clause, the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs sent Indian Agent James S. Calhoun
to New Mexico in order to record the territorial, demographical, and societal information of the region’s Indians. Unlike many Anglos, Calhoun recognized the distinctions between the region’s mission Indians and nomadic Indians. In 1849, he recommended that the United States send an Indian agent to every Indian pueblo in New Mexico. He included Ysleta del Sur and Socorro in his recommendations and noted that 600 Indians lived in these pueblos. Although Calhoun sought to place Ysleta and Socorro under the protection of Federal wardship, Texas jurisdiction in 1850 thwarted this plan.

Ysleta’s incorporation into the state of Texas placed the Tigua in a political quandary in which neither the federal nor state governments recognized them as an Indian community. Originally, the Texas Republic recognized all land titles and surveys made before November 13, 1835. This included the land in the Ysleta grant because the Republic recognized the land in the Spanish grants that had been legally recognized by Mexico, such as the land in the Chihuahua Colonization Law. After 1845, however, the state of Texas claimed complete sovereignty over all of its public lands and considered most of the land in west Texas as open and unclaimed land. This sense of entitlement to open and unclaimed dominions by the state of Texas caused the dislocation of numerous Indigenous groups, such as the Tonkawas, Karankawas, Apaches, and Comanches, as well as the very large scale dispossession of their land. Gary C. Anderson describes Texas’ violent Indian policy as “a policy of ethnic cleansing that had as its intention the forced removal of certain culturally identified groups from their lands.” In this context of state expansion, Texas dispossessed both Indians and Mexican Americans of their lands.

Yet because the Tigua seemingly fell somewhere in between these two ethnic categories, their status in Texas became blurred by discrepancies between state and federal Indian policies. Although the federal government managed Indian relations in Texas, the state claimed exclusive
jurisdiction over its public land and controlled negotiations over any agreements that gave the federal government jurisdiction over Indian affairs. This policy undermined the ability of federal Indian agents in Texas by 1850 because state law superseded federal Indian policies, and any federal actions needed to be approved by the state. As such, federal Indian agents could not enforce the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in Texas and Calhoun’s idea to create a federal reservation in Ysleta fell on deaf ears. By 1852, Texas had adopted an Indian removal policy, and violence along its frontier with groups such as the Apache, Comanche, and Kiowa increased. In an attempt to reduce the violence, Texas allowed the federal government to establish two reservations in 1854 on 17,712 acres near Fort Belknap on the Brazos River: the Brazos River Reservation for Caddos and Wichitas, and the Clear Fork Reservation for some Comanche bands. Yet tensions between Anglos and Indians persisted, and the federal government closed these reservations in 1859. Also at that time, the state established a 1,280 reservation for the Alabama-Coushatta in East Texas. Although Texas jurisdiction denied the possibility of a federal reservation for the Tigua, their ambiguous status as Indians living amongst Mexicans seemingly sheltered them from the worst of Texas’ policies towards Native Americans. Texas jurisdiction also isolated the Tigua and made everyone in Ysleta, as well as Socorro and San Elizario, vulnerable to Anglo incursions because the federal government could not fully enforce the provisions in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo that sought to recognize and protect Indians and Mexicans.

**United States Settlement and Land Dispossession, 1850-1870**

After the U.S.-Mexico War, the State of Texas continued the Texas Republic’s claim to the land east of the Rio Grande River to the 103rd meridian. This claim included the eastern half
of New Mexico and extended as far north as Cheyenne, Wyoming. Texas gave up its claim to New Mexico in the Organic Act of 1850, which was part of the Compromise of 1850, in exchange for $10 million in debt relief. The Compromise admitted California as a free state, banned slave trading in Washington D.C., endorsed the Fugitive Slave Act, and applied popular sovereignty in U.S. territories. As part of the 1850 Compromise, the Organic Act of 1850 created the current Texas-New Mexico border at the 32\textsuperscript{nd} parallel.\textsuperscript{81} This isolated the Tigua by “jurisdictionally” dividing them from their northern Pueblo counterparts, who lived in the federal New Mexico territory and received protection under the 1834 Intercourse Act, which protected Indian land.\textsuperscript{82} This isolation enabled local and state officials to bureaucratically dispossess the Tigua of their land during the second half of the nineteenth-century. The dispossession of Tigua land in the Ysleta grant area involved a two stage process that began during the 1850s and finalized itself during the 1870s and 1880s.\textsuperscript{83} By the early twentieth-century, land speculators had privatized most of the land in west Texas that the Tigua had collectively used for their subsistence economy. Thus, between 1858 and 1915, land speculators and local officials had manipulated the bureaucratic mechanisms of the state of Texas and dispossessed the Tigua of most of their land.

After Texas claimed political sovereignty over Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario, Anglo-Americans increasingly moved into the area. Between 1850 and 1854 these settlers sought to connect the region with an emerging US political economy and implement local government under the state bureaucracy. Houser points out that as politicians, civil officials, merchants, and farmers, these new arrivals benefitted greatly from an emerging social structure that privileged Anglo Americans and private property.\textsuperscript{84} While lawyers and politicians easily claimed title to already privatized land, they faced a dilemma in establishing a title chain to Ysleta because of its communal status as an Indian pueblo within a Spanish land grant. Thus, early Anglo bureaucrats
erased Indigenous identity and sovereignty in all documentation relating to land claims in order to create perfect title and establish a title chain to land in Ysleta.\textsuperscript{85}

After 1850, Texas implicitly and indirectly recognized Tigua land rights but did not directly state that the land in Ysleta actually belonged to the Tiguas. Texas land policy obscured Tigua land rights by defining the people in Ysleta as “inhabitants” instead of Indians.\textsuperscript{86} This use of terminology to dilute Tigua land rights is evidenced in the 1854 “Act to relinquish to the inhabitants of Ysleta, in El Paso county, a certain tract of land adjoining the town tract now held and owned by said inhabitants.” Although the 1854 relinquishment act obscured Indian land rights in Ysleta, it did recognize the 1751 Ysleta grant as well as its boundaries.\textsuperscript{87} This act stemmed from land disputes between Senecú and Ysleta over land that had previously been placed on the north side of the river during the floods and river shift of the 1830s and possessed by the United States per the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.\textsuperscript{88} Because of the sporadic nature of this river shift, some of the original land from Ysleta ended up on the Mexican side of the river in Senecú, and some of the land from Senecú ended up in Ysleta. Thus, in 1854 Texas granted the “inhabitants” of Ysleta the land from Senecú that had moved north of the river during the same river shift in order to compensate them for the lost land.\textsuperscript{89}

Speculative ambitions to establish a railroad also diminished Tigua sovereignty over the land during this period. Between 1850 and 1858, Texas ambivalently attempted to recognize Spanish and Mexican land titles per stipulations in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. While some state lawmakers adhered to the logic of Manifest Destiny and Anglo expansion, others honestly sought to protect the property rights of Mexicans who lived in the region before 1848. As such, Texas sent two commissions to record land claims along the Rio Grande: the Bourland Miller Commission in 1850 and the Rio Grande Commission in 1854. However, the former totally
overlooked El Paso county, while the latter totally overlooked the Ysleta Grant. The Bourland and Miller Commission rejected seventy eight land claims, fifty-one of which were from ejido, or common land holdings in Matamoros. In this way, both commissions denied ejido land claims in favor of private holdings. The Rio Grande Commission attempted to have various El Paso county titles recognized by the State, but Governor E.M. Pease vetoed the bill on August 23, 1856, because it contained too many land claims. Interestingly, the veto occurred two days before the Texas legislature’s incorporation of the Memphis, El Paso and Pacific Railroad Company. Moreover, documentation of the Rio Grande Commission’s recommendations subsequently vanished just before the approval of “An Act to provide for the Incorporation of Towns and Cities” (1858), which allowed for the first Ysleta incorporation in 1859. Also interesting is the approval of a reduced version of the Rio Grande Commission’s land title recommendations for El Paso county, which still excluded Ysleta, being passed right after the loss of the Commission’s initial findings. In this context, state collusion with railroad interests led to the denial of any Tigua land claims, which surely would have blocked the railroad.

In 1859, local officials worked in connection with the state and implemented the first incorporation of Ysleta as a town. This incorporation stemmed from a generic state policy that enabled the broad incorporation of various towns and cities as the state established dominion to its vastly unclaimed landscape. Although local officials sought to legitimize access to Tigua land, one provision prohibited them from doing so by protecting already established communal lands. This provision stated that “the act of incorporation under the provisions of this act, shall not be so construed as in any manner to affect the titles to land heretofore granted by the Government to the inhabitants of any said town, but the lands so granted shall continue to be held and disposed of by
the corporate authorities so created, for the use and benefit of the inhabitants of the said town, for the purposes for which they were originally granted.”

Although the above clause protected Tigua land in theory, some non-Indian settlers still acquired Indian land in Ysleta. Houser presents that one-hundred and twenty-five conveyances to non-Indians occurred from 1859 to 1870 and describes this period as one in which non-Indian settlers either encroached on unused tribal land, or received individual tracts of land from individual Indians. Yet the 1859 incorporation did not lead to the mass privatization of Tigua land because the uncertainty of the railroad’s arrival caused low demand which kept speculators temporarily at bay.

After the Civil War, the federal government recognized the Tigua as a group of Pueblo Indians but did not establish a reservation for them in Ysleta del Sur. At this time, Texas held complete sovereignty over its public lands and denied numerous Indian land claims. Texas sovereignty isolated the Tigua and excluded them from the benefits of federal assistance that the Pueblos of New Mexico enjoyed. In 1864, President Lincoln gave canes (“Lincoln Canes”) and land patents to all northern Pueblo tribal governors. These land patents gave New Mexico’s Pueblos their own sovereign land titles. Residence in Texas excluded the Tiguas from federal protection, due in large part to the Civil War and Texas’ status in the Confederacy, and set the stage for increased land dispossession after the Civil War.

**Tigua Land Dispossession in Ysleta, 1870-1889**

The next phase of the land dispossession process primarily occurred between 1870 and 1874, when surveyors, speculators, and local officials privatized and sold practically all of the land within the boundaries of the Ysleta grant. By 1870, many northern Anglos with capitalist ambitions
had moved to El Paso and assumed political control in the wake of the Civil War. Of these, William Wallace Mills, Andrew Jennings Fountain, Ward B. Blanchard, Joseph W. Tays, and J.P. Hague played a major role in the Tigua Indian land dispossession. In collusion with Ysleta’s mayors, José María Gonzáles and Baptiste Mariani, these politicians and bureaucrats possessed and transferred most of the land in Ysleta from Indians to non-Indians.

Albert Jennings Fountain served as one of the primary individuals in this phase of the dispossession process at both the local and the state levels. After fighting Indians as a soldier in the U.S. army, Fountain arrived to El Paso in 1865, where he befriended local elites, such as Luis Cardis and W.W. Mills at Ben Dowell’s saloon. During Texas’s post-Civil War reconstruction movement, Fountain’s political ties at Dowell’s enabled him to practice law and investigate old Confederate land titles, so they could be perfected and auctioned off. His relationship with Mills flourished, and he soon wielded local power as county surveyor and federal customs inspector. However, Fountain and Mills split on the issue of the Guadalupe salt beds, and in 1869 Fountain defeated Mills in a race for the Texas Senate. As a Senator, Fountain served on the Public Lands Committee, which was responsible for railroad “subsidies,” as well as the chair for the Indian Affairs and Frontier Protection Committee. He also served on the board of directors for two railroad companies, likely the Galveston Harrisburg and San Antonio Railroad Company.

These activities gave Fountain insider information about the Texas and Pacific Railroad’s arrival to El Paso. Chartered and given lands by President Grant on March 3, 1871, the railroad had been routed through El Paso because of the town’s geographical location on the 32\textsuperscript{nd} parallel. Fountain played a significant role in the railroad’s arrival as President of the Texas Senate because the Federal government did not have access to Texas lands. Given Fountain’s political ties at the
state and local level, as well as his connection to the railroad, it is crucial to investigate his role in the second incorporation of Ysleta.\textsuperscript{100}

In 1871, Fountain initiated the large scale privatization of El Paso’s lower valley during his tenure as a state Senator. Between April and May, he incorporated San Elizario, Socorro, and Ysleta as towns in El Paso County.\textsuperscript{101} Yet Fountain himself became politically and economically excluded at the state and local levels because of his support for Radical Reconstruction, and his political feuds with Mills over the privatization of the Guadalupe Salt Flats.\textsuperscript{102} In the end, local Mexican and Anglo leaders benefitted the most from Fountain’s incorporation of Ysleta at the state level.\textsuperscript{103} An \textit{El Paso Herald} article reveals some of these participants at the local level after the 1871 Ysleta incorporation:

On September 26, 1871, the town assumed to act under its new charter with the following officers: Benito Gonzales, mayor; Jose Gonzales, Juan Garcia, Nicolas Padilla, Pablo Romero, Martin Alderette, Francisco Mayor, Jose Apodoca, Pedro Candelario, Narciso Loya, as regidores or alderman; Edward Elias, as secretario; Francisco Garcia, as tesorero; Matin Pais, as mariscal. In June 1873, Jose Maria Gonzales became Corregidor and in August, Baptiste Mariany was seated as mayor and held office until July 1, 1874, about which time the special charter was revoked by the legislature.\textsuperscript{104}

This article reveals the main local vecino or Mexican-American leaders in the dispossession process, such as Jose Maria Gonzales. It also illustrates the time frame in which they privatized most of the land in Ysleta. Anglos such as Ward B. Blanchard and J.P. Hague also participated in this process. Blanchard already owned railroad land in present day El Paso across the river from Juarez, and Hague had a law firm that represented both the Town of Ysleta and the railroad.\textsuperscript{105} Together, these local Mexicans and Anglo bureaucrats greatly profited from the transfer of land in Ysleta to non-Indians.

The Tigua also participated in this process by initially selling their land. Influenced by the economic coercion of wealthier Anglos and vecinos to sell their land during a period of poverty
and famine, the Tigua fell into the land scheme through economic needs and circumstances beyond their control. Houser presents that by 1870, the Tigua had been “transformed from independent farmers to a poor and vulnerable minority dominated by politically affluent Anglos and Hispanics who attempted to divest the Indians of grant lands.” Reliant on agricultural production for survival, environmental factors such as drought hurt the Tigua economy and pressured them to sell their land to non-Indians. Helen Orndorff explains that

Agriculture in the El Paso Valley remained wholly dependent upon the Río Grande for its water supply. Beginning in the early 1870’s however, agriculture suffered greatly from a drought and its intensity was increased by a large influx of settlers who also demanded water from the river. The water shortage was of sufficient duration to mark the beginning of a long period of strife over equitable distribution of the waters of the Río Grande.

Considering poverty and drought as the main reasons for Tigua land sales to non-Indians illustrates how Anglo and vecino elites took advantage of the people’s vulnerabilities and coerced them to sell their land in pursuance of their own economic interests. In this way, these conditions enabled local elites to bureaucratically and economically dispossess the Tiguas of their lands and socio-economic lifeways.

The 1871 Ysleta incorporation served as the main bureaucratic instrument in the transfer of land to non-Indians. It differed from the 1859 incorporation in that it did not protect communal land ownership. The “Act to incorporate the town of Ysleta” declared

That the citizens of the town of Ysleta, in the county of El Paso, be and are hereby declared a body corporate by the name and style of “The Town of Ysleta,” and by that name may sue and be sued, may have and use a corporate seal, may hold real and personal estate, and may dispose of real estate in the manner herein-after provided, and in no other manner.

Undermining any notion of communal land, the 1871 Ysleta incorporation gave the Town of Ysleta the power to subdivide land, issue land titles, and delegate property ownership under the criterion of citizenship. Sections 15 and 16 of the 1871 incorporation gave the “town council” total
economic control over Ysleta. In this way, the Ysleta incorporation enabled the land dispossession process.

The actual transfer of land to non-Indians involved a two-step process in which the incorporated town council and the mayor issued land deeds in response to petitions for land. First, the town council voted to approve or deny land petitions as well as set land prices. Then, they forwarded the petitions to the mayor for approval, and if approved, the mayor would issue a legal land deed. Individuals who already inhabited previously titled land received deeds after they transferred their old titles into the incorporated town. As one of the first petitioners in this process, Ward B. Blanchard received over two-hundred acres of land and benefitted most from the 1871 incorporation. Yet most of the unoccupied communal land held by the Tigua did not fit the category of previously titled land, and speculators and local elites needed the land in Ysleta ready to sell to the arriving railroad. Thus, Joseph W. Tays surveyed and partitioned this land into sixteen and seventeen acre tracts for distribution to private owners. By 1873, local elites such as Jose Maria Gonzales and members of the Ysleta town council had become so desperate to privatize this communal land that they had residents draw tickets from a hat in order to receive “free land.”

Many Tiguas lost their own land as well as their social status through participation in the petition process. Practically all of the Tiguas from the “old pueblo” next to the mission petitioned the Ysleta town council for land, received deeds, and sold the land for cash. In addition, town meetings to petition land often occurred on the June 13 tribal holiday, Saint Anthony’s Day. On one occasion, the Catholic Church received eight and a half acres of land for the benefit of its congregation. In August 1873, Tiguas received forty-three of 259 approved land deeds, and most had sold this land to non-Indians within a three year period. By 1874, the Tigua had been dispossessed of the land grant, the mission church, and had lost most of the land in the pueblo.
They had also been dispossessed of any political power that they had held during the Spanish and Mexican periods. Houser explains that this phase of the dispossession process disrupted their traditional subsistence patterns and changed them “from self-sufficient farmers to landless day laborers,” who “were dependent on a cash economy and often were in debt.”

However, because much of the open land in Ysleta had not been occupied, the legitimacy of the Ysleta incorporation became an issue due to its violation of the Homestead provisions in the Texas Constitution of 1869, which “prohibited grants of over 160 acres without actual settlement or residence.” On May 2, 1874, the Texas Senate repealed the 1871 Ysleta incorporation. Yet this legislation contained a sixty day grace period before it took effect. For the Tigua, the sixty day grace period proved disastrous because it allowed the mayor enough time to approve a last minute rush of land petitions. Thus, the Mayor issued several hundred new deeds, 254 in May alone. In total, the 1871 Ysleta incorporation had dispossessed the Tigua of over 23,000 acres of their land from the Ysleta grant, leaving them three acres.

Although the state of Texas repealed the 1871 Ysleta incorporation in 1874, the land privatization process had gained traction and the Tigua had lost most of their land. Yet the process of creating perfect land titles in Ysleta had been flawed because local elites knew that the land belonged to the Tigua. Their legal right to the land had been reaffirmed by the state of Texas in 1873, when Edmund J. Davis issued a patent “grant to the inhabitants of Ysleta” based on the 1854 Relinquishment Act, which implicitly recognized the Tigua as the legal inhabitants of the original Ysleta grant. In order to whitewash the titles that had already been created and further establish perfect title to land in Ysleta, local El Paso officials held a vote in Ysleta to reincorporate. The vote passed, and in 1880 Ysleta incorporated for the third time. During this incorporation, which ended in 1895, the town conveyed 277 tracts of land: 257 of these went to non-Indians.
By 1880, land speculators had immersed themselves in Ysleta’s socio-economic landscape and furthered the divide between the Tigua and their land. Much of this activity occurred because of the pending arrival of the railroad. Yet even advertisements by land companies could not ignore the Tigua’s presence in the community. In 1881, the El Paso Herald announced that “Ysleta invites the immigrant to buy cheap lots and homes.—It may surprise your readers that we have a full blood Indian tribe in Ysleta. They dance the war dance and sing aboriginal songs once a week. However, they are counted among our citizens, being fully civilized.” As if using evidence to cover up the scene of a crime, this announcement validated the presence of the Tigua community in Ysleta as it contributed to the disintegration of its spatial sovereignty. By 1883, the speculative boom had increased in full force after the railroad’s arrival to El Paso. At this time, an advertisement by a land agent in Ysleta proclaimed “Great Bargains in Land at Ysleta, Texas,” announcing “60 acres of land all under cultivation 200 yards from the S.P.R.R. Dept.; and other lands ready for cultivation.” While many local Anglo and Mexican elites prospered from the railroad, its arrival in 1881 had further marginalized Ysleta’s Tigua and reduced them to poverty.

Local officials and landowners who had gained land titles in Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario during the 1871 incorporations had found themselves in a legal dilemma as to the validity of their land titles by the late 1880s. In particular, the relinquishment act of 1854 threatened land titles in Ysleta and brought into question the legal validity of all subsequent titles that had been issued during subsequent incorporations in 1859, 1871, and 1880. To avoid any complications and further establish perfect title to any land, the Texas Legislature approved an “Act to quiet land titles in the towns of Socorro, Ysleta, and San Elizario” in 1889. This policy bureaucratically sealed the land dispossession process in Ysleta as well as any other fraudulent deeds that had been
issued in Socorro and San Elizario by legally declaring “That all genuine deeds made by the town of Socorro, Ysleta, and San Elizario to lands lying within their respective corporate limits, whether the same be in form or attended with the formalities prescribed by the charters are hereby declared valid and operative as fully as if all the forms and formalities required had been complied with, saving the rights of third parties.”

In this way, the State of Texas facilitated the final touches of the Tigua land dispossession and cosigned the actions of local politicians, bureaucrats, and land speculators who sought to benefit from the arrival of the railroad and privatize the land in Ysleta. Overall, the bureaucratic mechanisms that dispossessed the Tigua of their land involved an administrative hodgepodge of overlapping policy that occurred between 1848 and 1889. This process not only impacted the Tigua landscape in the Ysleta grant area, it also dramatically altered their regional subsistence landscape that they had used for generations to maintain their community.

**The Salt War of 1877 and the Dispossession of Shared Subsistence Domains**

In addition to dispossessing the Tigua of their community land in Ysleta, land agents, speculators, and the state of Texas also disrupted their traditional subsistence patterns by claiming dominion over all of the land in West Texas. This included the Guadalupe Salt flats, Hueco Tanks, and most of the land that spanned from present day Brewster to El Paso Counties and bordered the Guadalupe, Delaware, and Davis Mountain ranges. Anthropologist Adolph Greenberg describes this territory as a “cross-utilization” zone in which Tiguas and Apaches competed for access to natural resources. This area extended well beyond Tigua territory, which included Hueco Tanks, and the land bordering the Rio Grande River into Presidio County. It also contained all of the land in the 1692 Hinojosa Grant. The Tigua inherited this land through intermarriage with Mansos
and Sumas, who passed their traditional subsistence patterns on to them through obligations of reciprocity and kinship. Yet the Tigua connection to the landscape involved more than just material and economic subsistence, it also contained a meta-physical aspect that rooted the gathering of resources within a spiritual context. While the Tigua utilized all of this land in their subsistence economy, the Guadalupe Salt Basin and Hueco Tanks played a fundamental role in Tigua identity, society and culture.\textsuperscript{131} Between 1877 and 1915, however, various land speculators and the state had disrupted tribal lifeways by privatizing these areas.

The Guadalupe Salt Basin had collectively served El Paso’s pueblos since the Spanish colonial period, and its privatization caused a considerable amount of violent resistance from the region’s ethnic-Mexican and Indian inhabitants, which culminated in the San Elizario Salt War of 1877. Initially, both Indians and Spaniards viewed the Salt Basin as a collective community resource. In 1656, New Mexico’s Governor, Tomas Vélez Cachupín, granted the region’s settlements communal rights to the Guadalupe salt beds, and this policy continued into the Mexican period.\textsuperscript{132} The Tigua had always used salt for food preservation, seasoning, and trading. During the colonial period, Ysleta contained a small salt bed, yet it likely had been exhausted by the 1870s. In 1849, William Henry Chase Whiting visited San Elizario and noted that several trails led to the Guadalupe salt ponds, which supplied much of the salt for Chihuahua.\textsuperscript{133}

During the post-Civil War era, more Anglos arrived to the region and political factionalism ensued. Conflict over the privatization of the Guadalupe salt beds caused much of this factionalism. This began in 1866 when A.J. Fountain surveyed the Guadalupe Salt Lakes for Samuel Maverick. Although Maverick privatized a portion of the Salt Flats, local ‘Paseños’ from San Elizario, Socorro, and Ysleta still had access to the salt because of a mistake in the survey. Then, William Wallace Mills sought to privatize the remainder of the Salt Flats, but local Paseños
objected. Motivated by political ambitions, Fountain sided with the area’s local ethnic Mexicans. This caused a rift between Fountain and Mills, and El Paso’s Anglos divided into two factions: the Salt Ring under Mills and the Anti-Salt Ring under Fountain.\textsuperscript{134}

This rift increased when Fountain defeated Mills in the 1869 election for State Senate by campaigning to protect the Salt Flats from privatization. Allied with Father Antonio Borajo and Luis Cardis, Fountain easily swept the election.\textsuperscript{135} Yet Borajo and Cardis split with Fountain after the election because he also refused to help them privatize the Salt Flats. When Fountain proposed a bill in the Texas legislature to make the land public property, it did not pass because Borajo and Cardis petitioned against it, telling the people of San Elizario that Fountain wanted to dispossess them of the salt. In reality, Fountain, Mills, and Borajo had all played against each other for possession of the Salt Flats, and Fountain’s self-interests became apparent in 1871, when he incorporated the town of Ysleta and dispossessed the Tigua of their land. Unwelcome in El Paso, Fountain moved to Mesilla, New Mexico after his term in office in 1874.\textsuperscript{136}

In 1872, ex-Confederate soldier, lawyer, and Texas Democrat Charles Henry Howard arrived in San Elizario and also developed ties with Luis Cardis and Father Antonio Borajo. With their help, he defeated J.P. Hague in a race for District Attorney and became District Judge in 1874. As they had with Fountain, Cardis and Borajo approached Howard with a scheme to privatize the Salt Flats. After Howard refused them and lost the subsequent election, he took interest in the Salt Flats at the behest of his father-in-law, George B. Zimpelman. Howard owed Zimpelman a lot of money, and, as payment, perfected title for him to the Salt Flats. Thus, Zimpelman became the legitimate owner of the Guadalupe Salt Flats. As part of the agreement, Howard was responsible for collecting extraction fees for salt from the region’s inhabitants.\textsuperscript{137}
Howard’s privatization of the Salt Flats created a backlash in which the residents of San Elizario, Socorro, and Ysleta, including the Tigua, rebelled during the Salt War of 1877. The foremost community members in opposition to the “Howard-Zimpelman title” were Leon Granillo, Sisto Salcido, and José Maria Juárez of San Elizario and Francisco “Chico” Barela of Ysleta.138 Allied with their ethnic-Mexican neighbors, Tiguas also resisted this privatization of one of their most valued shared resources. Many of the region’s people sought to increase their income by selling salt from the Flats because drought conditions during the summer of 1877 had disrupted agricultural production. When two people threatened to haul salt from the Flats without paying, Howard had them arrested. This put San Elizario and its proximate communities in an uproar.139 In October, 1877, as Howard was going to their trial in Fort Davis, Granillo and Barela captured him in Ysleta and brought him to San Elizario, where a large “mob” had gathered. Father Borajo had been transferred to Juárez, and the new priest, Pierre Bourgade, negotiated Howard’s release on the conditions that he drop the charges, relinquish his rights to the Salt Flats and leave El Paso County. Howard then fled to Mesilla, New Mexico, and stayed with Fountain. From Mesilla, he sent telegrams to the Governor of Texas for help.140

Howard subsequently returned to El Paso, found Luis Cardis, and killed him. He then returned to Fountain’s place in Mesilla and rallied with a group of newly arrived Texas Rangers. Against Fountain’s advice, Howard returned to San Elizario in December, 1877, with a ragtag outfit of Rangers under the assumption that he was going to regulate access to the salt. Within a week of his arrival, Howard was dead. Surely many Tigua’s sought to avenge Cardis’s murder because they likely viewed Cardis as trying to protect the salt beds from Anglo privatization. Earlier, Cardis and four Tiguas had gone to Austin and obtained papers validating their claim to the salt. During the revolt, about six hundred people journeyed to San Elizario from both Mexico
and the United States in order to resist Howard and the Rangers. In the aftermath of the uprising, the U.S. Army and the Texas Rangers entered San Elizario, Socorro, and Ysleta to restore order.141

Consequently, the Texas Rangers committed numerous murders, and isolated incidents of violence against ethnic Mexicans and Tiguas occurred after the revolt. For example, during late December, Texas Rangers arrested Crecencio Yrigoyen and a Tigua named Andres Colmenero for participating in Howard’s murder.142 In January 1878, U.S. Army Coronal Edward Hatch found one Tigua and one Mexican—likely Colmenero and Yrigoyen—lying dead on the road to Socorro. When Hatch questioned the local Sheriff, the Sheriff responded that these men had been shot by Texas Rangers while trying to escape. Yet Hatch viewed this as improbable because these men had left Ysleta tied in the back of a wagon and had been shot at point blank range in the face. This type of violence caused the U.S Government to re-establish Fort Bliss in El Paso as a permanent military base. In the end, Howard’s father in law, George B. Zimpelman, retained control of the Salt Flats, and much of its surrounding land.143

By this time, much of the Tigua cultural landscape in West Texas including Hueco Tanks had not been privatized. Yet, land agents and speculators soon set their sights on this land and began a new phase in the land dispossession process. Hueco Tanks in particular played a significant role in the Tigua cultural landscape and identity. Tiguas used Hueco Tanks as a hunting camp, a summer camp, and a sacred site for various spiritual ceremonies.144 Some Tiguas stayed there for months or perhaps years at a time as goat-herders and cheese makers, and women often accompanied men there on deer hunting expeditions, where they worked in the camp.145 By the late 1800s, however, Hueco Tanks had been privatized along with much of the land in West Texas.

The privatization of Hueco Tanks began when the state of Texas granted the Texas and Pacific Railroad and the public education and university system most of the land in West Texas.
However, railroads could not receive land patents until they had constructed their tracks and satisfied the terms of their contracts. On May 2, 1873, Texas entered into a contract with the Texas and Pacific Railroad Company. For every mile of track that the railroad built, the state would inspect it and then order the Texas Land Commission to issue 20 certificates of 640 acres each to the railroad. The railroad was to survey the land and submit the survey to the state. Texas would then grant the odd sections of the survey to the Railroad and the even to the State of Texas Permanent School Fund. By 1878, the Texas and Pacific possessed 2,600 certificates that would revert back to public domain in 1880 if not located, so they “hired Jacob Kuechler to survey the land between the Texas-New Mexico boundary and the Pecos and Rio Grande Rivers.” By 1879, Kuechler had located 2.3 million acres for the public school fund and the railroad. In 1888, the bankrupt Texas and Pacific gave its bondholders, Charles J. Canda, Simeon J. Drake, and William Strauss, 3,450,642.45 acres. Under the auspices of the Texas and Pacific Land Trust, these trustees from New York claimed most of the land in west Texas.

In response, the towns of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario hired land agent and attorney John P. Randolph to challenge the Texas and Pacific Land Trust, the State of Texas, and the Federal government in order to reclaim the ejido lands used by the people of these towns under the Spanish and Mexican land tenure systems. This land system had been severely disrupted by the 1871 incorporations of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario, and all that remained of it existed in the communal ejidos of west Texas. In 1887, Ysleta’s mayor gave Randolph power of attorney to recover the land situated in and around Hueco Tanks, known as “El Rancho de Ysleta.” Ysleta also authorized Randolph to litigate and “make such contracts, sales or compromises…as he may deem best and proper” in order to survey, petition and receive a land patent from the State of Texas.
In return, Randolph paid one dollar for rights to half of any land or monies awarded to Ysleta by the courts.  

Subsequently, in August of 1888, Randolph made an entry into an El Paso County Deed book entitled “Grant of Pasture Lands from the Republic of Mexico to the Inhabitants of the Pueblo of Ysleta.” It stated that on July 1828, Ysleta governor, Juan Jose Apodaca, petitioned the state of Chihuahua for land in the Sierra Alta, including Hueco Tanks and “Ojo de los Alamos,” which Ysleta’s inhabitants, 184 families, had used for years. It also stated that in August, 1828, Chihuahua’s governor had granted Ysleta one league of land for each head of family and ordered a survey of the grant. According to the entry, Mexican officials surveyed the land and gave possession to Ysleta in the “Rancho de Ysleta Grant.”

Both Hendricks and Houser argue that this entry is fraudulent and that Randolph manufactured the “Rancho de Ysleta Grant,” as part of a land scheme in which he worked in collusion with local officials in order to gain access to the land. According to Hendricks, Randolph and others mistakenly pre-dated the names of prominent Hispanic community leaders “by not going far enough back in time, resulting in an act of possession of a grant of land to a group of teenage (and younger boys) who were supposedly the leading citizens of Ysleta.” Hendricks also points out that in 1835, Ysleta’s alcalde only recognized the Ysleta grant of 1751 and did not mention the Rancho de Ysleta Grant. Houser presents both the Rancho de Ysleta Grant and the La Prieta Land Grant as fraudulent and notes that Randolph had entered into a “selfish alliance with the Tiguas,” in order to reify these fraudulent grants and acquire land for himself.

Similar to Ysleta, both San Elizario and Socorro gave Randolph power of attorney in 1889 so he could advocate for the legal recognition of the La Prieta Grant, which was allegedly granted to them by the Mexican state of Chihuahua in 1832. Basically, Randolph was to survey the land,
secure its patent in the State of Texas, and execute quit claim deeds in order to compromise with other claimants. To validate his contract, Randolph paid one dollar for rights to half of any money or goods acquired during any land negotiations and half of the land in the La Prieta grant.¹⁵⁶

Between 1889 and 1891, Randolph simultaneously used the legal system to try to gain recognition for these fictitious land grants and sold some of his portion of the land before completing his end of the contracts with Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario. In February, Randolph filed suit against the Texas Pacific Land Trust in the 34th Judicial Court in El Paso. In the *Town of Ysleta v. Canda*, the trustees from New York claimed that the state of Texas had granted the railroad 193 sections of patented land within the Rancho de Ysleta Grant. The *El Paso Times* reported that Ysleta sought to recover 500,000 acres of land under a grant from the Mexican government, issued in 1828.¹⁵⁷ Soon-after, Randolph gave H.R. Hillebrand a fourth of his Rancho land for $1000. In turn, Hillebrand gave this land to attorneys Nugent and Stanton as payment for their services in establishing a title chain. Then, Randolph leased five thousand acres of Rancho de Ysleta land, including water rights in Hueco Tanks, to P.J. Black. This had been some of the Tigua’s best land. Unfortunately for Randolph, his case stalled in the 34th District Court.¹⁵⁸

Despite the stalled court case, Randolph continued to sell tracts of land around Hueco Tanks in an effort to establish a title chain. In 1890, he negotiated a new contract with Hillebrand and gave him more land. Hillebrand, also a land agent, then gave San Francisco land attorney, Sylvester Rodemacher, five leagues of land for legal representation in the case.¹⁵⁹ Randolph then hired Ludwig Heldt to survey the land. For his services, Heldt received 3,413 acres and then sold 2000 of them.¹⁶⁰ A year later, Randolph filed another case before the Court of Private Land Claims (*City of Ysleta v. United States*), which backfired when the Texas Pacific Land Trust declared the
grant fraudulent because of a discrepancy in the copy. Randolph withdrew his claim to the Rancho de Ysleta Grant when the District Court dismissed the case in 1897.\textsuperscript{161}

In 1894, Ysleta entered into a similar contract with Ernest Dale Owen, a land speculator and attorney from Chicago. If Owen fulfilled the contract, Ysleta agreed to sell him their half of the grant for ten cents an acre. Owen attempted to use the pending case, \textit{City of Ysleta v. United States} and filed another suit against the Texas Pacific Land Trust in the 34\textsuperscript{th} Judicial District Court in El Paso (\textit{City of Ysleta v. Canda}). By late 1894, Owen had two cases open on behalf of Ysleta.\textsuperscript{162} Subsequently, the Court of Private Land Claims rejected Ysleta’s claim and dismissed the case, and the Texas District Court case was transferred to Federal court, where it was dismissed after Owen failed to appear.\textsuperscript{163}

The 1894 Court of Private Land Claims decision deeply affected both the Rancho de Ysleta and La Prieta Grants. In his response to Ysleta’s claims, U.S. Attorney Matt G, Reynolds denied that Chihuahua had issued a grant and refuted their authority to transfer land title to the pueblo. Reynolds also doubted that the Republic of Mexico, the State of Chihuahua, or any municipal or local sub-division had issued any copies of the grant. In fact, Reynolds alleged that Ysleta’s copy was “manufactured and anti-dated.”\textsuperscript{164} For Randolph, Owen, Hillebrand, and the other speculators involved, this decision held significant ramifications. It meant that in order to validate any grants in the courts, they needed more than just a copy of a grant in a deed book. However, this decision did not disrupt the title chain that had already established itself.\textsuperscript{165}

Similarly, Randolph privatized much of the land in West Texas in the area of the fictitious “La Prieta” land grant. In 1890, Randolph entered his contracts with San Elizario and Socorro to recover the La Prieta Land Grant into the El Paso County Deed Books. Soon-after, he entered a copy of the alleged La Prieta grant as well. This entry stated that in 1828, Mexico had granted 325
leagues of land to Socorro and San Elizario in 1828.\textsuperscript{166} Aside from this entry, there is no other evidence of the La Prieta grant. In the same way he had done with his portion of the land in the Rancho de Ysleta land scheme, Randolph gave local politicians and land speculators portions of his half of the La Prieta grant. For example, two months after he filed the grant into the deed books, Randolph sold 100,000 acres of land for one dollar to a group of various land speculators.\textsuperscript{167} This group initiated a series of land sales that undermined the Texas and Pacific’s grip upon the landscape and privatized the land that had once been collectively used by the Tigua and other Native Americans of the region.

Then in 1891, Randolph filed suit against the Texas and Pacific Land trustees in \textit{Towns of San Elizario and Socorro v. Canda}, in the United States Circuit Court for the Western District of Texas. Seeking $50,000 in damages, Randolph and his cohorts likely sought to cash out and share the profits. At best, they had a chance to take the land, which they hoped would be protected by the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.\textsuperscript{168} Randolph also sold much of his portion of the land to establish a deed chain. For example, he sold 15 leagues of land to H.R. Hillebrand for $9,963.\textsuperscript{169} Hillebrand then sold the same land to Charles L. Dignecoity of Bexar County for $10,500. As Randolph sold land to Hillebrand and other speculators, they in turn sold it to misinformed buyers, perpetuating a deed chain to land claimed by the State of Texas and the Texas and Pacific Land Trust.\textsuperscript{170} In this land scheme, two companies emerged and sold La Prieta land to distant buyers, the Empire Title Insurance Company and the Lone Star Abstract Company. Supporting their legal claim to the land, Judges Robert G. West and A.J. Evans of Austin and San Antonio, respectively, backed the companies by validating any title chain to the La Prieta Grant, inferring that the lack of state recognition was only a minor detail.\textsuperscript{171}
Considering Randolph’s contracts with Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario, the Tigua, who had always utilized Rancho de Ysleta and La Prieta land, became concerned with the rapid privatization of their once ejido landscape. In 1892, the Tigua gave power of attorney to Sostenos Gonzales, Crecencio Marquez, and Mariano Colmeneros for the recovery of their communal land. For the Tigua, the land in question had long been part of their subsistence economy, and they sought to stem the tide of its privatization. As Randolph sold more land to speculators, his case, *Towns of San Elizario and Socorro v. Canda*, fell apart because the court ruled that copies of an alleged grant in a county deed book proved insufficient and that original documents from Mexico were necessary to establish the validity of a grant. Thus, the court dismissed the case in 1894 after Randolph failed to appear. By then, Randolph had left and conveyed his interests to Herman R. Hillebrand for one dollar.

By mid-1907, deed chains to La Prieta land had ballooned significantly, and Socorro and San Elizario had hired W.H. Marsh of Tyler and John J. Selman of Dallas to recover the La Prieta Grant. For their services, they each received one fourth of the grant and would receive another fourth upon its recognition. In November, Selman sold his land and contract to Joseph D. Wiley of Dallas for $1000. Wiley then sold it to W.H. Yoakum, who in turn sold it to Charles T. Gregory for $460,000. Selman and Wiley had smartly unloaded their parts of the grant because El Paso County was already taking steps to “prevent the County Clerk from…recording certain alleged fraudulent deeds on the so called La Prieta Grant.”

Between 1909 and 1913 events spun out of control. Speculators had subdivided and sold numerous shares of La Prieta to various buyers, and the State knew they had a dilemma. The Texas Land Commissioner J.T. Robison and W.H. Marsh had searched diligently in Mexico for traces of the La Prieta grant and found nothing. The search had awakened them to the fact that there was
no Mexican grant. Subsequently, El Paso County stopped recording deeds in La Prieta. By 1913, several people had been indicted for land fraud, but the Texas governor did not pursue the rest of La Prieta’s landholders.\textsuperscript{176} Consequently, the State did not clear their title to its University and Public School lands because the governor had dismissed its suit against those who had purchased it. Instead of slowing the fraudulent deed chain, the governor’s decision to ignore the claimants had perpetuated it.\textsuperscript{177}

This placed the state of Texas in a dilemma in which the only solution involved legalizing all of the fraudulent land transactions. On June 3, 1915 the State of Texas validated all La Prieta land titles regardless of whether they had been made illegally or not.\textsuperscript{178} In this way, the fraudulent La Prieta title chain perpetuated itself and gained enough momentum to eventually force the State legislature to cave in to the pressure of land speculators, investors, lawyers, and settlers. Yet within this confusion, the Tigua had been dispossessed of much of their communal and cultural landscape.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The Tigua land dispossession involved a series of events that began after Mexican independence in 1821 as vecinos increasingly purchased and encroached upon their land. As they maintained their ethnic sovereignty, the Tiguas colluded with local militia and other Indians such as the Piro to defend against incursions by groups like the Apache and Kiowa. After the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Tiguas increasingly lost their land as Anglo Americans began migrating to the region. By 1915, the Tiguas had lost most of their land in the Ysleta Grant and all of the land surrounding it that had played an integral part in their social economy and identity. Despite contemporary nineteenth-century Anglo viewpoints that categorized Tiguas as Mexicans, these
Indigenous peoples persisted amongst Ysleta’s increasing Mexican and Euro-American population.

During the Mexican period, the Tiguas retained their ethnic sovereignty despite external pressures from vecino land encroachments and government objectives to incorporate Indians into Mexican society as citizens. This is because community based activities such as traditional religious ceremonies, agriculture and military service enabled community members to maintain bonds of social cohesion and kinship in familiar spaces, such as the Ysleta church and San Elizario presidio, which by this time had been symbolically established as significant identity markers within the Tigua historical memory. As Mexican-vecino society emerged around them, the Tiguas adopted various cultural traits, merged them into their pre-existing cultural lifeway and created various “bicultural innovations” that they articulated on their own terms from within their ethnic community.\textsuperscript{179}

During the Mexican period, government officials in Chihuahua and Paso del Norte protected Tigua land rights in Ysleta, often in response to pressure from the Tigua community. This is significant because in 1825 a boundary dispute between Ysleta and Senecú led to the land survey that reaffirmed the boundaries of the Ysleta Grant. As vecinos purchased Tigua land, these officials contested that only other Indians could buy land in Ysleta. By the 1840s, however, vecinos had encroached upon Tigua land beyond the local government’s ability to stop it, and more vecinos lived in Ysleta than Tiguas. Despite these encroachments, the Tiguas still retained their land.

By the mid-nineteenth-century, the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and a major shift in the Rio Grande significantly altered the Tigua historical trajectory by placing Ysleta into the United States. This placed the Tigua into a quandary because Texas sovereignty excluded them from the federal benefits that New Mexico’s Pueblos received. As many Anglos mistook Tiguas
for Mexicans, they fell into subaltern status as Indians in the public mindset. Not quite Indian according to common stereotypes, yet not Mexican either. Although this ambiguity may have protected the Tigua from the violence of Texas’ Indian policy, it did not protect them from land speculators who worked in collusion with the state and the railroad to dispossess them of their land.

Beginning in 1850, the Tigua lost of most of their land in the Ysleta Grant through a two stage process. First, the state of Texas overlooked all Mexican land claims in Ysleta that should have been validated by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and incorporated the town of Ysleta in 1859. Although some Anglos acquired land at this time, this did not lead to the mass privatization of Tigua land. Then in 1871, Texas incorporated Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario and local officials worked in collusion with state politicians, land speculators and the railroad to dispossess the Tigua of their land. During this second phase of the Tigua land dispossession, impoverished conditions and pressure by local officials and speculators caused many Tiguas to sell their land to non-Indians. By 1874, the Tiguas only retained about three acres of land in the Ysleta Grant. In the aftermath of the land dispossession, many Tiguas who had worked their own plots became agricultural wage laborers working in fields that they used to own.

Land speculators and the state also dispossessed the Tiguas of their shared subsistence domains that spanned from west Texas into New Mexico. Beginning with the Salt War of 1877 and ending in 1915, when the state validated numerous fraudulent land titles, the dissolution of this communal landscape severely disrupted Tigua cultural subsistence patterns. Thus, the Tiguas retained both ethnic and geographical sovereignty during the Mexican period. By the turn of the century, however, ethnic sovereignty remained, yet geographical sovereignty had significantly diminished. Somehow, despite losing ownership of most of their land, Tigua identity still persisted
in Ysleta because the people remained there, held together by bonds of kinship, culture, and community.
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Chapter 4:  
The Tigua Community, 1848-1900

In the first house I entered, a pile of blue corn lay upon the floor drying as in the other pueblos—a chimney extended across one side of the room and a metate of odd shape was constructed close to the fireplace. I saw a shield, bows and arrows, guns, a bundle of eagle feathers and a pair of wooden spurs hanging to rafters—but beyond these nothing whatever to lead me to suspect that I wasn’t in the house of an humble and industrious family of Mexicans. ¹

A Borderlands Community

During the second half of the nineteenth-century, Ysleta’s Tigua community experienced an ambiguous and messy transition that reflected the larger changes in the El Paso borderlands. As Mexico and the United States absorbed this peripheral region into their national political economies, land dispossession and discriminatory state regulations significantly pressured the Tiguas, as well as the Piros, Sumas, and other Indigenous peoples to rearticulate their circumstances and adopt new survival strategies. This negotiation involved various intermarriages between the area’s Indigenous peoples that regenerated their communities and created new ones such as Tortugas pueblo near Las Cruces, New Mexico. In Ysleta, various Tiguas intermarried with Piros who had migrated to the United States. Absorbing outsiders into their networks of family and kinship, Ysleta’s Tiguas pragmatically maintained their ethnic sovereignty and traditional culture as Anglo and Mexican society increasingly surrounded them.
At this time, the Tiguas, Piros, Mansos, and other Indigenous peoples of the region experienced a more transnational borderlands environment that enabled relaxed movement between Mexico and the United States. This relaxed border enabled free movement between the region’s Indigenous enclaves in Ysleta, Zaragoza, Socorro, Senecú, Juarez, and Tortugas. In response to Mexico’s assimilationist policies that undermined Indigenous sovereignty, this open borderlands provided Mexico’s Piros and Mansos the option to cross the international boundary and reestablish themselves in pueblos such as Ysleta and Tortugas. In this context of free movement, kinship ties and public gatherings, such as the Guadalupe Festival in Tortugas, gave the region’s Indigenous peoples access to increased cross community interaction that reinforced their Indigenous identities.

In this environment, Tiguas found common cause and maintained face to face community interaction between themselves, their Indigenous neighbors, and outsiders through their service as guides and scouts for the military, railroad and agricultural labor, and participation at public gatherings and events in which they continued to practice their sacred traditions and ceremonies. Symbolizing collective Tigua identity within the new socio-political context of United States expansion, the Tribal Constitution of 1895 exemplifies their self-determination to maintain their own ethnic and community sovereignty. Like other Indigenous peoples in the area, the Tiguas negotiated the pressures of nation-state colonization and reshaped their circumstances through intermarriage, migrations, military service, participation in the local economy as wage laborers, and the maintenance of numerous cultural traditions. Together, these activities involved myriad interactions that helped community members maintain bonds of family and kinship, which reinforced what it meant to Tigua by the turn of the twentieth-century.
Migrations and Ethnogenesis after Anglo American Arrival

After the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, as non-Indians began their assault upon Tigua communal lands and resources, many Piro Indians from Senecú moved to the United States in order to protect their land on the north side of the Rio Grande River. This trend is evidenced by a series of land deed registrations by Piro Indians between 1852 and 1854. ² Piro land claims are messy and fragmented because Spain relocated the pueblos various times, and shifts in the river placed much of the land from the Senecú Grant in the United States. These claims included the Sausal or willow thicket east of Ysleta, as well as various places in El Paso’s lower valley area. According to Houser, many Piros sought United States citizenship in order to protect their land. ³ This inevitably linked the Piros with the Tiguas, as both groups sought to keep their land and maintain their cultural lifeways.

This desire to keep their land caused many Piros to intermarry and amalgamate with the Tiguas of Ysleta. Although the Tigua intermarried with some Sumas and Mansos, the majority of intermarriage occurred between Tiguas and Piros because of geographical proximity and various cultural similarities that stemmed from their Pueblo descendency. Both groups originated from New Mexico, practiced sedentary agriculture, and worshipped the same patron saint—Saint Anthony. ⁴ Houser also observed Tigua-Piro intermarriage through the existence of Tigua surnames that are Piro and Manso in origin, such as Piarote, Pedraza, Paíz, and Padilla, as well as Juardo and Gemente. For example, he wrote that “Piarote is not a Spanish name and may have been derived from the joining of the affix, Piro, to the suffix, “rote”—meaning large. Hence the name, Piarote, may have meant ‘big Piro.’” ⁵ Yet Houser ultimately points out that the Tigua retained their identity and community in spite of intermarriage and that “nearly half” of today’s Tiguas of Ysleta “have Piro ancestry that originated from Socorro and Senecú pueblos.” ⁶
By the late 1800s, this continuity of Tigua community and identity made Ysleta del Sur an attractive place for Piros of Senecú and Socorro. Raymond D. Apodaca explains that as these latter communities became more “Mexicanized,” many of the Piros who sought to retain their Indigenous identity and culture either intermarried with the Tigua or just moved into Ysleta to be part of the community. This amalgamation into the Tigua community not only strengthened Indigenous identity among the Tigua, it also enabled various Piros and other Indians a cultural enclave in which to avoid full assimilation into Mexican society and maintain their own Indigenous identities. In this way, Ysleta’s Tigua community strengthened itself and maintained its population by absorbing some neighboring Piros into its direct and indirect kinship networks.

This type of interaction is evidenced by the lineage of Miguel Granillo Pedraza, who served as Tribal Governor (1971-1972), as well as in various other tribal leadership positions, such as Councilman and War Capitan. Born in 1904, Pedraza stated that he descended from a Tigua-Piro intermarriage and “is three quarters Tigua and one quarter Piro.” Considering Houser’s above assessment of the linguistic roots of Pedraza’s name, as well as the fact that his birthdate places the union of his grandparents roughly after the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Pedraza’s story supports the historical determinants that influenced the movement of Piros from Senecú into Ysleta’s Tigua community.

This movement also invokes the idea that some Manso and Apache Genízaro peoples also accompanied the Piro as they moved to Ysleta. Houser noted that both Tiguas and Piros held Manso last names, such as Juardo and Gemente, and Bandelier pointed out the similarities between Piro, Manso, and Tigua pottery. In addition, Apodaca mentioned that some Piros from Socorro migrated to Ysleta and intermarried with Tigua. Yet these migrations had begun much earlier, during the 1770s, when colonial Spain brought Apache captives to the Socorro mission. By 1848,
many of the latter had settled around Socorro as Genízaros and likely developed bonds of direct and indirect kinship with Socorro’s remaining Piros.\textsuperscript{11} In 1883, Bandelier noted a confused awareness of Apache lineage by some Socorro residents, as well as the fact that they maintained ties with the Mansos of El Paso del Norte.\textsuperscript{12}

This illustrates the ambiguity and messiness of being Tigua during the late 1800s in that Tigua society absorbed both Piros and Mansos and suggests that some of these may have been the descendants of Genízaro Apaches. In addition, Socorro’s Indians are difficult to pin down into one ethnic category because peoples of various groups, such as the Piro, Tano, and Jemez, resided there. As no one group was large enough to dominate culturally, this intense heterogeneity undermined the continuity of distinct tribal customs and languages in Socorro and caused Indigenous peoples there to adopt Spanish as their common language.\textsuperscript{13} Moreover, people on the ground throughout the area may have been less concerned with colonial notions of categorization through tribal blood lines and instead viewed themselves as distinct Indigenous peoples in opposition to newly arrived outsiders as they negotiated their changing social environment to protect their land, families, and cultural spaces. In this sense, the Tigua absorption of Piros and Mansos into the Ysleta community exemplifies Indigenous responses to increased colonial pressures. By the time Anglos arrived, Ysleta’s Tigua had adapted to and negotiated three hundred years of colonial contact.\textsuperscript{14}

During the 1850s, violent Anglo incursions, flooding, and changes in land tenure caused many Tiguas from Ysleta and Piros from Senecú to move away and form communities elsewhere. As Anglo settlers encroached upon the land, many Tiguas, Mansos, and Piros left the area for New Mexico. In 1851, a small group of Tiguas resettled in Tularosa.\textsuperscript{15} Piros from Mexico often relocated to Ysleta and New Mexico because they had lost their best land during the floods and
river shifts of the 1840s. Changes in Mexican land law also caused Piros to leave Mexico. More specifically, Mexico’s Reform Laws of 1855 prohibited the Church from owning land beyond its immediate needs, ending communal land tenure and disrupting the cultural autonomy that Indigenous pueblos had experienced under colonial Spain. The Reform Laws also prohibited Indians from performing dances and traditional ceremonies in front of churches without the written permission of civil authorities. In addition, many Piros left Senecú and El Paso to avoid being drafted into the Mexican army during the War of French Intervention. This caused many Piros to leave Mexico for Ysleta and Tortugas, in New Mexico’s Mesilla Valley. In Tortugas, various Tiguas, Piros, and Mansos who had migrated from Ysleta and other pueblos around El Paso intermarried with a small number of Mansos and Piros who already occupied the area and merged into a distinct Indigenous community. As Tortugas emerged as an Indian pueblo, Old Mesilla solidified as a Mexican settlement, as refugees from El Paso’s lower valley migrated to New Mexico.

Tensions during the Civil war also caused some Tiguas from Ysleta and Indians from Socorro to resettle in Zaragoza, Mexico, across the river from Ysleta. In 1862, Tribal Governor Jose Domingo Márquez and Cacique Juan Seberiano Gonzáles moved with a group of Tiguas to Zaragoza to avoid Confederate harassment. They also moved to Zaragoza to claim some of the land that originally belonged to them per the Ysleta Grant. In 1863, Márquez and Gonzáles petitioned Mexico to resettle fifty-four families in Zaragoza. In the petition, Márquez and Gonzáles defined Anglo oppression as the main reason for wanting to relocate. Mexico denied the petition, and most Tiguas remained in Ysleta after Confederate troops evacuated the region in 1863.

Although Tiguas had been abused during Confederate occupation, and Márquez and his family had initially fled to Zaragoza because of abuse by Confederate soldiers, they befriended
many local Southerners and sided with them during the Reconstruction era. In particular, various Confederate sympathizers such as Ben Dowell and Henry Dexter fled to Zaragoza and lived with the Tigua after Union troops occupied the area. On one occasion, Tigua scouts Simón and Bernardo Olguín observed Union troop movements for Dowell. On another, two Tiguas guided Dowell and other Confederate sympathizers to San Antonio. In this way, Tigua knowledge of the landscape, its watering holes, as well as assistance in defending against Union troops and Apache or Comanche raiding parties proved essential to the survival of Dowell and his companions.

Dowell’s interactions with the Tigua in Zaragoza eventually placed him into direct kinship relations with them as an intermediary and family member through his intermarriage with Juana Marquez, the daughter of Cacique Domingo Marquez. Dowell eventually moved to the early Anglo settlement of Franklin (El Paso) and established Dowell’s saloon, where he served as an intermediary between Tiguas and Anglos, such as A.J. Fountain, during the high point in the Tigua land dispossession in the 1870s. Dowell served as El Paso’s first mayor in 1873, and his connections with Anglo and Tigua elites enabled him to acquire a significant amount of land in Ysleta. Although the Tigua may have expected Dowell to help them protect their land because of his marriage to Juana Marquez, he could not reciprocate on these types of kinship obligations because the land grab was larger than his ability to control it.

In the aftermath of the land dispossession and Salt War of the 1870s, many Tiguas and Piros followed those before them and moved to Zaragoza, Mexico, and Tortugas in New Mexico’s Mesilla Valley. This migration included Piros, Mansos, and Tiguas from El Paso del Norte (Juarez) and Ysleta del Sur. Terry R. Reynolds and Mary Taylor contend that although some Tiguas migrated to Tortugas, and some people there identified as “San Juan de Guadalupe Tiwa,” the Piros from El Paso’s pueblos made up the majority of their population. This argument is based
upon the idea that by the early nineteenth-century, the Piros of El Paso Del Norte had absorbed practically all of the pueblo’s Manso peoples through years of intermarriage and cultural assimilation. It is also supported by the previous migration of Piros from Senecú to Ysleta and Tortugas during the 1850s, which gives credence to the idea that many of the Piros in El Paso’s lower valley moved to New Mexico in the aftermath of the land dispossession and Salt War of the 1870s. Thus, the lineage of Piro, Manso, and Tigua descendency in Tortugas involved a combination of previous intermarriages between these peoples in El Paso’s pueblos, their migrations from Ysleta, Senecú, and El Paso, and intermarriages between those migrants and Indians who descended from groups, such as the Pueblo and Apache.

One creation story evidences the predominance of Piro Indians from the El Paso area in the formation of the Tortugas community. This oral tradition presents that various Piros, Mansos, and Tiguas from El Paso’s pueblos “left their home to follow a fabulous beauty of their tribe. The girl, whose long flowing copper red hair was famous even among white settlers, had married Don Eugenio Van Patton, Indian fighter, soldier of fortune, and clever politico of early Dona Ana County history.” More specifically, Eugene Van Patton married Benita Madrid Vargas, the daughter of a Piro cacique from Senecú, in 1865. Benita Madrid Vargas became Benita Madrid Van Patten, gave birth to five children, and moved to Tortugas in 1873. As this move occurred during one of the peak periods of Indian land dispossession in the El Paso area, various Piros, Mansos, and Tiguas followed them. Yet Indigenous peoples from El Paso’s pueblos had been moving to Tortugas from the 1850s to the 1890s, and the Van Patten migration was part of a larger two-way migratory process that exemplifies the development of community ties between Ysleta, Senecú, El Paso del Norte and Tortugas.
By the early twentieth-century, Tortugas had emerged as a distinct Piro, Manso, and Tigua community that consisted of two distinct neighborhoods known as San Juan and Guadalupe. The west side of Tortugas became known as San Juan, and the east side as Guadalupe. Here, the Roybal and Trujillo families, among others from El Paso del Norte’s Guadalupe mission, joined with various others, such as the Pedraza family from Senecú, and the Duran, Grijalva, and Gonzales families from Ysleta, and continued their cultural traditions in a group called “Los Inditos de Las Cruces.” Patrick H. Beckett and Terry L. Corbett point out that Felipe Roybal, the nephew of El Paso del Norte’s last cacique, served as the cacique for this group. Los Inditos obtained land and planned to build a church in Tortugas’s San Juan de Dios neighborhood in 1888. Yet construction efforts stalled until 1914, when Los Inditos and other community members formed “Los Indigenes de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe,” a nonprofit corporation that built the Catholic Church in the Guadalupe section of Tortugas. After the death of Van Patten’s wife, Benita Madrid, in 1875, he remarried Francisca Avalos de Roybal, a Piro-Manso descendent. Both Van Patten and Avalos played an influential role in the construction of the church as officers for “Los Indigenes de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe.”

Thus, during the second half of the nineteenth-century, the Tigua community of Ysleta absorbed various Piros from Senecú and Socorro, who sought to maintain their cultural traditions and Indigenous identities. Mexican reforms, tensions during the United States Civil War, and increased encroachments and land acquisitions by non-Indians created a polemical climate that pitted Anglos against Mexicans and seemingly obscured Indians in all but the most prominent pueblos, such as that of Ysleta. Yet violence and land dispossession in Ysleta influenced some Tiguas to move to Zaragoza and Tortugas. This volatile climate also caused many Piros and Piros of Manso descent from Senecú and El Paso del Norte to move to Tortugas. The main reasons for
these migrations stemmed from the fact that these Indians sought to maintain and preserve their cultures, identities, and either protect their land north of the river or settle on new land, where they possessed enough autonomy to establish a sense of belonging in order to rearticulate a new connections to place based upon their traditional relationship with the land and the river. Underlying these internal determinants for migration, external factors such as the pressures of Mexican and American colonization and cultural assimilation caused many of the area’s Indigenous peoples to relocate. Yet most of these movements occurred relatively close to the river or within the region. In this context, cultural change and cultural continuity played an integral role in Tigua society.

**Cultural Change and Continuity in Ysleta after 1848**

Cultural change and cultural continuity for the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur involved a dynamic in which they adopted some modes of modern western civilization, yet retained many of their traditional customs and social norms. Because Tigua society absorbed some Piros and Indigenous peoples from other groups and lived within a socio-political environment largely steered by Mexican and Anglo-American hegemony, the Indigenous community in Ysleta that emerged during the second half of the nineteenth-century contained a group of people who sought to negotiate dramatic social change, resist assimilation, and maintain their inherent ethnic and cultural Indian identity.34 Explaining how Native Americans like the Tigua resisted cultural assimilation, David R. Lewis contended that they persisted “against overwhelming odds, through adaptive change and a historical consciousness of their identity as separate peoples.”35 For Lewis, cultural change involved a process of negotiation, adaptation, and cultural reproduction in which Indigenous peoples sought to blend their cultural traditions with modern society in order to derive
an acceptable meaning from the dramatic changes that they experienced during the late nineteenth century. Considering a shared historical consciousness as a signifier for community identity invokes Foster’s idea that the continuation of community identity depends upon the consistent and ongoing ability of its members to interact with one another, instead of the preservation of pristine language, social structure, and territory. In this sense, identity through shared experience enabled the Tiguas to adopt new elements of culture and blend them into preexisting systems in a way that did not interfere with their collective sense of self within the community. Taken together, Lewis and Foster’s ideas illuminate how the Tiguas negotiated Mexican and American influences by continuing to practice their shared traditions and maintain their identity as Indians in Ysleta.36

Numerous examples of change and continuity in Tigua society are evidenced in various journals and reports by government officials and ethnographers who visited the El Paso area during the second half of the nineteenth-century. Of these, some of the most relevant are those of William Henry Chase Whiting, John Russell Bartlett, John C. Bourke, Herman Ten Kate, Adolph F. Bandelier, and Jesse Walter Fewkes.37 While these reports contain certain inherent biases that reflect contemporary assumptions about Indians losing their authentic cultures and assimilating into Mexican society, they also illustrate various ways in which Tiguas and others retained numerous cultural elements, thus illustrating change and continuity. For example, in 1849, U.S. Army Lieutenant William H.C. Whiting described Ysleta as an “ancient pueblo” and the Tigua as “the remnants of the old Indian tribes long since reduced by the Spaniards.”38

Although Whiting viewed the Tigua as a Hispanicized people, he illuminated cultural continuity by noting that they still spoke their traditional language, practiced many of their traditional customs, and dressed somewhat differently than Mexicans. For example, he wrote that they wore “the same wide flowing drawers,” yet confined them “from the knee down with
bucksins and moccasins.” He also revealed how Indians in Ysleta identified as a distinct group of people in opposition to local Mexicans by noting that “time has not diminished their fierce animosity to the Spanish race.” Thus, Whiting informs us that during early U.S. occupation, the Tigua viewed themselves as a separate cultural entity in relation to the area’s Mexican vecinos by speaking their own language and dressing differently.

During the early 1850s, ethnologist and U.S. Boundary Commissioner John Russell Bartlett similarly reflected contemporary biases in his observations of the area’s Indians. Bartlett recognized the hybrid Indigenous traits of the greater El Paso area and viewed the people as mixed race and primitive in comparison to elite Hispanic society. Although Bartlett described Ysleta as a Mexican pueblo, his writing illustrated how Indigenous culture influenced Mexican society. For example, he noted how Mexicans used metates, stone grinders for corn and wheat, and how they built houses and churches of adobe. In this way, Bartlett illustrated the hybrid nature of El Paso’s Borderlands and revealed the presence of cultural change and continuity.

In 1850, while walking in El Paso del Norte, Bartlett witnessed a parade of Piro dancers from Senecú. In his accounts, he described the men as being dressed like Mexicans, in short jackets and bell bottom pants; while Piro women wore “short black dresses, reaching just below the knees, with a thin white muslin mantle thrown over their shoulders,” and a “red silk shawl” around the waist. He also explained that as women kept time with the music by waving large turkey feathers up and down, one in each hand,

men carried flint muskets, and one of them a drum, on which he was beating constantly. All joined in singing a monotonous tone, and when they reached the church, stopped and commenced dancing. They formed lines...passing through a variety of figures and marchings. From the perfect regularity with which they went through these figures, they must have followed some established forms.
Bartlett’s description reveals how Piros adopted elements of contemporary Mexican clothing and blended them into their own cultural traditions. He also reveals that by 1852, about eighty Piros still resided in Senecú and that although they had retained their traditional language, they primarily spoke Spanish. Ultimately, Bartlett did not view Senecú’s Piro as “pure and authentic” Indians and predicted that in one generation they would lose their language. Yet he also validated Piro cultural continuity by writing that this “mixed race may long occupy their present ground, and retain the manners and customs of their forefathers.”

Bartlett’s ambivalent description of the Piro relates to the Tigua because of the close relationship between the two groups and mirrors similar phenomena involving cultural change and continuity in Ysleta.

Ethnographic data on the Tiguas is sparse between the 1850s and the 1880s, when a new wave of soldiers and ethnographers began entering the region and recorded detailed information about Native American communities. In November, 1881, Army Lieutenant John C. Bourke visited Ysleta and chronicled various examples of cultural change and continuity. Noting that the old Indian pueblo had been “thoroughly incorporated into the Mexican-American town,” he wrote that it took a keen eye to distinguish between Indian homes and “those of their more civilized neighbors.” In particular, he wrote that the community consisted of one story adobe houses with doors and windows at ground level, instead of ladders leading to rooftop entryways. He also noted that Indians and Mexicans dressed alike and often intermarried with each other, describing the children of these unions as being lighter in complexion with “softer features, gentler expression and ruddier cheeks.” In this way, Bourke not only illustrated examples of cultural change, he also revealed how intermarriage changed the appearance of some of Ysleta’s Indigenous peoples.

Upon entering the home of one Tigua family in Ysleta, Bourke noticed numerous examples of cultural hybridity that involved both change and continuity. He viewed “a pile of blue corn”
drying on the floor, which was common among Pueblo Indians. He also noticed “a shield, bows and arrows, guns, a bundle of eagle feathers hanging on the rafters.” Yet beyond this, he wrote that the home resembled a “humble and industrious family of Mexicans,” observing that both men and women participated in doing the week’s laundry. He noted that the Tigua grew pears, apples, grapes, apricots, and peaches, as well as barley, beans, chile-peppers, onions, sweet potatoes and wheat. Describing Tigua livestock activities, Bourke wrote that they raised pigs, chickens, horses, cows, and burros. Bourke also illuminated the intertwined nature of Tigua and Mexican agrarian activities, writing that “I saw a couple of boys driving a large herd of sheep and goats, but I couldn’t tell whether they were Indian, or Mexican, or Half-breeds.” Thus, Bourke’s recollections illustrate how cultural hybridity in Ysleta involved a blend of Pueblo and Mexican customs.

Bourke’s visit with acting tribal governor Juan Severiano Gonzalez reveals some of the complexities and concerns that the Tiguas faced by the 1880s. For example, in 1881, the actual tribal governor lived in Socorro, various Tiguas had moved to Tortugas, New Mexico as well as across the river to Zaragoza, and many of these had adopted Mexican customs and intermarried with Mexicans. Another concern of Gonzalez involved land dispossession. In particular, Bourke wrote that the “old man complained that the Americans and Mexicans were crowding into their beautiful valley and taking up, without any recompense, land belonging to the people of the pueblo.” Gonzalez’s accounts evidence some of the hardships that the Tigua faced during the land dispossession period in the aftermath of the Salt War of 1877.

Bourke’s recollections also suggests that many Tiguas in Ysleta sought to live unnoticed by outsiders, especially Anglo-Americans, and chose to maintain their Indian identity in secret as they lived among the area’s largely ethnic-Mexican population. Many Tiguas did this to gain access to employment and avoid violent encounters with Anglos and Mexicans who disliked
Indians. When Bourke asked one Tigua about clan membership, the Tigua replied that clans did not exist anymore and that “this pueblo was now entirely Mexican and had given up many of the old ‘costumbres.’” Yet when Bourke presented Severiano Gonzalez with the same question and insisted upon an answer, Gonzalez validated the existence of a clan system, saying that he belonged to the Maiz clan, and that his wife and children belonged to the Aguila, or Eagle clan. In addition, Bourke listed the Tigua clans that existed in Ysleta by 1881.

Table 4.1: Tigua Clan System 1881.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maiz</td>
<td>Corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguila</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agua</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalchihuitl</td>
<td>Turquoise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso</td>
<td>Bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortolita</td>
<td>Turtle Dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conejos</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandia</td>
<td>Watermelon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganso</td>
<td>Goose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John C. Bourke documented the presence of ten Tigua clans in Ysleta in 1881 and noted that the Culebra and Coyote clans had ceased to be in existence by that time.

Bourke’s ethnographic documentation of Tigua society in Ysleta illustrates that Native American community members maintained their Indian identity as they adapted to and negotiated the changing world in which they lived. The continuity of various cultural traditions, including the clan system, evidences that most Tiguas viewed themselves as a distinct people among Mexicans and Anglos. The fact that they sometimes migrated and intermarried reveals how they negotiated a dynamic and often volatile borderlands community. That they chose to maintain their traditions in secret from outsiders exemplifies how they negotiated change and continued their cultural traditions.

Dutch anthropologist Herman Ten Kate’s visit to Ysleta in December 1882 further evidenced socio-cultural continuity and change in Tigua society. Ten Kate described Ysleta as a
community of acequías and “scattered and widely separated” adobe dwellings that housed a “predominantly Mexican and Indian” population.\textsuperscript{57} He noted that the forty Indian families who lived there identified as Tiguas and spoke “the same language as their northern brethren in Isleta and Sandia in New Mexico.”\textsuperscript{58} Like Bourke, he noted that although the Tigua wore leather moccasins, they had practically “abandoned their original attire” for European style clothing. He also noted that although the Tiguas practiced Catholicism, they quietly maintained their traditional religious practices.\textsuperscript{59} Yet the Tigua often displayed their Indigenous culture through public festivities such as dancing.

Ten Kate illustrated how Tigua dancers exemplified cultural continuity and change and revealed the hybrid nature of Tigua spirituality in the process. Upon his arrival, the Tiguas had been celebrating the closing of the year and dancing from the afternoon well into the evening. Ten Kate wrote that these dancers clearly blended “their ancient pagan customs with the religion they later adapted.”\textsuperscript{60} He explained in vivid detail that

\begin{quote}
Around 5 P.M….ten to fifteen men and boys. Holding rattles made from gourds, hopped up and down alternately behind or next to each other in a tightly closed row, without however, leaving their place and practically without lifting their feet. Now and then, in time to the rhythm from the monotonous chanting, the dancers bent their upper belly strongly to the side and stretched the right arm with the rattle out to the ground. All this is accompanied by monotonous droning from a leather drum. The Indian beating the drum and a couple of the most prominent people from the tribe stood behind the row of dancers and did not budge. They were all bare-headed, and many had smeared part of their faces with red paint. They did not wear special attire, however. In various places in the village the same dance is repeatedly performed, always starting in front of the entryway to the church.\textsuperscript{61}
\end{quote}

Ten Kates description is filled with many of the contemporary historical biases that Europeans held towards Native Americans. Yet it does reveal the convergence of traditional Tigua culture with the Church. For Ysleta’s Tigua, these sacred ceremonies and celebrations unified the community and reinforced a collective identity among its members.\textsuperscript{62}
Sacred traditions such as dances and ceremonies not only reinforced a collective identity among Ysleta’s Tigua, they also served as acts of resistance to colonialization and full assimilation into Spanish, Mexican, and American society. Anthropologist S.K. Adam explains that the Tiguas originally resisted full assimilation into the Church through compartmentalization and syncretism.\(^6\) Originally, colonial Spain outlawed traditional Tigua religious practices and destroyed the Kivas, or traditional spiritual meeting places. In response, the Tiguas either built hidden Kivas or met in the home of the cacique and practiced their sacred religion in secret. This practice is known as compartmentalization and is the main reason why the Tigua were and still are very secretive about their spiritual traditions.\(^4\)

Tigua resistance to full religious assimilation is also evidenced through the hybrid and syncretic blending of cultural traditions, such as dancing in front the church during ceremonies and festivities. This is the phenomenon that Ten Kate witnessed while visiting Ysleta and described as “clearly mingling” sacred traditions with Catholicism.\(^5\) This practice was common among Yaquis in Sonora’s Jesuit missions and New Mexico’s Pueblos in Franciscan missions, where these Indigenous peoples integrated their traditional beliefs into church ceremonies. Seemingly blending compartmentalization with syncretism, the Tigua mode of syncretism differed from Sonoran Catholicism in that unlike the Tohono O’Odham, they did not simply add aspects of Catholicism to their own religion. In the Tigua case, however, compartmentalization is more predominant than syncretism because dancing and other sacred traditions are practiced outside of the church itself.\(^6\) In any case, compartmentalization and syncretism both exemplify how the Tigua negotiated and resisted assimilation and continued to practice their cultural traditions into the twentieth-century.
While in Ysleta, the Tigua welcomed Ten Kate and gave him many gifts, including a sacred tribal drum. Cacique José María Durán and other prominent community members invited Ten Kate into their homes, where Kate took many pictures of them. As an anthropologist, Ten Kate sought to acquire an array of “ethnographic items” and did so persistently. This is significant because on one occasion, a tribal elder named Bernardo sold Kate “his war bonnet (emóh) decorated with feathers and round leather shield (gweeyér), along with a big drum (póhojét) coated with red paint and a [drum] stick (láh).” According to Ten Kate, Bernardo later regretted selling him the war bonnet, which he had acquired during a campaign against the Apache. Yet of more significance is the sale of the tribal drum, which even today the Tigua still hope to repatriate into the community.

Anthropologist Adolph F. Bandelier also visited the region during the early 1880s and recorded a significant amount of information relating to cultural change and continuity. In November 1883, Bandelier visited the Van Patten residence in Tortugas, New Mexico and described it as a Piro community, noting that although they still danced during Christmas, they had neglected many of their customs. Ultimately, Bandelier described Tortugas’s Indians as Mexicanized. Yet his recollections evidenced the continuity of many cultural traditions, such as the clan system, the feather dance, and the worship of the sun “Olo” and moon “Orno.” He described El Paso del Norte (Juarez) as “a big Indian village” and noted that most Indians lived in the “Barrial,” or muddy neighborhood. Considering the ethnogenesis of the Mansos, he wrote that they “are so mixed with the population that they have given up their nationality and language.”

It is important to remember that by this time numerous Indigenous peoples of the region had settled around El Paso’s Guadalupe Mission, and Piros and Mansos had significantly integrated there.

Similarly, Bandelier visited Senecú, where the cacique and various Piros welcomed him, and he made various observations. Although many traditions had been lost, the forty-families of
Piros in Senecú, “Tze-no qué” in Piro, understood that they descended from Abó and still practiced some of their cultural traditions, such as the rabbit hunt. Bandelier also noted that Piros and Mansos made the same type of pottery and that the former had moved one league downriver after the river shift of the 1840s and 50s caused them to abandon the original Senecú pueblo.

Although Bandelier spent most of his time among the Mansos and Piros of El Paso del Norte, he did visit “Tshia-iu-be-ga,” or Ysleta in the Tigua language. After being greeted by William B. Blanchard, who married an Ysleta woman named Ysable, Juan Severiano, and others, Bandelier wrote that like the Piros of Senecú, Ysleta had about 40 families and had preserved their language. Yet he also described the language as” slowly dying out among the younger people.” He noted that Piro and Tigua drums and pottery were exactly the same and confirmed that the Tigua understood they had descended from Manzano and Cuaray. Illustrating the connection between Piros and Tiguas in Ysleta, he confirmed that many Tiguas believed that they came from “the same place as those [Indians] of Senecú.”

The most significant examples of continuity and change in Tigua society by the late nineteen-century are evidenced in the research of anthropologist Jesse Walter Fewkes. Fewkes briefly visited Ysleta in 1901 after conducting years of ethnological fieldwork among New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians during the 1890s. Yet Fewkes’s analysis reflects the contemporary biases of his era because he compared Ysleta’s Tigua and Senecú’s Piro to New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians and based his views according to how authentically the former replicated the culture of the latter. For example, he described the Indians of El Paso’s settlements as practically “Mexicanized,” and wrote that their cultural traditions and “dances before the church, have long lost the meaning which once they once had or that which similar dancers still have in the pueblos higher up the Rio Grande.” Instead of viewing Ysleta as an Indian pueblo, Fewkes viewed it as a community in the
process of being transformed into a Mexican town. Noting that the Tiguas had retained more of their traditional customs than the Piros, Fewkes evidences both change and continuity in Tigua society and validates the presence of Tigua culture and identity in Ysleta. In this way, Fewkes illuminated the pueblo, their culture, and some of the social dimensions of Tigua society at the turn of the twentieth-century.

Fewkes description of Ysleta’s old Indian pueblo illustrates the layout of the Tigua community before the mass land privatization schemes of the 1870s and the early twentieth-century relocation to the “Barrio de los Indios,” which is located several blocks east of the church. Noting that Ysleta’s Indian name is “Chiawipia,” Fewkes described the church, its cemetery, and its courtyard as the center of the pueblo, where the Tiguas danced and practiced “pagan ceremonies dating back in the history of the pueblo to time when it was practically a Tiwan village.” Fewkes noted that the old pueblo originally resided next to the cemetery and consisted of a series of *jacales* (one story log and adobe homes) located around a rectangular shaped plaza. By the time of his visit, however, some Tiguas, such as Cacique José Tolino Piarote, still lived near the old pueblo, while others lived on various plots of land farther from the church—the result of land privatization.

Fewkes observed that some Tiguas had dispersed throughout the region during the second half of the nineteenth-century. For example, Mariano Colmenero told Fewkes that the Tiguas had settled Tularosa during the 1850s with the permission of the tribal cacique. Fewkes also noted that some Tigua families presently lived in Socorro, Texas, and Zaragoza, Mexico, and that Tiguas from these places frequently visited Ysleta, those from Zaragoza crossing the river to Ysleta. He described Tiguas in Socorro as “mixed Indians” and noted that they did not speak the Tigua language. In addition, he noted that some Tiguas moved to Las Cruces (likely Tortugas) to work
on the railroad. As such, Fewkes’s work reveals that although the Tigua community reshaped itself, it did not totally disintegrate. Similarly, Tigua culture may have changed by the time of Fewkes’s visit to Ysleta, yet it still maintained a strong presence in the community and the identity of its people.

Fewkes unknowingly acknowledged cultural continuity among Ysleta’s Tigua by documenting language, dances, and other tribal rituals, such as the rabbit-hunt. He noted that twenty-five elders actually had the ability to conduct a full conversation in the Tigua language and believed that it would be lost by the next generation, suggesting immediate “philological studies” before it is “too late.”

He also documented that Ysleta’s Tigua did various traditional dances, such as the rattle dance, the mask dance, the red pigment dance, the scalp dance, and the house dance. In addition, he noted the existence of the clan system and other cultural traditions, such as the rabbit hunt.

Looking closer at the rabbit hunt, Fewkes explained that during this cultural ritual, numerous hunters built a fire, formed a large circle around it, and closed in with sticks to kill the rabbits, shouting “Hotcha-pe-we-a-newa!” Then the men returned to the pueblo, where the women rushed to grab the rabbits from them, often racing for the same rabbit. Fewkes clarified that if two women grabbed the same rabbit, the War Capitan divided it in half. He also noted that this tradition had changed because it had once been customary for the Tigua to sprinkle “sacred meal (tlüka)” over the dead rabbit, but this had been discontinued because it was no longer used in Ysleta. In this way, Fewkes evidenced continuity and change in Tigua culture despite the fact that he believed in the inevitable Mexicanization of Tigua society.

In this sense, Fewkes, along with Bartlett, Bourke, Ten Kate, and Bandelier all viewed the Tigua through a cultural and ethnographic lens that reflected contemporary historical biases towards Native Americans. During the second half of the nineteenth-century, ethnographers and
anthropologists viewed Native Americans as a vanishing race on the verge of full assimilation into modern-civilized society. This view influenced an emerging wave of “salvage anthropologists” who sought to preserve and record authentic Indigenous culture before it vanished forever. Influenced by the anthropological views of Lewis Henry Morgan and Edward Burnett Taylor, who believed that all Indigenous culture was in the middle of a transition from savagery to civilization, ethnographers like Fewkes and Bandelier predicated an Indigenous community’s cultural authenticity upon its maintenance of their original traditions and customs in their most pristine forms. As such, salvage anthropologists like Fewkes believed that the Tigua transition into civilization would actualize itself through their Mexicanization, or eventual assimilation into the El Paso region’s mainstream Mexican and American society.

More recent viewpoints shun the idea that authentic Indigenous culture only exists in its most pristine forms and view culture as an organic entity instead of a historically isolated phenomena. Eric Hobsbawm exemplified simultaneous cultural continuity and change by distinguishing the difference between traditions and customs. Contending that traditions always remain constant over time, Hobsbawm explained that customs, or the behaviors associated with tradition, are variable to a certain degree and are subject to change as they are influenced by cultural innovations. David R. Lewis seemingly invokes Hobsbawm’s viewpoint by contending that in order maintain their culture, Native populations reproduced their cultural systems by applying traditional cultural practices to “new structures” and adopting new customs into these practices. Although Lewis admits that this inevitably caused cultural change, it only changed the customs associated with the traditions and not the traditions themselves. Nor did it change the implicit meaning of those traditions for groups like the Tigua, who sought to maintain those traditions in relation to their identities.
Thus, Ysleta’s Tigua community may have changed from its original form as it existed in 1692, yet it still existed, and its people still viewed themselves as Indians in relation to others, such as Spaniards, Mexicans, and Anglos. In the same way that Tigua housing patterns dispersed and recollected in Ysleta during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Tigua culture also reshaped itself. This did not mean that the Tiguas stopped identifying as Indians, lost their traditions and vanished into Mexican society; it means that they changed with the times, adopted new customs and other cultural elements, such as language, clothing, and various technological innovations, and incorporated them into their culture.94 One of the main reasons why Anglos assumed that Indigenous peoples had lost their identity is that they viewed authentic or real Indigeneity as a timeless or anachronistic phenomenon fixed forever in a timeless space in which cultural change seemed out of question. Denying their presence in real time and excluding them from the modern world, these views locked Indigenous peoples into a past and pure culture that served as a baseline from which exposure to non-Indian culture caused its ultimate deterioration.95 As nineteenth-century ethnographers viewed Tigua culture in terms of how much it resembled authentic and pure Pueblo culture, they overlooked the fact that Pueblo culture itself had never remained static. Language, clothing, and cultural traits dominant at one point in time always changed in accordance with new and different social contexts. While the particulars of these core characteristics changed according to contemporary customs, Indigenous identity and traditions still persisted. What kept these going in Tigua society involved historical memory and community interaction at ground level. This is what enabled Ysleta’s people to identify as Tigua as they negotiated their social and economic realities of the day.
**Tigua Military Activities during the American Period, 1840s-1880s**

During the second half of the nineteenth-century, various Tiguas colluded with the United States Army and the Texas Rangers in campaigns against Apaches and other Native Americans of the Southwest who overtly resisted Anglo expansion into their traditional subsistence domains. Yet conflict between Tiguas and Apaches, Navajos, and Comanches existed long before U.S. expansion into the region. Of these groups, the Apaches more often raided settlements in the El Paso region, and Tiguas responded to these raids by serving as scouts and guides for the U.S. Army and the Texas Rangers.96 Tigua military activity occurred between 1848 and 1880. Houser presents that Tiguas served as scouts for the U.S. Army, enlisting at posts in San Elizario, Frontera, Fort Bliss, Fort Davis, and Fort Quitman, and that they helped some Confederates during the Civil War.97 As such, Tigua military service during this period exemplifies their negotiated adaptation to the region’s changing national power structure in relation to their age old rivalries with groups like the Apaches and Comanches.98

When the United States laid claim to the North American Southwest, powerful groups like the Apache, Navajo, Kiowa, and Comanche controlled the countryside. By 1849, raids by these groups in which settlers and their livestock were either killed or taken captive had become commonplace, and Apaches and Navajos held and enslaved numerous human captives from the Rio Grande region’s settlements.99 Illuminating the regional hegemony that Apaches and others possessed, Indian Agent James S. Calhoun wrote that “the powers here have neither the authority nor the means to reduce the chaotic mess in this Territory, and the government at Washington has not thoroughly comprehended the diversity and the magnitude of the difficulties to be overcome.”100
In fact, Navajos, Comanches, Kiowas and Apaches had increased slave and cattle raiding during the 1840s because they relied on these forms of exchange to maintain their own social economies and feed their people. They also took human captives from Mexican settlements in retaliation for previous incidents in which Mexicans had captured and enslaved Indians. By the late 1880s, large scale raiding had ceased because the United States government had placed all of these groups on reservations.\(^{101}\)

Although Tiguas assisted U.S. forces in campaigns against these groups, they did so less out of allegiances to the Anglo cause and more from old animosities towards these groups, especially the Apache. For example, Tigua oral history says that Apaches sometimes entered Tigua homes, killing their residents and capturing their children. Tiguas also colluded with the U.S. Army to better negotiate their status within the new power structure as “civilized Indians” and possibly gain access to new economic opportunities.\(^{102}\) Fewkes evidenced this in 1901 when he wrote that “many of the Tiwa have served in the army as scouts against the Apache, and among the names of some twenty recorded…several have discharge papers setting forth the value of their services; others were killed while in the service of the United States. None of the former receives a pension or rations.”\(^{103}\)

These observations illustrate that although Tiguas served the U.S. military in campaigns against the Apache, they did not receive longstanding compensation for their services. By 1866, the United States government sought to reduce military costs by hiring Indian mercenaries. Unlike enlisted soldiers, Indian scouts and auxiliaries were expendable and could be terminated at any time. For many Indian men, military service offered access to money and resources unavailable on their reservations and pueblos. It also provided them access to captured horses, livestock, and other spoils of war such as bringing honor and reciprocity to their kin and home communities.\(^{104}\) Thus,
Tigua discharge papers may have exemplified good citizenship, valor, and honor among warriors, but they also signified assimilation into the same emerging power structure that privatized their land and reduced many of them to wage labor status on land that they had once owned. Despite this ambivalence, this aspect of Tigua history adds an important dimension in understanding how they negotiated their changing social environment during the early American period.

At ground level, this type of negotiation involved various and often violent encounters between Tiguas, different factions of U.S. society, and Apaches. For example, in 1857, various Tigua scouts led a company of U.S. soldiers from Fort Bliss into New Mexico’s Gila region, where they defeated an Apache band, killing twenty-four Apaches and taking twenty-six prisoner. During the Civil War, twenty Tiguas escorted Confederate soldiers to Fort Stanton, and in 1880, Tiguas Simón Olguín, Bernardo Olguín and three others scouted for the U.S. Army’s Buffalo Soldiers. During this last encounter, Simón Olguín lost his life when a small group of Apaches ambushed them at Paso Viejo, in the Eagle Mountains near Valentine, Texas. The ambush at Paso Viejo eventually led to the last violent encounter between Tiguas and Apaches at the 1881 “Battle of the Diablos.”

Tigua involvement at the Battle of the Diablos signified the end of an era of raiding and ongoing conflict with Apaches in the region. It began in 1879 when discontent on New Mexico’s Mescalero reservation caused numerous Lipan and Mescalero Apaches to join with Chief Victorio’s recently arrived group of Warm Springs Gileño Apaches and flee into the mountains and valleys of West Texas, southern New Mexico, and northern Chihuahua. By June of 1880, Victorio’s force consisted of about 236 men, as well as women and children. At this time, Apaches had fragmented, some remaining on the reservation, others joining Victorio, and others settling unnoticed in the countryside.
Tigua and Lipan scouts for the U.S. Army eventually tracked Victorio’s group into Mexico. On October 18, four hundred Mexican soldiers defeated Victorio’s group at the battle of Tres Castillos. Some Apaches escaped death and capture at Tres Castillos. Of these, a small band of twelve men, four women, and four children left Victorio’s group the night before the battle and went north into the Eagle Mountain area of West Texas. They ambushed Simón Olguín’s detachment at Paso Viejo early on the morning of June 11, killing him and six Buffalo Soldiers. Simón and four other Tiguas, including his brother Bernardo Olguín, had joined this detachment of the Tenth Calvary at Fort Davis. James B. Gillett described Simón and Bernardo as the “principle chiefs” of the tribe, writing that they “dressed in the usual Indian fashion, wore moccasins, buckskin leggings, and had their long black hair braided and hanging down the back.” Surely, this incident caused quite a disturbance in Ysleta.

The ambush at Paso Viejo occurred during the week of the Tigua’s Saint Anthony’s Day festival, and Simón Olguín was the tribal War Captain at that time. As a ten year old girl, Juanita Carbajal witnessed Simón Olguín’s body tied to a horse upon the scouting party’s return on June 13, the day of the festival. Soon after, the Apaches that ambushed Olguín’s group robbed a stage caravan near Van Horn and, on July 29, ambushed an eight man detachment of Buffalo Soldiers at Ojo Caliente, leaving one survivor. At Ojo Caliente, they killed a Tigua private named Francisco Olguín, who rode with the Buffalo Soldiers. Months later they robbed a stagecoach at Quitman Canyon, killing its driver and passenger.

By January 29, 1881, three Tiguas, Bernardo Olguín, his son Domingo Olguín, and Aniceto Duran, Captain George Baylor of the Texas Rangers post at Ysleta, and nineteen Rangers had pursued the group into the Sierra Diablo Mountains of West Texas. Here, during the Battle of the Diablos, they ambushed the Apaches just after sunrise and killed all but a few who escaped, taking
an Apache woman with three gunshot wounds in one hand, and two children prisoner. Baylor’s group included Tigua scouts who tracked the Apaches for the Rangers. Reviewing Gillet’s accounts, it becomes apparent that the Rangers never would have successfully tracked the Apaches without the Tiguas.

In the aftermath of the battle, the Tiguas took scalps and upon their return to Ysleta, they celebrated their victory. During the festival that followed they danced the Scalp Dance for the last time with real human scalps. Gillett described that “For three days and nights a feast and scalp dance were held by the whole of the Pueblo tribe of Ysleta. They feasted, wined, and dined their returning warriors, and invited the Rangers to the festivities. This celebration was the last scalp dance the Pueblo Indians ever had, for the destruction of the Apaches in the diablos exterminated the wild Indians and there were no more for them to scalp.”

The Battle of the Diablos signifies how Indigenous peoples sought reciprocity for losses incurred during violent encounters with others. Bernardo Olguín had lost his brother Simón to the Apache at Paso Viejo and his nephew Francisco at Ojo Caliente. In addition, the same Apaches had killed the tribal War Captain during one of their most sacred traditional holiday seasons, and his body had returned to Ysleta on the back of a horse during its climax on Saint Anthony’s Day. It also signifies how Tigua and Texas Rangers worked together on common ground.

In fact, Captain Baylor of Ysleta’s Texas Rangers respected the various Tiguas who worked under his command. Houser reports that Baylor greatly depended upon Simón Olguín to lead Tigua scouts on missions into West Texas. After Simón’s death, Baylor turned to Simón’s brother Bernardo Olguín. According to Baylor, Bernardo had scouted and tracked a long time for the U.S. Army and the Texas Rangers and “was familiar with the whole country.” Moreover, he was “brave, sober, and reliable and could read wood signs like a book.” Importantly, the name
Olguín and Holguín are one in the same, and the difference in nomenclature likely resulted from the fact that Spanish speakers do not pronounce the H, so the emphasis is on the letter O. This discrepancy likely caused contemporary English writers to omit the H when spelling the name.

Looking further at Bernardo Olguín, it becomes apparent that he played a significant role in Tigua history. Bernardo Olguín served as a Tribal Cacique between 1870 and 1880. When Ten Kate visited Ysleta in 1882, he described Bernardo as “a very old Indian.” In fact, Bernardo Olguín sold Ten Kate a tribal drum and drum stick that the Tigua are trying to repatriate today. He also sold him a leather shield and an Apache war bonnet. Yet Bernardo later felt remorse over the loss of the war bonnet, which reminded him of “so many campaigns against the Apaches.”

Recollecting a photograph session with Bernardo, his wife, and two daughters, Ten Kate wrote that he imparted “a warlike appearance to himself for the occasion by smearing his face with red and yellow paint and putting on an American officer’s coat, which he received as a gift from the commander of Fort Davis.”

As a scout and a guide, Bernardo Olguín possessed a vast amount of knowledge about the region, and various people employed him for his services. Aside from leading groups of U.S. soldiers and Texas Rangers, he escorted numerous settlers through the mountains and plains of West Texas. He led early survey expeditions for the Texas and Pacific Railroad as well as early government land surveyors. In this way, various new arrivals to the region employed him, his family, and other members of the tribe to safely guide them through Indian territory. Bernardo died around seventy years of age in an accident in April, 1883, two years after the death of his brother Simón. In his obituary, the El Paso Times echoed the voices of many Tiguas and revered him and his brothers as men of “fidelity” and “skill,” noting how they served the military as well as various individuals as scouts and guides.
Numerous Tiguas served the U.S. military, Texas Rangers, and other groups and individuals as Scouts and guides during the nineteenth-century. Houser listed forty-one of their names in the *Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo Archives*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cristobal Aquiar</th>
<th>Crecencio Marquez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvino Aquiar</td>
<td>Maleno Marquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristobal Colmenero</td>
<td>José María Montoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damacio Colmenero</td>
<td>Bernardo Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariano Colmenero</td>
<td>Domingo Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe Cruz</td>
<td>Francisco Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan De La Cruz</td>
<td>Jose Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Domingo</td>
<td>Ponciano Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniceto Durán</td>
<td>Simón Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José María Durán</td>
<td>Tebucio Olguín (Holguín)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago Durán</td>
<td>Manuel Ortega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastiano Durán</td>
<td>Santiago Ortiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Gonzales</td>
<td>Toredio Predrasso Pedraza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Severiano Gonzales</td>
<td>Patricio Perea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sostenso Gonzales</td>
<td>George Piarote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniceto Granillo</td>
<td>Jose Tolino Piarote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benislado (Wenselado) Granillo</td>
<td>Pasqual Piarote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encarnación Granillo</td>
<td>Simón Rodela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Granillo</td>
<td>Reyes Trujillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Granillo</td>
<td>Robel Trujillo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above list of Tigua scouts ranges from the 1840s to the 1880s. This time frame reveals that Tigua men scouted and tracked for the U.S. Army from the time of U.S. expansion into the region until the era of railroad arrival, Indian reservations, and boarding schools. Working as scouts and trackers for the military, these Tiguas sought to negotiate their status in the region’s emerging power structure by pitting new arrivals against old adversaries.

The phenomena of Indigenous peoples entangling newly arrived colonists in intertribal rivalries is prevalent throughout Indian history, and Tigua collusion with U.S. forces during the
late nineteenth century reflects various other historical experiences in which Indians sought to use colonial forces to their own benefit. For example, Tlaxcaltecs allied with the Spanish against the Aztecs and served as scouts for colonial expansion into New Spain’s northern frontier.  

Yet by the mid-nineteenth-century, both Indians and whites sought to benefit from intertribal rivalries between groups like the Tiguas and Apaches. For example, during the 1860s and 1870s the Tonkawas worked as scouts and guides for U.S. soldiers at Fort Griffin and played an essential role against the Comanche and Kiowa during the Red River War of 1874-75. These groups had often attacked Tonkawas for practicing cannibalism. Thus, Tonkawas likely viewed their collusion with U.S. soldiers as a means to achieve reciprocity for past acts of violence committed against them by these groups of the southern plains.  

In a similar way, Tiguas used the U.S. military to gain reciprocity for acts of theft and violence committed against them by Apaches.

Although they did not seek to gain regional power as much as enhance their status in an already colonized society, they still acted as intermediaries by serving as scouts for the U.S. army. Their participation in military activities during the second half of the nineteenth-century also exemplifies how they negotiated their status in the emerging U.S. nation-state. In this sense, it served to their best advantage to create alliances with the region’s dominant society because it carved out a niche for them in which they could maintain their own community and continue practicing their own military traditions. Yet despite their military service, the expanding United States political economy placed a considerable amount of external pressure on the Tigua.

**Agriculture and Economy, 1848-1900**

Tigua involvement in the region’s agricultural economy adapted to the environmental, social, and political changes that took place from 1848 into the early 1900s. This period can be
described as one that began in abundance for the Tigua and then changed for the worst because of non-Indian population increases, land dispossession, drought, and the region’s inclusion into the emerging national economy. Largely influenced by the arrival of the railroad, these turning points led to changes in agricultural production that greatly impacted Tigua social status. Houser argued that this process accelerated between 1871 and 1914 as Tiguas transitioned from “self-sufficient farmers to dependent laborers and landless tenants,” receiving “pauper allowances” from “several of non-Indians who had acquired Indian land during the 1871 incorporation.” Yet reduction to wage labor status on their own land did not lead to the disintegration of the Tigua community. Instead, the Tiguas strengthened their resolve to persist among the areas diverse Mexican, Anglo, and Native-American population, adapting to change as they had always done.

After the U.S.-Mexican War, agricultural production flourished in the El Paso area, and this abundance extended into the lower valley pueblos of Ysleta, Socorro, and San Elizario. Boundary Commissioner John Russell Bartlett described “La Isla” as “one of the most fertile spots in the whole valley.” Described as a cornucopia of agriculture and livestock, Ysleta’s peoples produced wheat, corn, pears, peaches, apricots, plums, onions, and grapes, among other fruits and vegetables. Local farmers blended grape vineyards throughout La Isla’s wheat and corn fields and used acequias or irrigation canals to divert water to them from the river. At this time, grapes served as the primary cash crop for the local production of wine and brandy, which was shipped for sale to Chihuahua, New Mexico, and Durango. In this way, these dynamics reflect how local Tigua agriculture connected with the regional economy as they maintained traditional subsistence farming.

During the early years of U.S. occupation many Tiguas participated in the local and regional economy as farmers on their own land. Examining an 1860 U.S. census, Houser noted
that census takers distinguished between farmers and laborers and also mentioned various other jobs that Tiguas did. Yet this census is ambiguous and only partially reflects Tigua society, because census takers listed many Indians as white. At this time, listed Indian farmers included Antonio Montolla, Fabrian Granillo, Rey Lurado Duran, and Jose Gomes. In addition, Ebanisto Granillo and Jurado Marcos are listed as day laborers. Houser also noted that many Indian men are listed as hunters or farmer-hunters, such as Encarnación Granillo, Julian Márquez, and Demascio Márquez. At this time, census takers also illustrated various women’s roles in Tigua society.

Indian women participated in various occupations during the 1850s, which are reflected in the 1860 census. For example, Anastacia Piarote and Petra Marques, Tiguas from Ysleta, worked as household servants. El Paso Indian Juana Torres also worked as a servant, and Socorro Indians Rufina Piarote and Dolores Durado worked as cooks. In addition, an Indian woman from Socorro’s large Jurado family worked as a day nurse. Although these occupations reflect women’s involvement in the regional economy, they show that most Indian women participated in gendered tasks connected to society’s domestic or household sphere rather than its public sphere.

Tigua women also made pottery and baskets, which brought additional income into households by the early twentieth-century. In 1860, census takers recognized Tigua women’s pottery making as an occupation and listed Juana R. Márquez, Isidora Piarote, Brigida Piarote, and Petronela Piarote as potters. Houser explains that although Tiguas traditionally made pottery for use at home, they increasingly sold it in public with other handcrafted commodities such as baskets and bows and arrows. Yet the production and sale of baskets, pottery, and other items involved both men and women, and men often wove baskets and braided rope “from willows and plants gathered along the river banks.” By the late 1800s, Tiguas sold these products at the Ysleta train
station and various other locations in the El Paso-Juarez area and sometimes took up to seven wagonloads to Chihuahua for sale or trade.\textsuperscript{139}

By the early 1870s, increased settler immigration, an outdated irrigation system, and increased drought conditions strained the river beyond its ability to produce water for local agriculture, dramatically impacting the local economy. In this context, many Tiguas faced extreme poverty and caved into the increasing demands of land speculators, selling their land to them. At this time, land speculation increased as speculators prepared for the railroad’s arrival.\textsuperscript{140} Houser contends that by 1870, Indian farm-laborers in Ysleta outnumbered actual Indian farmers. Looking further into this, the 1870 U.S. Census listed Ysleta’s population at 799 people, including 131 Indians: seventy-four males and fifty-seven females. Of these, twenty-one men worked as laborers or farm-laborers, and one man, Padricio Pierida, worked as a farmer.\textsuperscript{141} Thus, the Tigua transition from self-sufficient farmers to dependent wage laborers in Ysleta is illustrated by the 1870 census.

Unlike the 1860 census, the 1870 census is more generic in its descriptions of Tigua occupations at that time. Women, such as Felifea Granillo, Provencia Olguín, and Ruina Duran are all listed as housekeepers, while most men, such as Isidro Colmenero, Tomas Granillo, and Victoriano Piarote are listed as either laborers or farm-laborers. The exceptions to this are Juan Gonzales, who is listed as War Captain, and Simon and Jose Olguín, who are listed as a guides.\textsuperscript{142} While the latter served as scouts and guides for the U.S. Army, many of the men listed as laborers served in this capacity, and the census itself is somewhat myopic in that it surely did not list every Indian in Ysleta. For example, Bernardo Olguin (Holguin), who surely lived at that time, is not mentioned on this census.\textsuperscript{143} Although these general categorizations obscure the nuances of Tigua economic participation, they do illustrate the status that Indians in Ysleta held within the national
political economy, as well as the fact that Indian identity persisted and was recognized by U.S.
bureaucrats at that time.

During the 1870s, Tiguas who worked in agriculture likely worked on both sides of the
river and throughout the El Paso area’s settlements. In 1872, only five square miles of cultivated
farmland existed in Ysleta, and Socorro and San Elizario combined only possessed eight square
miles of cultivated land. In total, the U.S. side of the river in the El Paso valley only held nine-
thousand acres of cultivated farmland, while the Mexican side of El Paso Del Norte possessed
cultivated land that extended ten miles downriver and six to ten miles south of the river.\textsuperscript{144} By this
time, import and export businesses flourished in El Paso, and the top exports included Onions and
wine. Other exports included wheat, corn, beans, and various livestock like sheep and cattle, and
by the 1880s wheat and alfalfa served as the areas main cash crops.\textsuperscript{145} In this milieu, many Tiguas
worked alongside Mexicans as laborers in the region’s bustling agricultural economy.

Tiguas in Ysleta also remained self-sufficient to a certain degree because of the rich soil
offered by the river and acequias that extended from it. Yet poverty increased due to drought and
poor conditions. When Bourke visited Ysleta in 1881, before the arrival of the railroad, he noted
that the Tiguas raised apples, pears, peaches, apricots, and great quantities of grapes. He also noted
that they raised corn, wheat, barely, chile, onions, and beans among other vegetables.\textsuperscript{146} By this
time Ysleta’s Tigua had lost most of their land, so much of this likely occurred on small plots or
farms not owned by non-Indians. Many Tiguas also worked in the local wine producing industry,
such as the Holguin family, who worked on the Alderete farm in Ysleta. Frank Alderete, the
grandson of the farm owner recalled that they produced wine that had “a lot of kick” and that “the
Indians sometimes drank too much.”\textsuperscript{147} Before the completion of Elephant Butte Damn, low
rainfall, water shortages and floods plagued the region. Rainfall did temporarily increase between
1880 and 1885, however, and Bourke’s accounts likely reflect one of the better periods that Tiguas experienced within this time frame.\footnote{148}

The arrival of the Texas and Pacific Railroad in 1881 connected El Paso with the national economy and further transformed the region. Subsequently, Anglo farmers immigrated at a record pace despite the extreme fluctuations between drought and flooding. As white farmers sought increased profits, agricultural production shifted from easily perishable fruits and vegetables to grains such as wheat, oats, and barely, which could be shipped easier by rail.\footnote{149} In 1888, the Mexican state of Chihuahua renamed El Paso Del Norte, Ciudad Juárez, and Mexican farmers predominated in agri-production throughout the region. In 1895, Ysleta abolished its incorporated status after a dispute between two men claiming to be mayor turned into an armed conflict over rights to clean the acequia that brought water to Ysleta. By the early 1900s, most farmers in El Paso had lost interest in grapes and turned to alfalfa as the main cash crop, and many ethnic-Mexicans had left their farms because of the droughts and floods that plagued the region.\footnote{150}

The completion of Elephant Butte Damn in 1915 also transformed the region’s agriculture, ushering in an unprecedented era of large scale farming that included an emphasis on cotton production. Although Tigua Cacique Demasio Colmenero attended the opening ceremony for the Elephant Butte Damn, the Tiguas themselves did not greatly benefit from it because they had lost most of their land.\footnote{151} By this time, very few Tiguas held titles to land in Ysleta, and most had been reduced to wage labor status as tenants on the same land that they had lived on and farmed for generations. For some Tiguas, the rapid changes that occurred over the last thirty years impoverished them to the point that they received “pauper allowances” or monetary donations from non-Indians living in Ysleta. For example, in 1914, Geo Buchanan sponsored Cornelia
Colmenero and Manuel Piarote, and Julias Lowenstein sponsored Desidero Colmenero. By 1908, the Tigua had retained only three of 23,000 acres of land in Ysleta.¹⁵²

At the onset of U.S. occupation, Tigua agricultural subsistence depended on the production of various fruits and vegetables, and grapes for wine production served as one of the main cash crops. As land dispossession and drought transformed Ysleta’s social and agricultural environment, many Tiguas went from being self-sufficient farmers on their own land to impoverished wage laborers, working for non-Indians, on the same land that they had claimed for generations. In addition, many Tiguas worked in other occupations, such as guides and scouts for the U.S. Army and others, also crafting baskets and pottery for sale and trade throughout the region. Tigua participation in the local and regional economy increasingly linked them with the emerging national economy as the railroad connected local agricultural production with the rest of the United States. Yet the Tigua did not assimilate as many assumed they would, and they had not vanished into Mexican society either.

Instead of causing their assimilation after they had lost most of their land, agricultural wage labor strengthened Tigua identity. As Tiguas worked on large farms with their families and kin, they blended their modern reality with their traditional practice of subsistence agriculture in a way that enhanced their identity. Offering them ways to rearticulate themselves during the region’s changing social context of the late 1800s, wage labor offered Tiguas access to both space and resources, which in turn helped them maintain their community status.¹⁵³

**Sovereign Identity and the Tigua Tribal Constitution**

Pressured by Anglo-American incursions, land dispossession, and assumptions that they would soon vanish into Mexican society, Ysleta’s Tiguas reaffirmed their sovereign status as a
distinct group of people who formed an Indigenous community through two formal declarations that constituted their social organization. In 1895, the Tigua met with a notary named Dr. Wahl and established a set of regulations and officers duties in order to preserve their tribal structure and pass their traditions on to subsequent generations. In the context of the Progressive Era, the tribal constitution represented Indigenous responses to decades of violence and land dispossession. It was a new survival strategy in which tribal leaders and advocates such as Wahl sought to meet United States civilization on its own terms. The tribal constitution exemplifies the Tigua’s response to their changing social environment in a way that invokes Kevin Bruyneel’s argument that Indigenous peoples resisted colonial impositions in combination with their desires to fit into mainstream society and retain their cultural autonomy and Native identities. For Bruyneel, Indigenous peoples responded to the pressures of colonization by negotiating and redefining the meanings of their political identities, both individually and collectively, within and apart from American society. In this sense, the Tigua Constitution of 1895 exemplifies how the tribe negotiated colonial impositions in an effort to adapt to their ambiguous status in U.S. society and retain their sovereignty.

Although the tribal constitution illustrated Tigua political autonomy, tribal members had always gone beyond the boundaries of tribal affiliations by participating in local politics. For example, Tiguas Jorge Piarote and Patricio Perea served on both the tribal council and the Ysleta town council in 1882 and 1893, respectively. In addition, many Tiguas, such as Tomás Granillo, Higinio Durán, and Simón Olguín served on juries in El Paso County during the 1870s and received payments for their services. In one instance, Durán served as a jury foreman or chaired a jury that included tribal members Fabián Granillo and Ysidro Colmenero. Dating back to the rights they held under Spain, Tigua participation in local politics suggests that by 1895, they well
understood the importance of establishing a mission statement and a set of bylaws in order to maintain group cohesion within a seemingly volatile and often hostile environment. It also shows that they well understood the politics of tribal sovereignty and the significance of tribal councils in order to be recognized as an American Indian tribe and meet the federal criteria of a civilized Indian nation.

Table 4.2: Tigua Officers who signed the 1895 Tribal Constitution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cacique</td>
<td>José Tolino Piarote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Mariano Colmenero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Felipe Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Captain</td>
<td>Tomas Granillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Captains</td>
<td>Blas Colmenero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blas Granillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aniceto Granillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cristobal Aquiar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table lists tribal offers who signed the Tigua Tribal Constitution in 1895. Fewkes may have misread many of the names, so where possible I have made corrections. For example, he listed Mariano Colmenero as Mariano Manero, and the name Granillo as Graeme.159

Yet the tribal constitution did not create new offices in response to U.S. expansion; instead, it reaffirmed the structure of tribal government that had begun centuries earlier under Spanish colonization. In 1620, Spain designated a structure of tribal government for New Mexico’s Pueblos and recognized community leaders by their possession of canes with metal crosses at the handles.160 The Tiguas brought this same structure with them from New Mexico in the aftermath of the Pueblo Revolt and retained it since then. According to Bertha P. Dutton, the Tigua maintained their traditions and governmental structure because tribal members of the “highest order” migrated from New Mexico and brought five Spanish leadership canes and the tribal drum with them. This illustrates that they surely had the ability and the knowledge to reestablish the original structure of pueblo, maintain their Tigua identity, and continue practicing their sacred
In this context, the tribal constitution sought to perpetuate a sovereign tribal government instead of create one.

Aside from outlining the social organization of Tigua government, the tribal constitution elucidates how officer’s duties intertwined with the continuity of sacred traditions. Listed in hierarchical order, leadership begins at the top with the Cacique, Lieutenant-Cacique, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Capitan Major, and then Subordinate Captains. Officers’ duties range from organizing elections every year to directing public dance ceremonies and maintaining order in the community. Although the hierarchical nature of the tribal government is based upon colonial Spain’s desire to regulate and control Indigenous peoples, the Tigua have modified this to fit their own social context, mixing sacred traditions into colonial structure in the process.

The Tigua Constitution represents an increased awareness among tribal leaders of their social status at the end on the nineteenth-century. During the onset of the Progressive Era, federal policies such as the Dawes Act (1887) and the Curtis Act (1898) sought to break up and privatize Indian land, assimilate Indigenous peoples, and transfer their land to non-Indians. Combined with the entry of Indians into the nation’s expanding wage labor economy, these dynamics seemingly reinforced contemporary notions that Indians would vanish into civilization. Although the Tiguas had retained their tribal organization, language, and scared traditions, such as ceremonial dances, many Anglos believed that the tribe would eventually lose their culture and assimilate fully into Mexican and American society.

This placed the Tiguas into a quandary because they could not escape the realities of modernity, and successful inclusion in the region’s emerging U.S. political economy depended upon various degrees of conformity. Speaking back to these pressures, the Tiguas sought to reaffirm and maintain their own self-rule, group identity, and community cohesion in unison with traditions.
their connections to place and family.\textsuperscript{164} This response to colonial modernity is evidenced by considering the tribal constitution as an act of negotiation, or resistance, in which tribal leaders sought to navigate the changing tides of American economic expansion while maintaining their Indigenous community and identity.

**Conclusion**

United States nation-state expansion after 1848 significantly altered the social and economic milieu for the Tigua community of Ysleta Del Sur. Yet as Tiguas experienced land loss and reduced social status, they negotiated their changing social environment by adapting to some impositions of U.S. colonization while resisting others, such as full cultural assimilation, and maintaining their Indigenous identities.\textsuperscript{165} Evoking Homi K. Bhabha’s concept of a “third space” of hybridity and its application through the positioning of Native peoples in a “third space of sovereignty,” I contend that Ysleta Del Sur’s Tiguas negotiated the complexities of U.S. and Mexican socio-economic and cultural hegemony while maintaining their distinct identities and traditions within an increasingly diminishing ethnic enclave over the course of the nineteenth-century.\textsuperscript{166}

Although late nineteenth-century ethnographers recognized Ysleta’s Tigua and validated their autonomous standing as a people, they either viewed them as Mexicanized or mistakenly predicted that they would eventually vanish into American society through increased assimilation and the loss of their “authentic” cultural autonomy. This viewpoint reinforced the colonial discourse that critiqued the region’s Tiguas, Piros, and Mansos and relegated them to past customs and practices in order to validate their authenticity as real Indians under the gaze of nineteenth-century ethnographers.\textsuperscript{167} Yet at this time, these chroniclers of Indigenous culture did not recognize
the differences between cultural continuity and the adaptation of new technologies and customs into the practice of longstanding sacred traditions as well as everyday life activities in the pueblo. Instead, their accounts illuminated the hybrid nature of Ysleta’s Tigua community as it persisted in Mexican society after numerous years of Spanish colonization as a mission-Indian pueblo.  

Towards the end of the nineteenth-century, the preservation of Ysleta’s Tigua community depended upon the continuation of its social and cultural traditions. In turn, this reinforced the Indigenous identity of its people as Tiguas apart from yet within the dominant Mexican and American society in which they lived. Cultural elements that helped support the persistence of Tigua identity included the maintenance of the clan system, language, governmental structure, and various sacred traditions, dances, and ceremonies.  

Although volatile social and environmental conditions in the El Paso area caused some Tiguas as well as Piros and Mansos to relocate to places such as Zaragoza, Tularosa, and Tortugas, many of these people still maintained their Indigenous identities as they lived among the region’s Mexican and Euro-American population.  

Yet because these Native communities and enclaves remained unrecognized by the United States federal government, they did not receive reservations, and their people lived within the shadows of Mexican and American society. Andrew H. Fisher attributes the persistence of Indigenous identity for unrecognized groups such as these to an ancestral connection with the land, resistance to and detachment from federal control, and the continued practice of cultural traditions.  

Examining the Pacific Northwest’s unrecognized Columbia River Indians, Fisher argues that they “are the product of social and political processes triggered by Euro-American colonization.” The Tigua of Ysleta, as well as the Piros, Mansos, and Tiguas from Tortugas, experienced a similar process, although it began much earlier during Spanish colonization.
Thus, by the late nineteenth-century, Anglo American expansion reinforced Indigenous identities in Ysleta and Tortugas. In this context, land dispossession, violence, and various other social changes caused Tiguas to make adjustments and negotiate their position through contestation, as exemplified through participation in the 1877 Salt War, and collusion as signified by collaboration with the U.S. Army and participation in the region’s emerging U.S. political economy as agricultural laborers.\textsuperscript{173} Cynthia Radding contends that although Indigenous identities survived under these types of circumstances, “the political, economic, and social dimensions of their cultural identity were radically changed through their relations with the dominant society and through the internal articulation of their communities.”\textsuperscript{174} Ysleta’s Tigua community did rearticulate through the absorption of and intermarriage with Piros from Senecú and some non-Indians, yet this aspect of community ethnogenesis did not significantly alter the internal hegemony of Tigua identity and culture because it had been retained and reinforced during the course of Spanish colonization under the protective auspices of Franciscan missionaries.\textsuperscript{175}

Tigua military service as scouts and guides for the U.S. Army and Texas Rangers signifies collaboration and collusion with the dominant society. Yet it also exemplifies how they adapted to and negotiated the region’s changing power dynamics to their own advantage by using newly arrived U.S. forces against old rivals such as the Apache.\textsuperscript{176} Radding defines this type of Indigenous response to colonial impositions as “resistant adaptation” and presents that Indians often used military participation as a means for social mobility in colonial settings.\textsuperscript{177} Although difficult to perceive as overt resistance, James C. Scott’s idea of covert resistance suggests that because Tigua military involvement held a different meaning for the Tigua, it signified an elusive type of conformity, or an unperceived resistance from within.\textsuperscript{178} Invoking Radding’s idea of “resistant adaptation,” Tigua military involvement also illuminates the way Indigenous peoples
contributed to their own colonization by “using colonial institutions to attain specific ends.”¹⁷⁹ Despite the possible complexities behind Tigua military service, I conclude that it served two basic purposes: reciprocity for past offences against the honor and livelihood of the community and its peoples, and social recognition with the possibility for social mobility and increased economic opportunities.

Although Ysleta’s Tiguas had always relied on farming as part of their subsistence economy, they lost most of their land to non-Indians. Between 1848 and the early 1900s, they transitioned from self-sufficient land owning farmers to landless wage laborers, often working in agricultural production on land that they had once owned. In addition, many Tiguas produced baskets and pottery and sold these craft items for additional income, often traveling as far as Chihuahua, Mexico.¹⁸⁰ These economic activities represent how some Tiguas adapted to the pressures of U.S occupation. Yet just because Tiguas lost most of their land, lived in impoverished conditions, and participated in economic occupations linked with the dominant society does not mean that they fully assimilated into the region’s predominant mestizo community. Instead, they responded to outside pressures by strengthening their resolve and creating the 1895 Tribal Constitution, determined to maintain their identity as Tiguas and carry on their sacred cultural traditions.¹⁸¹

This persistence to maintain their cultural autonomy as a people under significant pressure from U.S. society enabled the Tigua community in Ysleta Del Sur to maintain their traditions and their collective Indigenous identity into the twentieth-century. Yet the survival mechanisms that the Tigua used to negotiate the racist violence and discrimination of the early twentieth-century Progressive Era often caused them to deny their Indianness and identify as Spanish or Mexican, and this norm carried on throughout the twentieth-century until the 1960s, when Ysleta’s Tiguas
experienced a cultural rebirth. As the next chapter will show, Tigua identity persisted throughout the early twentieth-century as tribal members continued to negotiate their Indigeneity in public and private spaces, using their ambiguous and mistakenly perceived status as Mexican-Indians to their advantage in some situations and displaying their Indianness in others.
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Chapter 5:
Living In the Shadows: Community Change and Continuity during The Early Twentieth-Century

Indians survived mainly by farming and working together. I know I worked on farms as a laborer and also did construction work, and I was very good at making adobe which is made by mixing mud and straw and water and letting it dry.¹

Negotiating Identity during the Progressive and New Deal Eras

From the late nineteenth-century to the 1930s, the Tigua community in Ysleta, Texas persisted despite poverty, discrimination, and popular assumptions that they would soon assimilate into Mexican society. Here the Tiguas maintained their Indigenous identity and culture within a distinct yet ambiguous enclave known as the “Barrio de Los Indios,” or Indian neighborhood in Ysleta. What made Ysleta’s Tigua Barrio ambiguous to outsiders was that various Mexican-Americans resided there, and their presence seemingly reified the notion that the neighborhood Indians would eventually become “Mexicanized.”²

Although events and demographic changes in Ysleta over the last century had reshaped the Tigua community, they had not erased it. As Tiguas negotiated their changing social environment during the early twentieth-century, they adapted to the region’s absorption into the national political economy by working as agricultural laborers, attending the Albuquerque Indian boarding School, and presenting their traditional dances at public events. They also maintained kinship networks and social ties by living in distinct neighborhoods that mirrored the spatial layout of pre-land dispossession cultural landscapes. Through external pressures such as redlining, racial discrimination, and “barrioization,” Tigua inter-personal and inter-familial bonds and social
relationships supported the face-to-face interactions that formed the core of a distinct Tigua identity. These kin networks and extended family ties were typically beyond the purview of the general public and may not have gained the attention of civil officials and municipal representatives. However, public displays of Indigenous culture not only reaffirmed the internal continuity of their scared traditions, they also served to reify their Indigeneity within the public sphere and establish them as a living people who had not vanished into the past, as many had assumed.

Maintaining community and familial interaction through activities such as agricultural labor, midwifery, and public ceremonies such as Saint Anthony’s Day helped reinforce their identities as an Indigenous people with a history rooted in place and tradition. Tribal identity solidified during this period despite the heterogeneous nature of the community. As various Piros moved to Ysleta and intermarried with Tiguas, they became Tiguas according to tribal culture, and over time, their children identified as Tigua. Negotiating their public identities, some Tiguas may have hidden their Indigenous identity to gain access to employment and avoid violence against Indians by groups like the Texas Rangers. They also attended Indian boarding schools where they negotiated between being Indian and the pressures of assimilation. Public presentations of dancing and culture at events such as the 1936 Texas Centennial also reinforced their identities as Tigua Indians. This tribal identity also manifested itself through their emergence within the region’s historical grand narrative as active participants in its history as mission-Indians. As an unrecognized Indian community who lived in the shadows off reservations, they resiliently persisted and negotiated their circumstances to the best of their ability as they lived amongst a predominantly Mexican and American population.
Progressive Era and New Deal State and Federal Indian Policy

During the early Progressive Era, the United States sought to culturally assimilate Native Americans as second class citizens and privatize Indian lands. Seeking to indoctrinate American Indians into the nation-state, the federal government shipped children from reservations to boarding schools, educated them in English, and encouraged them to integrate into mainstream society. The 1887 General Allotment Act (Dawes Act) created tribal rolls, established a baseline for blood quantum, and distributed private allotments of reservation lands to eligible members of various Indian tribes who already lived on reservations. The goal of the Dawes Act was to end communal land use on reservations by distributing individual land allotments. After distributing relatively small land allotments to eligible Indians, the government sold the leftover lands to speculators, farmers, and miners. Between 1887 and 1934, this policy reduced Native American reservation landholdings from approximately 138 million to 48 million acres.\(^4\)

Within this national context, the Tiguas found themselves nationally obscured because of their status as an unrecognized mission-Indian community. Although the Dawes Act did not affect Ysleta, federal Indian policy enabled speculators and bureaucrats to privatize Tigua land because Texas retained sovereignty over its public lands in 1845 upon being annexed to the United States. In addition, the Supreme Court Case United States v. Joseph (1876) viewed New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians as “civilized” and released their land from federal protection. As such, the Supreme Court’s decision, the Dawes Act, and Texas sovereignty all exemplified state and federal objectives to assimilate Indians and privatize their lands. By the end of the nineteenth-century, popular assumptions that the Tiguas had been “Mexicanized” had obscured their status as an Indian pueblo. Responding to these pressures, the Tiguas wrote a Tribal Constitution in 1895 that outlined their
tribal government and policies. By the early twentieth-century, the Tiguas lived in the shadows, unrecognized by state and federal governments.  

Although Texas Indian policy is non-existent between 1880 and 1927, federal policies further marginalized the Tigua. In 1913, the Supreme Court case Sandoval v. United States recognized the land claims of New Mexico’s Mexican citizens as well as Pueblo Indians per the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. Placing New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians and their land under federal wardship, this policy excluded Ysleta’s Tiguas because Texas retained sovereignty over its public lands. Citizenship also remained elusive for the Tigua until 1924, when the Indian Citizenship Act (ICA) granted citizenship to all American Indians. Seeking to assimilate Indians as individual citizens, ICA did little to help Indians improve their social status.  

Although Indians gained citizenship in 1924, they still did not hold equal voting rights. At the national level, restrictions in many states excluded Indians from voting. Indians living on reservations in some Western and Midwestern states including New Mexico could not vote because they did not pay property taxes. In others, such as California, local officials and county registrars decided which Indians could vote according to how “civilized” they were. In Jim Crow Texas, Tiguas could only vote if they paid a poll tax. Even before ICA passed, it is likely that some Tiguas identified as Mexicans in order vote in local elections. For Indians unable to afford the poll tax, voting and participating in tribal council elections was their only political activity. Yet this likely strengthened group cohesiveness among community members and tribal identities, thus undermining ICA’s objective to assimilate citizens into the mainstream society.  

By the late 1920s, numerous Native Americans had lost their land and lived in poverty. In response, reformers advocated for the protection of Indian communities. Under the auspices of the Brookings Institution, Luis Meriam published a report in 1928 entitled The Problem of Indian
Administration. Known as the Meriam Report, this document informed policy makers that as Indians lost their land, they experienced high levels of poverty, insufficient health standards, high death rates and low birth rates. During the New Deal era, this report influenced Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier and Secretary of Interior Harold Ickes to end the assimilationist movement. Subsequently, these policymakers ended the allotment system, abolished boarding school requirements, and supported Native American cultural preservation. In 1934, Collier influenced Congress to pass the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), which placed all federally recognized Indian land into a trust, reclaimed land sold to individuals during the allotment period, and guaranteed Native American rights to self-determination, tribal government, culture, and identity. Thus, by the 1930s, state and federal Indian policies had excluded the Tigua of the Ysleta pueblo because of their ambiguous status as a borderlands community. Isolated by Texas’ sovereignty, the Tigua maintained their tribal government through familial and kinship ties that bonded the pueblo into a tight knit social organization that appeared elusive to outsiders.

Identity and Place

In the wake of the land dispossession of the 1800s, many Tiguas lived in adobe dwellings in close proximity to the Ysleta mission church, while others lived on scattered plots throughout Ysleta. Still others moved to Tortugas and other places in New Mexico for employment opportunities, such as working on the railroad or working in agriculture. In 1907, the Ysleta mission church burned down because of two candles that had been left aflame at the altar. It was rebuilt in 1908. During its reconstruction, many Tiguas complained because the original bells had been removed and placed on church grounds. Around this time, many of Ysleta’s Tiguas settled
about eight blocks east of the mission church, interspersed among their Mexican-American neighbors in an area known as the “Barrio de los Indios” or Indian neighborhood.\textsuperscript{11}

As an Indigenous social space, the Barrio de Los Indios significantly helped preserve kinship, family, and community networks through constant interaction and relationships between Tigua Indians. Although the presence of Mexicans and Anglos in Ysleta impinged upon the lives of the Tiguas, they still identified as Indians. Visits to Hueco Tanks kept them connected with their traditional cultural landscape, and annual elections to tribal council positions helped them maintain their traditional form of government and redefine themselves as Indians in a diverse social environment.\textsuperscript{12} Importantly, they sustained their identities as members of a group within the larger community. Donald Fixico explains that for Indigenous peoples

> Group orientation helped define identity and role for each person. This gave overall purpose to life. Beyond extended families, each person belonged to a clan or society making Indian life systematic and complex. Belonging to a community, clan/society, and extended family provided security and safety for everyone—child, teenager, adult, and elder. Cousins and close relatives are part of the immediate orbit of extended families. It is part of the norm to have relatives constantly around. In fact, growing up with cousins living nearby is a part of Indian life. In this way, it seems that everyone is related to each other. This also means that everyone knows each other and who their people are. And, belonging is pertinent to Indian people. Belonging to a community means security and protection. A person is never alone in such an existence.\textsuperscript{13}

Taking Fixico’s assessment into consideration, it becomes apparent that the tight knit social network within the Tigua community of Barrio de Los Indios instilled a sense of being and belonging that superseded the presence of outsiders in Ysleta. In a sense, the Barrio de Los Indios inhabits what Homi K. Bhabha and Kevin Bruyneel refer to as a “third space” between ethnic and spatial definitions of Indianness and Mexicanness, a space of agency, collusion, and resistance to colonization.\textsuperscript{14} In short, this community enclave offered the people the social space to be Tiguas.

Housing in the Barrio de los Indios consisted of small adobe dwellings from one to three rooms with no electricity, plumbing, or running water. Here the Tiguas lived in often overcrowded
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and impoverished conditions in which up to eight people shared three small rooms.\textsuperscript{15} For water, Tiguas often dug wells and drew water using ropes and buckets as well as hand pumps. For cooking, they used small wood burning bell shaped stoves called “campanas” (similar to chimineas), which rested in the corners of these dwellings. These stoves also provided heat in the winter. Outdoors they used larger mound shaped adobe ovens called “ornos” or “fogons.” Brush and mesquite wood as well as cow dung served as the main sources of energy for these stoves. Tribal elders often made clay pots for cooking and painted some of these with Tigua figures and designs, although most did not get painted.\textsuperscript{16}

Tiguas continued to practice their own subsistence economic activities, yet these increasingly diminished as the region became incorporated into the U.S. capitalist economy. Primary economic activities consisted of hunting, fishing, and farming.\textsuperscript{17} They hunted deer and rabbits in the sand hills near Zaragoza and around Hueco Tanks. Tiguas hunters always shared venison with other tribal members and often shared with Ysleta’s Mexican “vecino” people as well. Yet as white farmers and ranchers privatized and fenced off the land, they disrupted Tigua hunting patterns, pushing them away from subsistence activities, such as hunting and resource gathering, into the area’s wage labor economy.\textsuperscript{18} Tiguas who owned small plots of land continued growing corn and other crops, yet many did not own land and became increasingly dependent on agricultural wage labor for survival. Fishing in the Rio Grande River also played a major role in the Tigua subsistence economy, especially before the completion of Elephant Butte Dam in 1916. When the river was higher, they used spears, hooks, and nets to catch catfish and carp.\textsuperscript{19} Wood gathering, mainly mesquite, served as another primary subsistence activity. Yet this too became problematic as whites increasingly enclosed the land around the sand-hills and Hueco Tanks.\textsuperscript{20}
During the early twentieth-century, some Mexicans and whites excluded the Tigua from their traditional land base in Hueco Tanks, the sand-hills, and surrounding mountains where they hunted and gathered herbs and firewood. Hueco Tanks had always been culturally significant for the Tigua and some of its caves are named after tribal members. Miguel Pedraza, who served as tribal governor in the late 1960s, stated that one cave there is named after his father, Luz Pedraza. Other caves there are named after tribal caciques Demasio Colmenero and Melatone Holguín. According to Pablo Silvas, the Tiguas referred to Hueco Tanks as “Sierra Waco” and often hunted deer there. Illustrating how non-Indians impinged upon tribal lifeways in Hueco Tanks, Silvas explained that

One day, a man by the name of Juan Armandariz moved onto the land, started paying taxes and claiming the land as his own. From Mr. Armandariz the land went to Silverio Escontrias, who when he died, it went to his wife and family. Then Juan Escontrias took over the land and he was extremely mean. He put up fences to keep the Indians out and would fence off water and the deer. Mr. Juan Escontrias then sold to Mr. Ruby Davis. My. Ruby Davis was extremely nice and the Tigua Indians regarded him as one of the nicest white men they had known. Mr. Ruby Davis would let the Indians come onto the land and hunt and to gather fire wood just like it was before Juan Armandariz took the land away. When Mr. Ruby Davis got old, he sold the land to a man by the name of O’Leary.

Tigua access to their territorial landscape fluctuated according to the whims and attitudes of non-Indian property owners. Between the 1930s and the 1950s, Tiguas often visited Hueco Tanks for ceremonial purposes. During the 1930s, Cacique Demasio Colmenero and Sebastian Duran went there with the tribal drum dressed in traditional clothing used for ceremonies and public performances. In 1947, Cacique Thomas Granillo was photographed there in traditional Tigua clothing on horseback. And, in 1959, various members of the Silvas family visited there with the tribal drum in hand. Thus, although the privatization of Hueco Tanks excluded the Tigua from legal ownership, it did not change the meaning of this sacred place for them, nor fully exclude them from it.
Similarly, the sand-hills near Zaragoza served a significant role in the Tigua subsistence landscape. Here white settlers more successfully excluded Tiguas from access to the land and its resources. In this area, Tiguas hunted deer and rabbit and often gathered firewood. Yet land privatization here also disrupted the tribal lifeway. Pedraza explained that the Tiguas used to hunt all over this land, but after a while the gringo ranchers put up fences and would not let us enter even though we told them it was Indian land. The white man would not even let us collect fire wood from the sandhills. We told them this was Indian land and that we had always took firewood from the sandhills, but they still ran us off. I remember one man named James Woldridge who found me picking some firewood and chased me off the land and almost shot me….as more white men moved in, they would take over our land and then put up fences so that we could not hunt or collect wood any more.

Non-Indian incursions upon the Tigua subsistence landscape placed more economic pressures on the people, which in turn caused them to become more dependent on wage labor for their survival. Because the Tigua had always relied on agriculture in their subsistence economy, the privatization of their landscape accelerated their transition into the national economy as farm laborers during the early twentieth-century.

Farming also served the Tigua subsistence economy. Yet as whites took over the land, Tiguas increasingly worked as laborers instead of subsistence farmers. If Tiguas owned their own land, they often farmed corn, beans, and chili, among other crops. Those who did not own land often helped land owning Tiguas for a share of the crop. Others worked for large white owned farms as laborers, picking melons and cotton. During the early twentieth-century before cotton production increased in the mid-1920s, many likely picked grapes along with alfalfa and melons. Tiguas also worked as laborers in a large scale agricultural system in which small farmers supplied a large cooperative made up of the El Paso Valley Cotton Association and the Southwestern Irrigated Cotton Growers Association. As agricultural workers in the fields, whole families often assisted. Pedraza explained that groups of fifteen to twenty Tiguas, including children, picked
Looking at Indian agricultural workers, William J. Bauer explains that Indians from California’s Round Valley Reservation worked as agricultural wage laborers to maintain their community identities, survive economically, and retain their connection to the land. In this way, “Indians used work and economic change to their advantage in order to survive and persist in the twentieth century.”

Although the El Paso region flourished as an agricultural production center after the construction of Elephant Butte Dam, this did little to benefit the Tigua beyond keeping them dependent on seasonal employment that held no real certainty nor job security.

Despite this, agricultural work helped the Tiguas maintain a sense of community and tradition as they negotiated the external pressures of capitalist expansion. One reason for this is that Tigua experiences with the land pre-dated the Spanish arrival in the 1500s and made up a significant part of their cosmology. Another involves the idea that group cohesion increased as kinship networks and whole families worked together in the fields. Similar to agrarian wage labor activities by other Indigenous groups, this group involvement likely reinforced traditional intra-community power dynamics in which leaders directed workers, as well as created new ones as farmers made demands upon them according to the dictates of capitalist production. In this way, agricultural fieldwork enhanced the Tigua collective community identity as they rearticulated themselves within new social contexts.

In addition to agriculture, various Tiguas also found employment as railroad workers during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Fewkes reported that such jobs caused some migration into New Mexico, where Tiguas settled in Las Cruces, Tularosa, and other locations near railroad lines. In the Southwest, the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific railroads employed numerous Mexicans and Indians to work on the railroads. At the time of Fewke’s visit
in 1902, prominent El Paso railroads included the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe and the El Paso and Southwestern railroads. For companies such as these, Tiguas likely worked alongside Mexicans and other Pueblo Indians. In addition, Apaches, Sioux, Navajo, Yaqui, and Zapotec Indians worked on these railroads. While many of these workers identified as Indian, others identified as Mexican, and it is likely that Tiguas either identified as Mexican in order to gain employment as railroad workers or the railroad considered them Mexican regardless of who they said they were. In New Mexico, the Santa Fe Railroad hired Laguna Pueblo Indians in exchange for the right to use their land. Yet from the 1880s, Mexicans predominated as railroad workers, and it is highly likely that Tiguas identified as Mexican to gain employment with the railroad.33

Tigua women also contributed to household incomes through domestic tasks such as doing laundry and housekeeping. Aside from household tasks such as making adobe clay pots and wooden spoons and cooking, women also worked in other people’s homes. Tribal member Pablo Silvas recalled that his mother often washed clothes for whites “in order to make a little money for the family.”34 In 1990, the oldest living member of the tribe, eighty-nine year old Ramona Parras Paiz, stated that she married because “life was difficult, and I worked very hard…I worked most of my life cleaning other people’s houses. I thought things would get easier, but things only got worse.”35 While growing up in Ysleta, Paiz did not attend school, nor learn English. She married at the age of fifteen and mothered seven children. Living in a one bedroom home with no electricity, she chopped wood every day for cooking and keeping warm in the winter.36

While most Tigua men worked as seasonal agricultural laborers, some moved into other jobs that offered them more economic stability. For example, Pablo Carbajal, a tribal member who grew up in Ysleta during the early twentieth-century stated that his father worked on the railroad to make extra money for his family. Although Carbajal worked on a farm before the 1930s, he then
“joined the grading camp” and then later “went to work for the State Highway Department as a grader and worked for them for 35 years.”\textsuperscript{37} Considering that Carbajal was sixty-nine years old during the recognition period of the late 1960s and early 70s, when his statement was recorded, it is likely that he entered into a New Deal program during the 1930s, learned a trade, and found employment working on state road development.

Both Tigua men and women served the community as midwives and medicine men during the early twentieth century, due to a lack of doctor’s and access to healthcare. Telling his life story during the late 1960s, sixty-five year old tribal member Miguel Pedraza stated that “I was born in an old adobe house along the canal that runs through Ysleta. There was no doctor, so like all the others, I was delivered by an old Indian (Tigua) woman by the name of Antonio Orona.”\textsuperscript{38} According to tribal member Pablo Silvas, the Tiguas did not have access to western doctors or medicine, so they made their own medicines using herbs that they gathered from the countryside. Silvas explained that

Some of these medicines estafiate, which is a plant and is used when you have a stomach ache. We also used mint and ojosen, which were also used for the stomach. When little children got sick or had a stomach sickness we would use pageable. There is also the medicine Popotio which was used for the kidneys to keep them fresh. Whenever anyone had a fever we would use lanten, which were leaves and were placed on the head with a secure rag. As these leaves would dry out, they would relieve the fever or headache. We also used what is called bavisa, which is ground up or milled into powder…then sprinkled on a cut or a wound which has become infected. This bavisa would then get rid of the infection or prevent it from becoming infected.\textsuperscript{39}

Silvas’s testimony elucidates how Tigua community healthcare during the early 1900s intertwined with traditional knowledge about herbal medicine and their connections to the land. Yet the emerging U.S. bureaucracy impinged upon these traditional lifeways just as much as the privatization of the tribe’s subsistence landscape. Silvas explained that because of the people’s dependency on midwives for childbirth, Tiguas did not obtain birth certificates and that they
needed to apply for them at the county courthouse after the fact. In this changing social environment, Ysleta’s Tiguas maintained these traditions in order to survive.

In addition to gathering herbs, Tiguas used mesquite beans and tornillo beans to make a hot drink called atole, and they used corn and grapes to make an alcoholic tesguino and wine. Atole, which is often referred to in Mexico as “champurrado,” is similar to coffee and hot chocolate and is made by putting mesquite beans or tornillo beans into boiling hot water and stirring it until it becomes syrupy. Tesguino, also known as corn beer, is an alcoholic beverage made by grinding up germinating corn and letting it ferment for a few days. Piro Indian Guadalupe Padilla explained that they made wine by putting grapes into large tubs and pressing them down with bare feet. In this way, they made wine and “aguardiente,” which is a stronger alcoholic drink.

For most of the twentieth-century before tribal recognition, the Tigua maintained their sacred traditions through private meetings at the residence of the War Captain. Located in the middle of Ysleta’s Barrio de Los Indios, the War Captain’s small adobe home served as the tusla, or kiva, which at this time can be described as the people’s cultural community center. Here they collectively met, danced, and practiced their traditions in the tribal “tusla,” located in the home’s rear bedroom. Dancing and ceremonies involving large groups took place outside the War Captain’s home on a fifteen foot ramada, or patio, shaded by a lattice wood framed structure covered with twigs and small branches. The “tusla” also served as the storage place for the tribe’s sacred possessions, such as the drum, bows and arrows, and abuelo masks, similar to Katchina masks. By this time, the War Captain’s role had changed from leading war parties to the oversight of sacred tribal ceremonies and artifacts.

The Ysleta Church held and still holds a significant place in Tigua culture, serving as a space for community gathering and identity reinforcement. Although colonial Spain initially
named the church, “Corpus Christie de los Tiguas” in 1692, the Tiguas have always honored Saint Anthony since their arrival from Isleta, New Mexico. After secularization, the Bishop changed its name to Nuestra Señora del Carmen, yet Ysleta’s Tiguas still maintained their allegiance to their original patron saint, Saint Anthony. The celebration of Saint Anthony’s Day on church grounds every June exemplifies how the church and Tigua identity are intertwined through the continuity of cultural traditions. During the early twentieth-century, these celebrations helped maintain both cultural and community cohesion for Ysleta’s Tiguas.

Festivities in Ysleta also helped maintain ties between Tiguas and Piros from Tortugas during the Progressive Era. By this time, the Piro and Manso enclaves that existed in Senecú and Juárez had been significantly fragmented, while the Tigua community in Ysleta remained intact. This disruption of Piro and Manso settlements in Senecú and Juarez began in the 1850s and culminated during the Mexican Revolution, when many of these Indians fled to the United States and settled in Ysleta, Las Cruces, and Tortugas. In the late 1960s, seventy four year old Vicenta Avalos Roybal, who identified as a Tigua tribal member from Tortugas pueblo, explained that as a boy he often traveled to Ysleta, Texas, to dance and sing and that Tiguas from both Ysleta, Texas, and Isleta, New Mexico, often traveled to Tortugas to do the same. In this way, festivals and culture helped maintain links between separate Tigua communities during the early twentieth-century.

Regardless of the appearance of cultural unification, these communities did maintain boundaries between each other. Although he illustrated the interconnectedness between Tiguas from Tortugas, Ysleta, Texas and Isleta, New Mexico, Roybal also noted how members of these communities distinctly identified according to place. Roybal explained that “there was an understanding among the Tigua Pueblo here in Tortugas with the Tigua of Ysleta, Texas, that
should an Indian from the Pueblo in Ysleta, Texas, come to Tortugas, then they would transfer his membership in the Tigua Tribe to the new one in Tortugas, New Mexico.” This elucidates that these groups self-identified and suggests that factionalism existed between them. Tribal member Joe Sierra illuminated this tension when he explained that his forefathers often warned them about Tortugas Indians who attended dances in Ysleta in an attempt to get the Tiguas drunk and steal their sacred drum. Presumably, the Tortugas men knew that the drum not only symbolized and reinforced Tigua identity, but that its possession validated that identity both culturally and socially.

In this early twentieth-century context, Tiguas in Ysleta, Texas, had good cause to worry about their tribal identity and protect its authenticity in relation to other groups in the region. One reason for this is that most mainstream Americans did not fully understand the heterogeneous nature of Indigenous communities, much less that of Ysleta’s Tigua who resided in a cultural enclave amongst Mexicans and Euro-Americans and absorbed some outsiders into their community, such as Piros from Senecú, in order to maintain and regenerate its population base.

This absorption of Piros and others into Ysleta’s Tigua society is empirically evidenced in various instances. For example, Miguel Pedraza’s grandfather, Toribio Pedraza, was a Piro from Senecú, who became a Tigua after he married an Ysleta Tigua woman named Cesaria. Pablo Silvas’s father, Luis Silvas, became a Tigua after he married tribal member Isabelle Granillo. And Pablo Carbajal’s mother, Margarita Pedraza Carbajal was half Tigua and half Piro from Senecú. Similarly, Herminia Silvas explained that although her mother, Ramona Parra Paíz, stems from Tigua lineage, her father, Antonio Paíz was half Senecú Piro and half Apache Indian. While some Tiguas who grew up in Ysleta during the first half of the twentieth-century knew of their heterogeneous ancestry, others simply identified as Tigua regardless of possible Piro ancestry.
Even in cases where tribal members in Ysleta identified as strictly Tigua, traces of Piro ancestry appear within the nomenclature of their Indigenous lineage. For example, Jose Trinidad Granillo, Pablo Silvas, and Andreas Granillo are all grandchildren of Nestora Piarote Granillo. According to Nicholas Houser, this suggests that they are descendants of both Tiguas and Piros because the name Piarote is rooted with the affix, Piro, and followed by the suffix, rote, which signifies something large in the Spanish language, hence, creating the name Piarote, or “big-Piro.” Since this name is found in the Granillo family lineage, this suggests Piro as well as Tigua ancestry in the family history. Although it is difficult to know exactly what the lineage of every community member is according to limitations in the data, what is available does suggest that intermarriage between Tiguas, Piros, and others commonly occurred during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The absorption of Piros and others into Ysleta’s Tigua community did not decrease its Indigenous Tigua identity. This is because Tiguas viewed and accepted outsiders who had been absorbed into the community as Tiguas, and this especially pertained to Piros and other Indians who intermarried and lived among them. According to Jose Trinidad Granillo, one is either born into the tribe or adopted through intermarriage after proving themselves. In the case of the latter, one must adopt tribal culture and “live like an Indian.” During the early twentieth-century, Tigua and Piro identities merged through territorial proximity as well as cultural fusion and innovation. Pablo Carbajal explained that Ysleta’s Tiguas accepted Piros from Senecú, who danced with the Tiguas and considered themselves part of the Tigua community, but did not accept non-Indian whites and vecinos. Pedraza confirmed this, stating that one is either born, married, or adopted into the tribe, and that the latter pertained to “Indians, mostly Piro, who were raised with...or have been adopted into the Tribe and are now full Tigua Indians.”
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Violence, Texas Rangers, and Hidden Indigenous Identity

To avoid discrimination and violence, many Tiguas identified as Mexican instead of Indian regardless of their ancestry. Much of the violence against Tiguas occurred at the hands of the Texas Rangers. This is ironic because Tigua scouts often assisted Texas Rangers during campaigns against Apaches and others who raided the area’s settlements during the 1800s, and Texas Rangers often targeted Mexicans as well as Indians. Nevertheless, Tiguas experienced a significant amount of discrimination and violence by Texas Rangers and other non-Indians, which often caused them to identify as Spanish or Mexican in an attempt to hide their Indian identity.61

Tiguas often identified as Mexican during the early twentieth-century to avoid discrimination in public. Yet this often obscured their presence and reinforced the notion that Ysleta’s Indians had become Mexican. Outsiders often perceived Tiguas as Mexicans because they often wore cotton clothing instead of the colorful stereotypical Indian regalia, which was mostly used during ceremonies and dances by this time.62 Also, whites often treated Mexicans better than Indians, and identifying as Mexican gave Tiguas access to economic opportunities such as working for the railroad. This type of discrimination became especially apparent in 1932, when Texas created a pension plan for those who served in the Texas Rangers between 1877 and 1908 and did not include Tigua scouts in the program. Thus, to avoid prejudice and discrimination, Tiguas often externally identified as Mexican while maintaining their internal identities as Indians. Whether they identified as Indian or Mexican, white society in Texas during the Jim Crow area excluded both groups from voting through the use of the poll tax. In one instance, the El Paso Times illuminated how local politicians excluded and included Tiguas in the voting process by reporting that El Paso County Attorney Dave Mulcahy recommended that they be exempted from the poll tax in order to vote during a 1934 local primary election.63
Violent acts committed against Indians by Texas Rangers and others also influenced many Tiguas to identify as Mexican during the early twentieth-century. According to anthropologist S. K. Adam, one Tigua stated that before the 1950s, “You could either be a live Mexican or a Dead Indian.” While this may seem to be an over exaggeration, violence often posed a very real threat for the Tiguas at this time. In 1915, Texas Rangers killed Miguel Pedraza’s father in front of his own home. Pedraza described the incident as follows:

As I recall, there had been some little argument with some other Indian, who had gone to the white man and complained about my father. When my father got home, he got off the street car and someone told him the Texas Rangers were looking for him. He went to his house because he didn’t want to Rangers to arrest him. I was at my grandmother’s house which was next door at the time. When my father got to his house, the Texas Rangers found him and there was shooting. One of the Rangers shot my father in the back of the head right in front of his own house. My grandmother and I ran over there, but the Texas Rangers did not get close to my father, they just stood away pointing their pistols at him. My grandmother ran over to him and turned him over, but he was dying and there was nothing we could do. We then buried my father in the old Mission Cemetery with many of the other Tiguas.

This incident traumatized Ysleta’s Tigua Indian community and likely caused some of its members to hide their Indigenous identity in public. Yet it is likely that most Texas Rangers viewed the Tiguas as Mexicans in the first place and would have acted violently regardless as to whether or not they perceived them as Mexican or Indian. Pablo Carbajal’s statement supports this idea in that Texas Rangers often hit and taunted Indians and Mexicans who went to town after eight o’clock in the evening.

In other instances, Texas Rangers and Mexicans both physically abused and threatened Tigua Indians, which also contributed to the suppression of their Indigenous identity in public. According to Pablo Silvas, both whites and Mexicans abused Tiguas, and in one instance, Silvas recalled that Texas Rangers tied Thomas Granillo and Felipe Cruz to a tree, then untied them and took them to the river, where they planned to kill them. Yet Granillo and Cruz freed themselves.
and escaped.\textsuperscript{68} On another occasion, a Mexican claiming to be an Indian chief named “Chiwee” attempted to kidnap some of the tribe’s young women. The Tiguas caught on to him, however, and ran him out of the neighborhood with sticks and rocks. In another instance, Texas Rangers brought Demasio Colmenero to the river and threatened to hurt him. Although Colmenero escaped uninjured, the implications for being Indian were obvious. If Tiguas identified as Indians in public, they stood the chance of being assaulted.\textsuperscript{69} However, this does not rule out the fact that Texas Rangers committed numerous acts of violence against Mexicans and Indians.

During the early twentieth-century, Tiguas often identified as Mexican in public to gain access to various opportunities and avoid discrimination and violence. Because of Ysleta’s intertwined Mexican and Indian ethnic environment, Tiguas negotiated between these two categories, appearing as Mexican in public when it served their best interests. Yet in private, Tiguas retained their Indian identity through their association with place, people, and various cultural traditions.\textsuperscript{70} Although the Tiguas repressed their Indigenous identity in public in some social settings, they emphasized their identity as Pueblo Indians in others. This is especially true when it came to opportunities to attend Indian boarding schools.

**Tiguas Negotiating Identity in Indian Boarding School**

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Progressive Era, Indian boarding schools sought to assimilate Native Americans into mainstream American society. Although the United States government subsidized mission schools as early as 1810, the first federal off reservation boarding school opened in 1879 in Carlisle, Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{71} Known as the Carlisle Indian School, this institution sought to civilize Native Americans by “killing the Indian and saving the man or woman.” Subsequently, various other Indian boarding schools echoed the Carlisle
school’s objective to acculturate and assimilate Indian children into civilized society. This process of cultural genocide involved the forced relocation of children from their communities and families to various boarding schools, many of them centrally located in regions heavily populated by Native Americans.\textsuperscript{72}

Indian boarding schools held the objective of erasing one’s Indigenous culture and identity. Emphasizing citizenship and vocational skills, boarding schools required its students to wear military style uniforms and speak English only. Indian students often resisted and spoke their home languages, and some became homesick and ran away. In the summer, some boarding schools hired students out as cheap labor to farms and other industries. Yet many parents viewed boarding schools as a way for the next generation to escape poverty and adjust to life in the United States. Food, clothing, and shelter appeared attractive to students from poor communities. Ultimately, many of the federal schools away from the reservation did not assimilate Indians into mainstream society. And, the presence of students from various tribes often reinforced one’s tribal identity.\textsuperscript{73}

Although many Native Americans resisted or fell into depression and committed suicide, boarding schools appeared attractive to groups like the Tiguas for many reasons. Many Indians accommodated completely, while others culturally adapted without surrendering their traditions. Often, parents and tribal elders believed that an education would offer the next generation some advantages and help prepare future tribal leaders. This caused them to encourage children to attend the schools. In some cases, Indian students truly believed that an education would bring them out of savagery and into civilization. Others attended because they believed that their only choices involved assimilation or extinction. While some felt that an education would benefit tribal interests, others sought to escape from poverty, dysfunctional families, and oppressive tribal
traditions. Once enrolled, many students overcame the trauma of separation and got along with their teachers. And, brothers and sisters of returning students often attended as well.\textsuperscript{74}

Most Pueblo Indians and others from the New Mexico region either attended the Albuquerque Indian School, which opened in 1881, or the Santa Fe Indian School, which opened in 1890. Because of their proximity to Albuquerque, many Indian children from Ysleta del Sur, Tortugas, and other communities along the lower Rio Grande attended the Albuquerque Indian School.\textsuperscript{75} Not all Native American children from Ysleta, El Paso, and the lower Rio Grande attended the Albuquerque Indian School. Yet some of those that did likely viewed it as an opportunity to get an education and escape the poverty within the community.

One of the reasons that Tiguas likely viewed boarding schools as an alternative is that opportunities hardly existed in Ysleta by the turn of the twentieth-century. Beginning in 1659, Franciscan missionaries taught Tiguas how to read and write in Spanish as well as other basic vocational skills such as handicraft and sewing. By the mid-nineteenth-century, however, many Tiguas in Ysleta did not attend school, and illiteracy ran hand in hand with poverty. According to Houser, “It is probably a correct statement that there were more literate Tigua Indians in 1760 than in 1860.”\textsuperscript{76} In Texas, El Paso opened its first public school in 1881 and Ysleta in 1884. During the 1920s and 1930s, schools in Ysleta promoted slogans such as “I can’t is un-American” and celebrated the region’s cowboy culture. Emphasizing Americanization in a way that reflected late nineteenth-century social-Darwinist views, these schools segregated students by race and nationality and taught “English only” classes until the 1940s.\textsuperscript{77} Some Tiguas such as Ramona Paiz never learned English and never went to school. Many worked in the fields to help support their families. Those who did go often went barefooted and were ridiculed by whites and Mexicans
alike. By the 1940s, the average Tigua who attended school in Ysleta received a third grade education. In this context, attending an Indian boarding school did appeal to some Tiguas.

Between 1894 and 1907, various Tiguas and other Indians from the region attended the Albuquerque Indian School. Actual attendance from Ysleta is somewhat unclear because some Tiguas are listed as living in El Paso. Houser noted more than twenty Ysleta Indians at the school, and Melitón Holguín, a Tigua from Ysleta who attended the Albuquerque school between 1904 and 1910, believed that around twenty-five Tiguas from Ysleta attended the school.

Table 5.1: Enrollment in Albuquerque Indian School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tigua Students from Ysleta</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Date enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Gonzales</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigno Gonzales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres Colmenero</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Ajiyo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo Granillo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Piarote</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Piarote</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysidro Colmenero</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliton Olguin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Olguin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciano Paiz</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Paiz</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrico Cooper</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Cooper</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas Pedregon</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demasaio Paria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Rodella</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ysidro Rodella</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugia Paiz</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilar Acequia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Rodella</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Perez</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad Espalin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Espalin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Lozoya</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>07-27-1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Nogales ¾ Tigua ?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10-27-1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuela Provencio ¾ Tigua ?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10-27-1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. Cooper</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09-01-1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfredo Provencio ¼ Tigua ?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09-28-1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Provencio ¾ Tigua ?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>09-28-1906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list reveals that most Tiguas from Ysleta went to the Indian school in 1904 and some thereafter. It lists thirty children. Some of these may be non-Tiguas posing as Tiguas in order to gain access to the school.
A roster comprised of students at the school in 1870 lists numerous Indians from Las Cruces, El Paso, and Ysleta. It notes thirty Indians from Ysleta attending the school, yet some of these may have been Mexicans posing as Indians in order to gain access to an education. This snapshot of Tigua enrollment at the Albuquerque school reveals that most who attended the school ranged between nine and sixteen years of age when admitted. It also shows that most Tiguas from Ysleta who attended the school traveled from Ysleta to Albuquerque in 1904. Holguín explained that when the school superintendent arrived in Ysleta, all of the children going to the school met at the cacique’s house with the priest of the Ysleta church. He stated that his parents viewed the school in a positive light and viewed his going to the school as “a good idea.”

In this sense, the Tigua experience with boarding schools may have been less traumatic than that of other Native Americans, who went through forced removal and relocation to far away schools. David W. Adams points out that in 1885, the superintendent of the Albuquerque school preferred that parents visit often to monitor the progress of their children and encouraged long vacations at home. Holguín illuminated the Tigua’s positive view towards boarding schools by stating that he wished he could go to the Carlisle Indian School. He also told of another Tigua named George Piarote, who went to the Carlisle school, married a white woman, and remained living near there. This suggests that boarding skills seemed attractive to some Tiguas. Although it is difficult to project the whole Tigua boarding school experience from Holguín’s statements, it appears that he wanted to present boarding schools as a privilege rather than as a punishment.

The Albuquerque Indian School offered Tiguas the opportunity to meet and develop ties with other Native Americans of the region. Holguín pointed out that he got along well with Indians from other tribes and explained that at that time, about one hundred and fifty Indians attended the school. These included “one Apache” and individuals from Santo Domingo, San Felipe, Isleta,
Holguín also mentioned that Tiguas from Las Cruces (Tortugas) attended the Albuquerque school, such as the sons of Felipe Roybal: Candelario and Victor Roybal. In fact, numerous Indians, Piros, Mansos, and Tiguas from the Las Cruces-Tortugas area, also attended the school. These included people with last names such as Lujan, Padilla, Billegas, Ortega, and Montoya. In particular, eleven year old Rafela Montoya, daughter of Felipe Roybal, as well as Maesis Francisco, the nine year old son of Tranquilino Trujillo from Mimbres pueblo near Las Cruces, attended the school. In this way, the Albuquerque school served as a space of cooperation and negotiation for younger Tiguas and others as they learned of one another and maintained their own identities in an institution that sought to erase their Indianness.

Nevertheless, boarding schools sought to indoctrinate Indigenous peoples into the everyday regimens of a modern, capitalist society. Vocational training worked hand in hand with education in this system, and the Albuquerque school reflected Progressive society’s views towards Native people’s place in the political economy. Holguín explained that although the school paid for food, clothing, and shelter and included a free education on top of that, it promoted a military type curriculum in which students woke up at six, marched, and then went to school for half the day and worked for the other half. The school considered Sunday as recreation day for both boys and girls, and this time likely allowed them to relax and get to know one another. Yet intermarriage between students did not occur. Holguín also suggests that students likely had some autonomy at the school by explaining that one of the Pedraza brothers from Las Cruces drowned in the river in Albuquerque, which illustrates that students left the school from time to time to swim and engage in various excursions.

Tigua enrollment in Indian boarding schools involved a process of negotiation in which families and children alike sought to improve their social standing through education and the
opportunities it offered within the emerging Progressive era borderlands economy. After living through severe drought, economic hardship, and land dispossession, those Tiguas who remained in Ysleta del Sur may have viewed the Albuquerque Indian School as an avenue towards self-improvement and away from poverty. At best, however, the school trained them in various blue collar vocational skills as well as math and English, preparing them for work as wage laborers at the lower levels of the socio-economic hierarchy and forcing them to speak English in a way that seemingly criminalized their traditional culture. Nevertheless, Tigua participation in boarding schools likely reinforced their unique community identity as they lived with other Indians from the region and responded to the pressures of United States colonization.

**Indigeneity in Public Spaces**

The most significant evidence of Tigua cultural continuity and the persistence of their Indigenous identity during the early Twentieth-century is exemplified through their performances of traditional dances in public spaces. Openly displaying and celebrating their cultural identity during religious events, state fairs, and local festivals helped internally preserve Tigua identity within their own community while simultaneously establishing and reinforcing their presence as a distinct group of Native Americans within the public sphere. Representations of Indigeneity in public spaces also helped the Tigua establish themselves as active participants within the narratives of both El Paso and Texas history. In turn, these public gatherings augmented their sense of self and strengthened their community identity within a dynamically changing national and social environment. Public performances also signify how Tiguas defied the early twentieth-century assimilationist discourse that assumed they would eventually vanish into Mexican society and lose their authentic Indigenous culture. Culminating in their participation in the 1936 Texas
Centennial celebration, Tigua public presentations at local events and state fairs exemplify a form of tribal self-determination in which they negotiated popular assumptions of authentic Indigeneity to their best possible advantage and established themselves as a living community of “real Indians” in the process.93

From the late 1800s into the early twentieth-century, Tiguas who performed traditional dances and rituals in public helped actualize the continuity of their traditions. At the same time, public performances established the Tiguas as a culturally sovereign group within the El Paso region’s emerging popular consciousness. In 1895, the Tigua Tribal Constitution specifically declared their intent to preserve their tribal identity and culture through the continued practice of their traditional celebrations such as Saint Anthony’s Day.94 Although popular Anglo society recognized the Tigua celebrations, they did so in a way that boxed it into contemporary assimilationist discourse and ridiculed it. For example, one late nineteenth-century newspaper article described Tigua dancing as “one of the last flickers of the dying fire of Indian custom.”95

In 1909, another emphasized the consumption of “firewater” and the firing of guns over the cultural significance of Saint Anthony’s Day for the Tigua.96 Noting how Tigua dancers moved in a procession from the chief’s house to the church, this article concluded by stating that these dances had no connection with church services and that in a few years the Tiguas “will have passed into history.”97 For Ysleta’s Tiguas, however, Saint Anthony’s Day always involved traditional dances and celebrations that exemplified their non-conformity to colonization as much as it did cultural continuity.

Tribal dances and celebrations during Saint Anthony’s Day exemplify how Tiguas adapted to Catholicism and resisted Spanish colonization through their own application of cultural syncretism. Saint Anthony’s Day is held every year on June 13. In order to avoid the violence that
the Franciscans used to coerce Indians into Catholicism, Tiguas and other Indians seemingly conformed to Church imposed holidays by dancing on Church grounds. During Saint Anthony’s Day, Tiguas did this by dancing the Corn Dance in front of the church. For the Tigua, the Corn Dance signifies the onset of the agricultural season and their gratitude to the Earth Mother. In this way, Tigua ceremonial dancing during Saint Anthony’s Day represents how they negotiated colonization similar to Sonora’s Yaqui by merging Indigenous traditions into church holidays.98

Performing their Indigenous dances in public spaces reinforced popular stereotypes about Indians, yet also gave Tiguas the opportunity to assert their presence as an Indian community. Presenting at the 1890 and 1899 Texas state fairs, for example, broadened the tribe’s exposure at both the state and regional levels.99 These cultural performances also provided the Tigua the space to establish their Indigeneity in opposition to the hegemonic narrative that viewed them as a disappearing people. Describing how Indigenous peoples used fairgrounds as spaces for negotiating identity within the structure of white society, Frederick W. Gleach explains that although the dominant society used fairs and expositions to perpetuate power and national identity, groups like the Tigua also appropriated these processes and used them to resist the assimilationist narrative by dancing in public as a counter hegemonic strategy.100 Whether or not the Tiguas perceived their own cultural public performances as resistance, persistence, or both, dancing in public significantly challenged popular assumptions about their inevitable extinction and let outsiders know that they were still real Indians.

In order to convince the general public of their real Indianness, the Tiguas needed to emphasize their cultural authenticity. Ironically, this emphasis on authenticity relegated the Tigua to seemingly anachronistic cultural practices that reinforced popular stereotypes about Indians. In order to meet these public expectations and establish themselves as real or authentic Indians,
Tiguas diligently practiced how to use bows and arrows and used traditional Indian clothing and regalia not regularly worn everyday in Ysleta.\textsuperscript{101} Paige Raibmon explains that Indians often coopted and used white ideas about authentic Indigeneity and performed “Indian-ness” to gain access to social, economic, and political opportunities within the structure of colonialism for their own survival.\textsuperscript{102} Thus, as Tiguas practiced their traditional ways to become more culturally authentic for non-Indian audiences, they enhanced their own group identity and illuminated their presence as a distinct community apart from, yet within, Mexican society.

Although “traditional” regalia instilled the image of authentic Indigeneity for non-Indians, it also held a special meaning for the Tiguas themselves. Describing an incident that occurred in 1910 during an Indian parade at El Paso’s Washington Park, Miguel Pedraza explained that after a young Mexican boy plucked one of the feathers from his “Indian suit,” he disrupted the whole parade by getting into an intense street-brawl in an attempt to retrieve the feather. According to Pedraza, “the parade stopped for a little while and they couldn’t stop the fight…we were fighting like dogs you know. He took that feather and I did not like that.”\textsuperscript{103} Pedraza’s encounter illustrates that while the public often viewed Indian regalia as a novelty for the taking, tribal members viewed it more seriously as part of their cultural identity.

During the Progressive Era, various newspaper articles discussed Tigua public events in a way that emphasized negative viewpoints towards Indians. Although this type of press coverage opened a space for the Tigua as real people, living in the historical present, it also evoked derogatory stereotypes of otherness that infantilized them in the public forum. For example, in 1909, the \textit{El Paso Herald} announced that “the tom-tom is heard every night” as Tiguas prepared for their winter festivities. Noting that the tribe planned to participate in a parade during a winter fair, the \textit{Herald} described Tigua dances as “of great interest to all newcomers in the valley.”\textsuperscript{104}
Another article emphasized drunkenness and disorder during the Tigua 1910-1911 annual New Year festival. Reporting that an intoxicated dancer named Santiago Lujan “insisted in joining the dancers with his hat on,” this article described Lujan’s actions as “a serious breach of etiquette” and explained that after “one of the merry makers took it off for him he became very angry and...proceeded to shoot up the dance with a 22 rifle.” Similarly in 1913, the Herald vividly announced an “Indian dance and shooting party” in “the Indian Village” of Ysleta, where Gilberto Carbajal and Guillermo Tapia both received gunshot wounds and someone struck Antonio Bustamante with a pistol during the fight. In a condescending way that invoked the racist and primitive savage rhetoric of the period, these articles conflated Tigua celebrations with violence, drunkenness, and savagery. Yet they also quietly refuted the notion that the Tigua had vanished and validated their presence as an autonomous and interactive Indigenous community.

The 1936 Texas Centennial Celebration

During the 1930s, Tigua representations of Indigeneity in public spaces reinforced their identity and helped establish their status as significant historical participants in the region’s public history. Nationally, changing views and policies towards Native Americans influenced the Tigua’s emergence into the region’s historical narrative. During the Great Depression, state and local policy makers sought to exploit the region’s historical Spanish missions to boost tourism and stimulate the economy. As Indians who lived in one of the region’s early Spanish missions, the Tiguas ironically benefitted from this exposure, which gave them a chance to emphasize their tribal identity as Indians from Ysleta. This publicity peaked at the 1936 Texas Centennial, when Tigua Cacique Demasio Colmenero made President Franklin Delano Roosevelt an honorary tribal cacique, and tribal member Isabel Granillo made his wife Eleanor an honorary tribal member.
At this time, the local media presented the Tiguas in a celebratory fashion that connected them with the region’s colonial Spanish past. For example, in 1933, The San Antonio Express described the Tiguas as refugees who formed “the first permanent settlement in Texas.” Presenting Ysleta as “a living example of the metamorphosis of the United States,” this article glorified Ysleta as a place where Indians, conquistadors, and Anglos lived in “peace and harmony.” This romantic and racialized rhetorical imagery of peaceful Indians and Spanish conquistadors sought to attract tourists through its emphasis of its European colonial past. This imagery also emerged on the cover of a booklet published by the El Paso Catholic Diocese, which illustrated Spanish conquistadors possessing the land and Franciscans converting the Indians. Written by Cleofas Calleros and Joseph I. Driscoll, this booklet claimed Indians as part of the region’s colonial history and presented El Paso’s missions as “the oldest in Texas.”

Initially, it seemed unlikely that the Tigua would perform at the 1936 Texas Centennial Exposition. In January, Catholic social worker Cleofas Calleros invited the Tigua to present the following June at the Centennial’s El Paso Day and National Folk Festival, but the Tiguas turned down his offer because it conflicted with their traditional Saint Anthony’s Day celebration. Yet that April, they decided to send thirty-five people after Saint Anthony’s Day. Then they decided to perform at the Expo before the holiday. Calleros and the Tiguas resolved this with the help of Father Cordova, who had served as Ysleta’s pastor for thirty years. With Cordova’s influence, the Tigua agreed to perform at the Texas Centennial during Saint Anthony’s Day and celebrate it after they returned to Ysleta.

Many organizations from El Paso planned to display and perform at the Texas Centennial. Although the city chartered a special train to accommodate them, it did not include the Tiguas. Other organizations that planned to present in Dallas at the Texas Centennial included the El Paso
Chamber of Commerce, the American Smelter and Refining Company (ASARCO), the International Boundary and Water Commission (IBWC), and the Tipica Orchestra, as well as various artists such as Tom Lea. Illustrating how locals believed that national exposure would boost the region’s economy during the Depression, the *Herald Post* reported that President Roosevelt’s presence at the Centennial “is expected to give this city a ‘break’ in publicity.”\(^{112}\)

Funding the Tigua’s trip to Dallas proved to be considerably problematic. In late 1935, the Texas Centennial Commission awarded the El Paso Chamber of Commerce $50,000, but the money could only be used for “permanent projects such as buildings, statues and markers.”\(^{113}\) Excluded from state funds, Calleros and the Tigua relied on private contributions. In April 1936, El Paso’s Chamber of Commerce seemed open minded about funding the Tiguas and led Calleros and Sarah Knott of the Centennial’s National Folk Festival to believe that they intended to donate $3000 for the trip. Subsequently, organizer Leslie Reed agreed to help the Tigua raise the money for transportation, food, lodging, and cloth for uniforms. By late April, however, the Chamber of Commerce had not contacted Calleros, who had already begun to solicit funds elsewhere.\(^{114}\)

Reaching out to his network, Calleros wrote, “We are having a terrible time raising the necessary funds to pay our transportation from El Paso to Dallas…so we are counting on you or the Dallas Knights of Columbus, or Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, or some other Catholic organization, to sponsor our show for June 13th.”\(^{115}\) In this context, it seemed doubtful whether or not the Tigua would obtain funding for the trip.

Nevertheless, Calleros and Reed worked diligently to get the Tiguas to Dallas. Calleros worked on their publicity campaign while Reed acquired additional funding and materials. Although Reed acquired funds for lodging and material for uniforms, they did not cover the full expenses needed. To raise additional funds, Reed booked the Tigua to perform at a Centennial
fund raiser at El Paso’s Austin High School. The Tiguas also agreed to dance at a Catholic fundraiser on Saint Anthony’s Day in Dallas and split the admission proceeds with the Church. In addition, the Chamber of Commerce solicited donations by mail after losing city and county funding, and Calleros received some funding from El Paso’s Druggist’s Convention delegation.116 The El Paso Herald Post even ran an ad selling stamps that commemorated the “Ysleta Texas Centennial Celebration” and noted that Ysleta is the “Home of the Tigua Indians.”117 Furnishing the Tigua with the material for their uniforms, Reed provided ribbons, moccasins, five yards of yellow satin, ninety-five yards of red satin, forty-four yards of black satin, and thirty-two yards of white satin, along with one pound of “red paint and feathers…to be given without charge to the Indians.”118 Tigua men wore Red uniforms with yellow trim, and women wore black and white costumes with multicolored ribbons. Tribal oral history presents that the Tigua first used vividly colorful uniforms at the 1936 Texas Centennial.119 In this way, Calleros and Reed helped the Tigua in their journey to Dallas.

Poor planning and coordination between Calleros and El Paso’s other Centennial participants did create some confusion. Only noting that the Tigua planned to dance at the fair, the Herald announced that El Paso’s Tipica Orchestra planned to give President Roosevelt “a $60 sombrero and serenade him with some music.”120 Upon learning that the “El Paso delegation” planned to give Roosevelt a sombrero, Calleros assumed that they would do so when the Tigua made him an honorary cacique.121 Across the state it was known that the Tigua planned to make Roosevelt a cacique, and Calleros helped make this a reality. Through his efforts, the Centennial commission agreed to let the Tigua have ten minutes with the President on July 12, pending “Presidential Approval.” Calleros wrote Sarah Knott of the National Folk Festival and requested media coverage.122 Just before Calleros left with the Tigua for Dallas on June 10, he was still
unsure as to whether or not the Roosevelt ceremony had been approved. His last message to the Centennial General Manager stated that

we assume that this ceremony has been included in the arrangements as per your telegram of June 4th. Accordingly we have prepared the headdress, moccasins, [and] bow and arrow. The presentation will take ten minutes as per your request. Will you kindly arrange for Movietone and photographers?¹²³

In this sense, Calleros had no idea what to expect once the Tigua arrived in Dallas. Similarly, Reed worked overtime trying to book rooms and arrange transportation for the Tigua. In late May, Reed agreed to pay $500 to E.C. Strachan of Clint, Texas, for the transportation of thirty-five people from Ysleta to Dallas. Strachen was to lease a bus, depart on June 10 and return to Ysleta on June 15.¹²⁴

On June 10 at three o’clock in the afternoon, Calleros, Cacique Colmenero, and thirty-three Tiguas boarded the bus in Ysleta and departed for Dallas. Calleros wrote that the group traveled in a brand new Ford V-8 bus. A mural on the side of the bus announced the “Tigua Indians” of “Ysleta Texas” in large letters and displayed an image of an Indian in a stereotypical plains style war bonnet.¹²⁵ The next morning, Thursday, June 11, the Tigua arrived in Abilene for breakfast. The Abilene Daily Reporter wrote that they “swarmed into Doyle’s cafe…filling every table in the house and crowding the palefaces to the counter.”¹²⁶ After breakfast, assistant cacique Sebastian Duran played “a single beat on the 150 year-old tom-tom” that “brought Indian chants from half a dozen old braves.”¹²⁷ The Reporter concluded on a romantic note that “Smiles lit their faces as the campfires of sixty years ago lived in their eyes as they shuffled back and forth in the Red-man’s dance.”¹²⁸ At Seven o’clock that evening the Tigua bus reached Dallas, and Calleros and Reed met with the exposition’s staff and worked out their schedules for the next three days.¹²⁹

The next morning, El Paso Day, April 12, Calleros, Reed, the Tigua, and the Negro Chorus met at 8:30 in front of the Centennial Administration Building, but the El Paso Tipica Orchestra
was nowhere to be found. As the sun shined brightly, the Tigua and the Negro chorus entered the Dallas Cotton Bowl at 9:30 and waited for the President’s arrival. During that time, the Centennial staff mistakenly confused the Tigua with the Alabama-Coushatta and announced that “Indians from Alabama” waited to honor the President. As they waited on the stadium floor in front of sixty-five thousand spectators, Cacique Colmenero asked Calleros to name the President an Honorary Tigua Cacique. When Roosevelt’s cavalcade entered the stadium and crawled to a halt, Governor Allred escorted Calleros, Colmenero, and Isabel Granillo to the President’s car. There, in front of numerous government officials and photographers, Calleros bestowed the President with a headband that Tigua women had made from peacock and turkey feathers and declared him an Honorary Cacique. Then Colmenero gifted Roosevelt with a pair of black and white buckskin moccasins that came from a deer that had been hunted at Hueco Tanks. Subsequently, Granillo made Eleanor Roosevelt an “Honorary Squaw” and presented her with an Indian Molcajete, which is a small stone bowl for grinding vegetables and other foodstuffs.\textsuperscript{130}

After the Tigua greeting, the President’s caravan continued to a platform stage on the stadium floor, where Roosevelt made a speech. Soon-after, the Tigua, the Negro Chorus, Reed, Calleros, and El Paso’s Mayor Sherman met at the Socorro Mission Building.\textsuperscript{131} This reproduction of the Socorro Mission, complete with live Indians, surely pandered to the crowd’s fantasies and stereotypes of Spanish missions, conquistadors, and colonized Indians. But this did not stop the Tigua from stealing the show. Later that day they gave two performances in the amphitheater and made El Paso’s presentation quite a success. Their sensational performances continued into the Saint Anthony’s Day celebration on June thirteenth and the National Folk Festival on the fourteenth. Noting the Tigua, the Negro Chorus, the Tipica Orchestra, and “two lovely senoritas,” the \textit{San Antonio Light} reported that El Paso “ran the show at the Centennial.”\textsuperscript{132} Writing that “it
was El Paso Day yesterday, today, and tomorrow,” the article stated that the Tigua “created a near riot wherever they appear.” Before their premier introduction of the National Folk Festival, the Tigua also opened a “National Broadcast” which included the Tipica Orchestra and a group of Mexican children from Dallas who “sang the original Mission songs.”

The 1936 Texas Centennial celebration was a state fair, world’s fair, and centennial celebration all wrapped up in one. It was the first world’s fair ever in the American South. One Centennial flyer emphasized patriotic themes that included history, progress, and development. The Centennial sought to promote tourism and stimulate economic development in the midst of economic depression. The flyer did not mention any American Indians and instead focused on tourist attractions such as Caddo Lake, noting that the lake’s glorious history “vanished with the end of steamboat transportation.” In this way, flyers such as this erased any trace of Native Americans from the state’s historical narrative. Mentioning El Paso as the “city of the sun,” the flyer paid tribute to “ancient Spanish Dons” and displayed depictions of Spanish conquistadors. Moreover, it did not mention the Tigua as it romantically described Ysleta as Texas’s oldest community. Using the terms “mellow mission” and “golden yesterdays,” the flyer overlooked the Tigua as participants in the mission’s history. Of course this flyer was intended for the general public in order to draw them to the Exposition under the guise of growth and progress.

Despite these types of cultural erasures, the publicity that the Centennial Exposition gave the Tigua significantly elevated their status. Often described in terms of vanishing and ancient, the Tigua’s Centennial performances opened a new discourse which described the Tigua as “an Indian nation living in Ysleta.” Yet these new views overlapped the old as the rhetorical imagery of the 1930s Texas popular imagination associated the Tigua with the state’s “oldest city” and the fair’s “Old Ysleta historic village.” The fact that Cacique Colmenero was 87 years old in 1936
added to this misconstrued conflation of Indians with the old, a primitive residual of Spain’s colonial past that survived into the present.\textsuperscript{139} Despite this negative imagery, the Centennial was a success for the Tigua and El Paso.

Upon their return, the Tigua performed on July 16 at the Ysleta Centennial Celebration and planned to perform at El Paso’s Sun Carnival that December. The 1936 Ysleta Centennial was the first of similar celebrations to be held in Socorro and San Elizario. It featured matachine dancers from New Mexico, Franciscan Friars from El Paso’s St. Anthony’s Seminary, and the Tigua as “guests of honor.” At the Ysleta Centennial, Margarita Calleros, Cleofas’s daughter, unveiled a historical marker commemorating the Ysleta Mission, and various local officials spoke on behalf of Ysleta and the Tigua. For instance, County Judge Joseph McGill stated that the “Tiguas were Indians of peace, not war.”\textsuperscript{140} Another speaker elaborated that the “settlement of this region might have been delayed for a century,” inferring that the Tigua had helped the conquistadors defend colonial settlements against Apaches. Accompanied by a dinner and fireworks, the Ysleta festival celebrated the Tigua’s interpolation into the grand historical narrative.\textsuperscript{141}

During the festivities, the Tigua made Driscoll and Reed honorary tribal members. The \textit{Herald} described that “Chief Colmenero placed his feathered headdress on Joseph I. Driscoll, making him the honorary Tigua historian, and on Leslie Reed, inducting him into the tribe.”\textsuperscript{142} Driscoll and Reed had both contributed significantly to the Tigua’s success. The first writer of Tigua history, Driscoll’s work exhibits itself in the revised September edition of the El Paso Diocesan Committee’s 1536-1936 Texas Centennial booklet.\textsuperscript{143} Although Driscoll’s writing serves as a baseline for Tigua historiography, the booklet itself promoted El Paso as a tourist booster more than as a study on the Tigua. Its pages seemingly commodified the Tigua to promote El Paso as an
exotic tourist destination; yet in so doing, they reinforced the Tigua’s Indigeneity and placed them at the center of the region’s history as real Indians.\textsuperscript{144}

The interjection of the Tigua into the region’s history paralleled their introduction into the market economy as American Indians. This dynamic exemplified itself when El Paso invited them to present alongside the Mescalero Apache at the Sun Carnival’s “Indian Day” on December 31, 1936. For their presentation, the Tigua planned to display their “craftsmanship in weaving and silver working” as they performed “ancient tribal dances” at El Paso’s San Jacinto Plaza.\textsuperscript{145} For the Tigua and other American Indians, crafts such as basket weaving signified their entrance into the market economy as authentic producers of cultural artifacts. Merging the “sacred” with the “secular,” Tigua basket weaving exemplified their cultural persistence in the modern world.\textsuperscript{146}

The Tigua made great public gains at being recognized as Native Americans during 1936, yet by the end of the year, life on life’s terms eventually caught up with them. Just before the Tigua’s presentation at El Paso’s 1936-37 Sun Carnival, Demasio Colmenero’s wife, Agustina, passed away, causing the tribe to cancel its performances at the carnival.\textsuperscript{147} In this sense, 1936 served the Tigua as a year of transition, a turning point in which they established themselves in the public consciousness as being real Indians. Although the Tigua lived everyday lives in Ysleta’s contemporary modern society, their self-representations of Indigeneity throughout 1936 rearticulated their cultural identity in the public imagination and influenced many to advocate for governmental recognition of the tribe.\textsuperscript{148}

Although the efforts of Calleros and Reed made the Tigua’s trip to Dallas a reality, it was the Tigua themselves who represented their Indigeneity. Refuting the popular notion that they had vanished into Mexican society, the Tigua solidified their Indigenous identity through cultural performances at public events and state fairs during the Progressive and New Deal eras. They
strategically used fairgrounds to rearticulate popular misconceptions of the vanishing Indian by adapting to public stereotypes of Indianness and using them to their advantage. Persisting through the oppression of the Progressive Era, the Tigua emerged in the public sphere as a real life community of Indians.

Conclusion

From the 1890s to the 1930s, Tiguas in Ysleta Del Sur persisted as a people and retained their identities as members of an Indigenous community by adapting to modern society and negotiating it to the best of their ability. While most Tiguas in the El Paso area lived in Ysleta’s community enclave known as the Barrio de Los Indios, others resided in Tortugas, New Mexico or moved to various places away from these communities. In Ysleta, tribal identity solidified as Tiguas absorbed some Piros, and both groups increasing interacted as one community. During the Progressive and New Deal eras, the hegemony of Tigua culture and their association with place interacted with white ideas about Indians and influenced the solidification of a tribal identity in opposition to the dominant society’s impingements upon the Tigua landscape and cultural lifeways. These impingements also caused some Tiguas to deny their Indigenous identity and identify as Mexican in some public settings to avoid violence and discrimination. Yet this only reinforced their Indian identity as Tiguas in private cultural community settings as their self-awareness increased despite these outside pressures.

Tigua participation in Indian boarding schools also reinforced group identity in opposition to non-Indian society. One of the main reasons for this involved the fact that one needed to be Indian in the first place in order to attend these institutions of assimilation into the emerging nation and its political economy. Because of the poverty that existed in the region at the turn of the
twentieth-century, Tiguas viewed boarding schools as places of opportunity and many sought to attend them. The Albuquerque Indian Boarding school in particular helped solidify tribal identity. As Tiguas from Ysleta met other Tiguas, such as those from Tortugas and Isleta, New Mexico, as well as other Pueblos and people from other tribes, they developed their sense of self in association to their place in the region’s diverse Native American population. In this sense, boarding schools enhanced their community identity as Indians from Ysleta.

Cultural presentations of Indigeneity in public spaces such as fairgrounds and during sacred ceremonies also helped solidify tribal identity in opposition to non-Indians audiences. In spite of white and Mexican ridicule that they would soon vanish into Mexican society, Tiguas persisted in carrying on their traditional dances and ceremonies during events such as Saint Anthony’s Day as well as during performances at state fairs and other local events such as the Sun Carnival during the Progressive Era.¹⁵⁰ As U.S. bureaucrats and policy makers became more amicable towards Native Americans in general during the 1930s, local historians recognized the Tigua as significant actors in the area’s colonial Spanish history. Exploiting their role in the history of the Ysleta mission, the Tiguas benefitted from increased publicity and continued performing dances in front of non-Indian audiences. Their presentations at the 1936 Texas Centennial exemplify the peak in this publicity and established Ysleta’s Tiguas as a real Native American community with their own history.

These events both internally and externally reinforced Tigua community identity as insiders experienced increased group cohesion in opposition to outsiders, who informally recognized Ysleta’s Tigua Indians as an autonomous American Indian tribe. During the Progressive and New Deal eras, Tiguas negotiated their community identity in relation to the changing social environment in which they lived. Performing at fairgrounds, writing a tribal
constitution, attending Indian boarding schools, and working with outsiders to establish themselves as significant participants in the region’s history all invigorated the Tigua’s collective tribal identity. Although the Tigua did not receive federal recognition at this time, their emergence in the region’s historical narrative and presence in popular culture as real Indians served as a precursor to their tribal recognition during the 1960s.
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Chapter 6:
Tribal Recognition

In Spite of their isolation with others of their people, the Tiguas have maintained a surprising degree of tribal identity. The first step in this effort to secure aid for the Tigua is to establish the fact that the Tiguas are an Indian tribe.¹

Against All Odds

The tribal recognition period began during the 1960s, when attorney Tom Diamond intervened in various foreclosures of Tigua property for non-payment of taxes after the City of El Paso annexed the town of Ysleta in 1955. Diamond’s involvement eventually led to state recognition in 1967 and temporary federal recognition in 1968. At this time, federal recognition was somewhat demeaning for the Tigua because the United States government immediately transferred trust and responsibility to the state of Texas as part of their Cold War era program to terminate federal oversight over numerous tribes and reservations and place them into state custodianship, where they would eventually become self-sufficient tax paying communities.² Yet Tigua recognition in the 1960s eliminated the threat of tax foreclosures, established a state Indian reservation in Ysleta, and served as a precedent for full federal recognition in 1987.

Considering the economic hardships that the Tigua community faced by the 1960s, state officials sought to make the Tigua economically self-sufficient by promoting tourism as their main means of support. The state had applied this policy approach to the Alabama-Coushatta of East Texas, and it appeared to be their only viable solution for the Tigua. This spurred a renaissance in Tigua culture as tribal members adopted the discourse of self-sufficiency and opened the
reservation to tourists. As tribal members performed dances and revived Indians crafts such as basket weaving, they adapted to the expectations of the state and the general public on their own terms. These cultural rearticulations also enhanced their identities as Tiguas through participation in myriad community activities. Thus, during the 1960s and 1970s, community efforts to avoid tax foreclosures and disintegration culminated in tribal recognition and a cultural renaissance that actually preserved the community and enhanced its Indigenous identity.

In the early to mid-1980s, state officials had grown tired of funding the Tigua and began another assault upon their sovereignty. By this time, economic self-sufficiency seemed more a myth than a reality. As poverty and limited economic opportunities plagued the community, self-sufficiency became self-determination as tribal members such as Jose Granillo, Trinidad Granillo, and Miguel Pedraza worked with Tom Diamond and others to gain federal recognition. Between 1985 and 1987, debates over federal recognition included the tribe’s cultural authenticity, casino gambling, and blood quantum. After much negotiation and political maneuvering, the United States government recognized the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur Pueblo in 1987. Federal recognition solidified the community identity for Ysleta’s Tiguas and protected their land and political sovereignty. Throughout this process, the biggest threat to these had been the objectives of federal and state policy makers to terminate their relationships with Indians and break up their communities.

**The Termination Era, 1940s-1960s**

During the Termination Era, the United States sought to break up tribal reservations, relocate Indians to urban centers, and have them assimilate into mainstream American society. In order to understand the Tigua recognition process, a cursory examination of Indian policy at the
national context and state contexts are necessary. After World War II, the United States spent a significant amount of money rebuilding western European nations in order to stop Soviet communism. In this Cold War political climate, numerous U.S. politicians looked for ways to reduce government spending. In 1946, the Senate ordered Commissioner of Indian Affairs William Zimmerman to produce a list of tribes that could be removed from federal wardship. Zimmerman reluctantly complied and considered various factors that included a tribe’s acculturation level, pre-existing economic development, and the ability of state governments to assume economic responsibility for a tribe’s well-being.⁴

Seeking to roll back the New Deal programs of the 1930s, conservative politicians criticized the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 and its emphasis on sovereignty and self-determination. In 1948, Herbert Hoover chaired the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, which recommended that the federal government turn Indian affairs over to individual states. The Commission assumed that Indians desired assimilation into mainstream U.S. society and proposed property taxes for Indian land. In response, the National Congress for American Indians (NCAI) protested on the grounds that the government needed Indian consent before their removal from federal programs. The NCAI also argued that termination of federal oversight would damage Indian communities by opening up tribal lands to speculators and reducing access to health, education, and welfare programs.⁵

The National Congress for American Indians began in 1944, when eighty Indians representing fifty tribes from twenty-seven states met in Denver, Colorado, and formed a Pan-Indian organization that sought to protect Indian rights. NCAI viewed federal services as necessary for Indian communities. They advocated for a tribe’s right of self-determination to choose between
assimilation and tradition and sought to protect tribes from state governments. As such, their efforts significantly contributed to Tigua recognition.

The United States put termination plans into action in 1951, when U.S. Commissioner for Indian Affairs Dillon Miller implemented the Indian Relocation Program to move Indians from reservations to urban neighborhoods in cities like Chicago, Seattle, Dallas, and Los Angeles. As ex-director of the War Relocation Authority, Miller had been responsible for the relocation of over 120,000 Japanese-Americans to internment camps during World War II. The relocation program sought to assimilate and acculturate Native Americans into the mainstream U.S. capitalist society by giving them government loans and funding through other programs. Yet relocation ultimately failed because numerous Indigenous peoples were not ready for assimilation. In cities, many Indians lived in overcrowded and impoverished conditions. Unwilling to break up their families, Indians retained their tribal identities. By 1958, close to 100,000 Native Americans had moved to cities, but only one-third of those had received federal funding. By 1960, about 75 percent had returned to reservations, and the government had spent well over $3,000,000 on this dismal program.

The termination of federal wardship over sovereign Indian nations began in 1953, when Dwight D. Eisenhower signed Public Law 280, which placed all Indians under state laws and jurisdiction in California, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Oregon. This law opened the door for all states to place Indian reservations under their jurisdictions at their own discretion. The NCAI lobbied against this in Congress, arguing that it violated treaties between tribes and the federal government. Between 1953 and 1958, the federal government passed a series of termination laws releasing Native American reservations and giving them private land allotments. Describing termination as
“emancipation,” these policies led to land dispossession and eliminated healthcare, education, and welfare programs in numerous Indian communities.  

At the national level, the Termination Era appeared to be grinding to a halt during the Civil Rights movements of the 1960s. As the National Indian Youth Council advocated for Native fishing rights in the Pacific Northwest and Native Americans occupied the former prison on Alcatraz Island near San Francisco, Indian activism gained momentum as leaders such as Vine Deloria Jr of the Lakota Sioux became involved. Between 1964 and 1967, Deloria served as the NCAI Executive Director before earning a law degree from the University of Colorado. In 1968, as the American Indian Movement (AIM) began, President Lyndon B. Johnson gave a speech entitled “The Forgotten American,” which denounced the federal government’s termination policies. Offering a new direction in American Indian policy, Johnson’s speech was more a response to recent Indian activism. That same year, Johnson signed the bill recognizing the Tiguas and placing them under the jurisdiction of the state of Texas. This is ironic because as many reservation Indians lost their federal status and viewed state trusteeship as a violation of their sovereign rights, federal status and state trusteeship actually elevated the Tigua from their seemingly subaltern status as non-recognized Indians living amongst Mexican Americans in Ysleta.

After the 1936 Texas Centennial, the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur appear to have faded into historical obscurity. Yet during the 1940s and 1950s they maintained their cultural identity and continued to practice their traditions. As Termination Era policies eliminated benefits, erased treaties, and liquidated entire reservations, it appeared that the Tigua enclave in Ysleta known as the Barrio de los Indios would disappear into Anglo and Mexican society. Even Cleofas Calleros,
who had worked so much to help the Tigua gain historical recognition, could not escape this assimilationist discourse. In 1953, he wrote that the

Tigua Indian nation is disappearing. And it is doing so with frightening rapidity. Friction, disbandment, intermarriage and fundamental differences are the results. They are dying out, and in the near future will be only recorded on a page. One day soon the beat of the tom-tom bidding Tiguas to assemble will only be an echo.\(^{11}\)

By the mid-1950s, it may have appeared to outsiders that Ysleta’s Tiguas had fully assimilated. During this era of the Second Red Scare and McCarthyism, federal and state policy makers had seemingly forgotten the Tiguas, as city property taxes threatened to dispossess them of whatever land they had left from the Ysleta Grant. Thus, the external pressures of capitalism threatened to invade their sovereign space at the same time that the federal government terminated its relationships with numerous sovereign nations, exposing them to similar dilemmas.

This assault on tribal institutions and government exemplified itself in Texas in 1954, when the United States resigned its responsibility over the Alabama-Coushatta tribe and placed it under the jurisdiction of the State of Texas. The Federal Government had recognized the Alabama-Coushatta in 1928. The policy terminating the Alabama-Coushatta Federal land trust placed it into state custody, yet still allowed federally recognized Indians access to schools and hospitals. Because the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs did not exist until 1965, the State administered the Alabama-Coushatta land trust through the Board of Control and then the Department for Special Schools and Hospitals.\(^{12}\) Following in the logic of self-sufficiency, Texas permitted the Alabama-Coushatta to sell timber from reservation lands in 1957 for funds to benefit their community. Further impinging on tribal land through this approach, Texas let them lease their land for mineral rights in 1959 in order to increase tribal funds for education and other living costs, such as off reservation medical expenses. At this time, termination policies transferred authority
over tribes to the states as part of the devolution of Indian affairs. Yet they only did so if the reservation had significant resources and tribal members had been deemed self-reliant enough to manage them. In this way, Texas officials sought to integrate the Alabama-Coushatta into the mainstream political economy and likely viewed these measures as stepping stones in the assimilation process.¹³

By the early 1960s, however, economic hardships due to poor soil for farming and limited job opportunities caused the Alabama-Coushatta to turn to tourism as their main revenue source. The State agreed, and in 1963, Governor Price Daniel allocated $40,000 to help finance a crafts shop, museum, and restaurant.¹⁴ After tourism proved successful, the State increased funding for more guest services, which in turn greatly assisted the Alabama-Coushatta on their path towards self-sufficiency, providing new housing, and increasing their overall quality of life. Implicit in this dynamic, the Alabama-Coushatta experienced a revival in their cultural heritage and Native American identity in order to appeal to outsiders. By 1971, they had adapted to the rhetoric of the State, which is exemplified in one bulletin that stated that “the Indian eagerly looks forward to the day when he can fill his place in Texas as a contributing citizen.”¹⁵ During the 1950s, the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur maintained their community identity through the continued practice of their traditions and their association with place.¹⁶ This is evidenced through various public ceremonies such as the annual Saint Anthony’s Day celebrations in which locals recognized them as Tiguas apart from yet a part of the region’s Mexican and Anglo-American society.

The greatest external pressure experienced by Ysleta Tiguas during the 1950s occurred when the City of El Paso annexed the town of Ysleta. In 1955, this annexation placed undue tax burdens on Tigua landholders. At this time, Tigua families’ income averaged around $400 annually, and property taxes that averaged $100 per year led to various foreclosure proceedings,
which threatened to undermine Ysleta’s Tigua community by dispossessing them of any land they had retained since the initial disposessions of the late 1800s.\textsuperscript{17} According to Thomas A. Green, Ysleta’s annexation by the city of El Paso signifies a turning point in Tigua identity in which the community responded to this external threat through a “nativistic movement” that emphasized their folk history and eventually led to a major legal battle that resulted in both state and federal recognition.\textsuperscript{18} In this sense, the 1955 annexation of Ysleta served as a catalyst for tribal recognition and cultural revival during the 1960s and 70s.

\textbf{Ysleta Socio-Economic Status}

From the 1930s to the 1950s, Ysleta changed from a rural society of open fields and cotton fields to an urban landscape. Engulfed by urbanization, the Tiguas found themselves isolated in pockets of poverty.\textsuperscript{19} According to Houser, Tigua women experienced high infant mortality rates. In some instances, up to four of nine children died of pneumonia and fever. In addition, adobe homes often did not have running water, indoor toilets, gas stoves, nor electricity.\textsuperscript{20} Facing discrimination in a public school system where some racist teachers euphemistically emphasized health and cleanliness in a way that abused both Indian and Mexican students, most Tiguas did not make it past the third grade. During the 1950s, Ysleta’s segregated high school contained mostly Anglo students because of the high Mexican-American and Indian dropout rate. By this time, Ysleta’s urban landscape possessed a mixed race population of Indians, Anglos, and Mexicans that ranged from low to middle income families.\textsuperscript{21} On the eve of tribal recognition, Tigua families averaged less than $1000 a year, usually picking cotton, tomatoes, beans, and working in agricultural jobs and often working as whole families.\textsuperscript{22}
Despite high poverty, Tiguas negotiated the area’s social environment as much as possible. While some Tiguas left Ysleta for Los Angeles, California, to work in factories among that area’s Mexican American population, most remained in Ysleta. In both cases, they retained their Tigua identity in opposition to the Mexican and Mexican-American people they lived among.\textsuperscript{23} One reason for this involved the history of prejudice between Tigua Indians and Mexican-Americans. Another involved frictions between these two groups as they competed with each other for access to jobs and other economic resources for their survival. While both Tiguas and Mexican-Americans experienced poverty, the latter possessed more social and economic capital. This caused some Tigua men to intermarry with Mexican women in order to gain access to social mobility through extended kinship networks.\textsuperscript{24}

Beginning in the 1970s, most whites moved from Ysleta in a way that mirrored the “white flight” migrations taking place throughout United States cities. As middle class whites and Mexicans-Americans left, more low income Mexican-Americans moved in, and Ysleta changed from a middle class society to one with high rates of poverty.\textsuperscript{25} In this urban context, the Tiguas gained tribal recognition and transformed their community as they embarked on a new journey of cultural revival.

**Tom Diamond, Nicholas Houser, and Tribal Recognition**

By the early 1960s, many local and state officials had become aware of the Tigua plight. As unpaid property taxes and the specter of foreclosure threatened to break up what remained of Ysleta’s Tigua community, local officials began to take action on their behalf. In one case, Tigua Cacique Jose Granillo had accumulated a bill for sixty-one dollars in back taxes and late fees between 1956 and 1964. In another, Tomas Granillo owed sixty-six dollars in back taxes.\textsuperscript{26} In
1961, El Paso Mayor Ralph Seitsinger advocated for the Tigua by writing a letter to the Federal government requesting that they be recognized and given rights as American Indians. In response, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) stated they could not recognize the Tigua because the State of Texas retained its own jurisdiction over any Indians within its borders, except for the Alabama-Coushatta, who had been placed in trust of the State in 1954 as part of the federal government’s termination program.27 While some local officials recognized the plight that Ysleta’s Tiguas faced by the early 1960s, they were powerless unless the Tigua became formally recognized. Yet one clause in the BIA’s response shed light on the possibility of federal recognition by stating that if the U.S. Congress recognized El Paso’s Tigua band, the BIA would gladly award them all services that they authorized.28 In this way, the BIA placed the recognition and benefits issue on the U.S. Congress, stating that they could only help the Tiguas if Congress recognized them and approved them for BIA assistance. This appeared to lead to a roadblock because at this time, many in Congress still viewed termination of federal trusteeship as the best Indian policy. Yet the BIA’s response also opened the door for tribal recognition through Congressional approval.

In this context, events in 1965 set the stage for the Tigua recognition process. That year, the Texas Legislature established the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs in order to oversee the Alabama-Coushatta reservation. Although it only consisted of three appointed members, the Commission served as a valuable tool during recognition negotiations.29 Also that year, attorney Tom Diamond learned of the Tigua’s dilemma involving property taxes and decided to help them in their cause. At that time, Diamond served as County Chair for El Paso’s Democratic Party, which added an incredible amount of political capital to their efforts.30

Diamond first learned of the Tigua’s tax dilemma with the city through channel 4 news director Jack Salem on July 4, 1965, at a public speaking event in San Elizario, where he and U.S.
Congressman Richard C. White spoke of the area’s history. Salem asked Diamond to visit the Tiguas and investigate their problem. Although skeptical, Diamond went to Ysleta a month later and met with El Paso County Tax Assessor, Alex Candelaria, who was Tigua, in the home of Tigua Indian Pablo Silvas. Of the Tigua, only Silvas met with Diamond because the other tribal leaders did not trust outsiders. At this time, Jose Granillo served as Cacique, Miguel Pedraza Sr. served as Governor, and Trinidad Granillo served as War Captain. Convinced that the Tiguas were real Indians, Diamond decided to investigate the matter further.

Diamond began his investigation by traveling to New Mexico to learn as much as he could about the Tigua. In the fall of 1965, Diamond visited the Tigua reservation in Isleta and met with tribal Governor Andy Abeita, who validated that Ysleta’s Indians were real Tiguas. Subsequently, Diamond visited Tortugas, New Mexico, and met with Dr. Bernard Fontana, an ethnologist from the University of Arizona. Taking interest in Ysleta’s Tigua, Fontana accompanied Diamond to Ysleta to visit Silvas and Pedraza and also became convinced of the need for further investigation. Fontana then suggested that a graduate student named Nicholas P. Houser from the University of Arizona conduct a study on Ysleta’s Tigua.

Houser first arrived in Ysleta to study the Tigua in the summer of 1966. Initially, funding proved problematic for Houser’s research, and Diamond did not fully understand Houser’s status as a graduate student pursuing his Master’s Degree. Yet Diamond procured Houser’s funding through El Paso’s Project Bravo Program: a subsidiary of one of Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society programs called the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). While conducting his research in Ysleta, Houser lived for three weeks with Pablo Silvas and his family. Because of crowded living conditions, in which eight people shared three rooms, Houser then moved to an apartment to prepare his reports. Houser explained that compact living conditions in the Silva
household made it impossible for him to work because the family went to bed around 9:00pm, and the rooms had no doors to separate himself and not disturb them while they slept.36

As Houser conducted ethnographical research in Ysleta, Diamond used his political connections to negotiate a plan of action at the state level. Keeping in mind that the BIA had clearly stated that Texas retained jurisdiction over its public land and Indian policies, Diamond and the Tigua viewed action at the state level as the best first step towards federal recognition. After corresponding with Texas Governor John Connally, Diamond met with David Spurgeon of Connally’s executive staff and Alan Minter, who worked for State Attorney General’s office.37 Diamond, Spurgeon, and Minter developed a positive relationship in their legal investigation of Tigua history and soon uncovered how the 1871 Ysleta incorporation had fraudulently dispossessed the Tigua of their land in the Ysleta Grant. Armed with this evidence, Diamond met with the Tigua in the late summer of 1966 at the tusla in Trinidad Granillo’s house, proposing that they enter into a law suit for their land. As Diamond waited outside, the Tiguas unanimously decided to go for it in hopes of gaining state and federal recognition.38 By this time, the Tiguas surely felt confident that federal recognition could become a reality because they had already gained the support of one of America’s leading Native American organizations.

One of the first major gains in the Tigua recognition process occurred earlier in March, 1966, when the executive committee of the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) recognized Ysleta’s Tigua and unanimously accepted them into their organization. This began when Diamond corresponded with Wendell Chino of the NCAI Board of Directors and asked him if the Tigua could appear at their annual convention at El Paso’s Cortez Hotel that year. Between 1955 and 1965, Chino had served as Chairman for the Mescalero Apache reservation. Fortunately for the Tigua, Chino’s wife, a Pueblo Indian, attended the convention and verified the Tigua’s
dances and chants as authentic and real.\textsuperscript{39} Well known Native American activists such as Vine Deloria Jr. and Georgina Robertson of the Standing Rock Sioux attended the convention and watched as the Tiguas performed their ceremonial dances. Miguel Pedraza played his Piro drum, and the Tiguas sang and danced the Kafura, or Apache Scalp Dance. Subsequently, the NCAI recognized the Tiguas as Native Americans and accepted them into their organization that day without dues, agreeing to help them gain federal recognition.\textsuperscript{40} Recognition by the NCAI set another precedent in the Tigua recognition process, and the efforts of this organization greatly encouraged the Tigua and influenced policy makers at the national and state levels.

By the fall of 1966, the Tigua recognition process appeared impossible at the federal level. By September, the BIA would not formally endorse the Tigua. Yet with Congressman Richard C. White’s support, Diamond at least had some backing at the federal level. On September 19, White introduced H.R. 17819 to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to give the Tigua federal recognition, BIA services, and funding. Yet the BIA did not approve it, and their approval was a necessary prerequisite to committee approval in the House of Representatives.\textsuperscript{41} Diamond explained that the BIA could not help the Tigua unless they had already received services. When Diamond evidenced the Tigua as recipients through their attendance at the Albuquerque Indian School, the BIA responded that this was only an isolated incident and still remained uncooperative. The main reason for this was that at this time, the BIA was in the process of terminating tribal relationships with the federal government. Thus, it likely made no sense to BIA Commissioner Theodore W. Taylor to recognize a new tribe, the Tigua, when the federal government was terminating their relationships tribes that had already gained federal recognition.\textsuperscript{42}

On the other hand, events at the state level proved more successful for Diamond and the Tigua. David Spurgeon of Governor Connally’s executive staff requested a budget for the
governor’s approval, and Diamond responded with one for $280,000. As the governor and numerous state politicians supported the idea for a Tigua reservation, a synergy developed in which Diamond coordinated the activities of numerous advocates, such as those of Vine Deloria of the NCAI, Fontana and Houser from the University of Arizona, and State Representative Ralph Scoggins, who sought to introduce legislation for state recognition. Dr. Leslie Dunbar of the Fields Foundation offered to acquire $50,000 for the Tigua and visited Ysleta to meet with the Cacique and War Captain. Yet upon his arrival, Cacique Jose Granillo and War Capitan Trinidad Granillo went rabbit hunting. Witnessing the community’s poverty and the seeming lack of interest in the money over rabbit hunting by its leaders likely impressed Dunbar, because he turned out to be significant financial asset for the Tigua through the NCAI.

With NCAI support, more information supporting the Tigua cause, and the backing of some powerful policy makers, Diamond aggressively responded to City tax collectors. On October 3, 1966, he submitted a three page letter to Tax Assessor and Collector C.R. Terrazas in which he established the Tigua claim to the Ysleta Grant and declared that they are no longer responsible for any property taxes. Asserting that Ysleta’s Tiguas never should have been taxed in the first place, Diamond withdrew his request for a delay in foreclosure proceedings. In response, local officials surprisingly caved in to Diamond’s position. Historian Jeffrey Schulze explained that the next day, County Attorney Jack Fant exempted all tribal members from any outstanding and future property taxes as long as they could produce documentation, such as birth, death, and baptismal records that establish that their family lineage goes back to 1854. In fact, Fant had stalled foreclosure proceedings since March in order to give Diamond and the Tigua time to gain federal recognition. Although the city attorney disagreed with Fant’s position, he publically accepted it because the County Attorney dictated whether or not foreclosure suits would be filed. Thus, the
city did not file any foreclosures against the Tigua. This local victory set the stage for the next phase of recognition at the state level in 1967.

The success of recognition at the state level depended greatly upon success at the federal level as well. Using his network to help the Tigua, Diamond met informally with Governor Connally early in March 1967 and convinced him to support the tribe and establish a reservation. At this time, Connally proposed that the federal government recognize the Tigua and transfer trust responsibility to Texas. Although Connally did not initially seek federal funding for a reservation, he wanted federal recognition and transfer to the state, hunting privileges on federal land, and Tigua rights to participate in the OEO poverty program. Weary of reliance on the BIA, Jose and Trinidad Granillo felt more comfortable with the idea of being placed into the state trust. By late March, hearings had been set for April 12 before the Public Affairs Committee of the Texas House of Representatives for two bills. The first increased the size of the Texas Indian Commission and gave them jurisdiction over the Tiguas. The second authorized the state to accept trust responsibility over the Tiguas after they had been federally recognized. Worried about the possibility of rejection at the federal level, Diamond also proposed conveying whatever individual plots of land the Tiguas still owned to the state in order to avoid property taxes. In any case, tribal recognition by the U.S. Congress was needed to make the Diamond’s plan acceptable to the BIA and the State of Texas.

The hearing in Austin on April 12, 1967, signified a successful turning point for the Tigua. In the days leading up to it, the BIA appeared more receptive to Diamond and the idea of coordinating state and federal legislation for recognition and transfer into a state trust. The Tigua delegation included Jose and Trinidad Granillo, Pablo Silvas, Miguel Pedraza, Doras Silvas Cedillo, Susana Hisa, Meliton Holguin, and tribal agent Alex Candelaria. In addition, Diamond,
Fontana, and Houser along with Andy Abieta of Isleta, New Mexico, Georgina Robinson of the Osage Nation, and Fred Smith of Project Bravo all planned to speak on the Tigua’s behalf. At the hearing, the Tiguas performed their traditional dances and chants while expert witnesses such as Abieta validated the cultural authenticity of these ceremonies. Subsequently, HR 888 and HR 654 easily passed, and Governor Connally signed these bills into law on May 23, 1967. At this time, Cacique Jose Granillo made Governor Connally an honorary tribal cacique, and news reporters exploited the day, proclaiming that Texas actually had some “real” Indians besides the Alabama-Coushatta. Having moved forward at the state level, the tribes next hurdle involved federal recognition.

Soon after state recognition, Diamond and other supporters of Tigua recognition began pressuring federal officials. By mid-May, the BIA recommended federal recognition as long as it coincided with the termination era process of transferring wardship to the state and did not involve federal funding for the Tigua. At the same time, Congressman White received numerous letters from various tribes and Pan-Indian organizations affiliated with the NCAI advocating for Tigua recognition. In one letter, the Hualapai tribal council requested a copy of the recognition bill in order to pressure their own Congressional Delegation to support it. In another, New Mexico’s All Indian Pueblo Council also requested copies of the bill to do the same. Similarly, the League of Nations Pan American Indians, also known as the League of North American Indians, wrote that the Tiguas had been long neglected due to BIA laxity and that they should have begun receiving federal assistance in 1890. The League advocated for Indian rights between 1935 and 1970 and held hour basic objectives: protect Indian land, people, and sovereignty as well as unite all Indigenous peoples and empower them politically. Although these letters likely influenced some policy makers, Diamond’s good relationship with President Lyndon B. Johnson also helped the
Tigua, as Johnson pressured the BIA for Tigua recognition.58 Another appealing factor for federal recognition involved the idea that Diamond’s approach conformed well to the process in which the federal government emancipated Indians to the state and terminated their relationship with them.

In this context, Diamond responded to BIA requests to reword the federal recognition bill in a way that excluded the Tigua from BIA support. Diamond complied with this policy discourse in hopes that they could receive funding through Project Bravo and the Office of Economic Opportunity. To appease the BIA, Congressman White and Senator Ralph Yarborough introduced HR 10599 for Tigua recognition on June 6, 1967.59 The bill stated that

Nothing in this Act shall make such tribe or its members eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians nor subject the United States to any responsibility, liability, claim, or demand of any nature to or by such tribe or its members arising out of their status as Indians, and none of the statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall be applicable to the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta del Sur. Nothing herein shall preclude the application to the people of the Tiwa Indians of any program arising under the Office of Economic Opportunity.60

This wording reflected 1950s Termination Era ideology which sought to reduce federal oversight over Indians and transfer responsibility to state governments. Mark E. Miller explains that this ideology remained alive and well into the 1960s, emphasizing self-sufficiency with some local and state assistance. This logic, which Texas had always applied to the Alabama-Coushatta, viewed state trusteeship as a temporary stop on the road to “equal citizenship.”61 One of the main reasons why the Tigua made it this far into the process of federal recognition and termination involved the fact that Diamond possessed a significant amount of political capital as an attorney and County Chair for the Democratic Party and that he sincerely wanted to help the Tigua. Another involved the fact that the Tigua appeared as a humble people before Congress, only looking to retain their land and gain access to basic resources.
Having set the process of federal recognition in motion, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs set a hearing for August 1, 1967. On that day, Tigua leaders Jose Granillo, Trinidad Granillo, and Miguel Pedraza appeared before the committee with the tribal drum and some bundles of reeds in place of the Spanish leadership canes, which they left in Ysleta for fear of something happening to them. Diamond had driven his car to Washington with them as passengers. Events at the hearing turned in the Tigua’s favor when one committee member asked to hear what the Tiguas had to say. In response, Diamond asked BIA representative James Officer to translate for the Tigua. When the committee asked Jose Granillo what Congress could do for him, Granillo replied that “the government can do nothing for me, I’ve lived my life and it’s near its end, I’m at peace and satisfied. But my people need help.” When the committee asked what they could do to help them, Granillo stated that “we need water, we no longer have water. We need a water connection at each house.” In response, the committee moved the bill onto the floor with full approval as Diamond, White, and others watched in amazement. Then it stalled in the Senate because New Mexico’s Pueblo Indians had pressured Senator Clinton Anderson to oppose Tigua recognition because of their affiliation with the Spanish during the Pueblo Revolt. That night, Senator Yarborough convinced Anderson to change his mind after a few drinks, and the bill went onto the Senate floor the next day, passing unanimously. According to Diamond, “If Ralph Yarborough hadn’t taken a bottle of whisky over and gotten Clinton Anderson drunk, we may have never gotten recognized.”

On April 12, 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Tigua recognition bill into law, designating the Tiguas as Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Texas, and transferring responsibility for them to the State of Texas. This act set a new trend in United States Indian policy because the Tiguas were the first tribe to be recognized in practically fifty years. In this way, Diamond’s strategy
worked well because the federal government had recognized the Tigua in a way that pushed them into the devolutionary processes of termination by immediately placing them under states jurisdiction. Although the Tiguas had no access to BIA benefits and no legal status under federal law as American Indians, they would be protected from property taxes and be able to keep their land. Yet these protections subjugated them to state laws and did not give them any legal sovereignty beyond what Texas would allow.\textsuperscript{68} Fortunately for the Tigua, Texas had a state Indian commission with a substantial budget to fund a reservation and some programs for its support. Similar to their termination era policies towards the Alabama-Coushatta, the state sought to fund the Tigua to make them self-sufficient enough to support their own health, housing, education, and economic development programs.\textsuperscript{69}

Seemingly echoing the Alabama-Coushatta experience of the late 1950s, the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs sought to make Ysleta a tourist attraction in order to help the Tigua generate their own revenue. Yet these objectives conflicted with those of Pedraza and the Granillo’s, who wanted a small tax free reservation where they could practice their traditions and receive health care and education.\textsuperscript{70} Although the Tigua sought to become self-sufficient, they did not initially see tourism as the solution. Instead, they sought to follow a plan that Houser had created before recognition to create jobs involving the construction of a community center, a greenhouse, and various cultural and educational programs. As the Granillos, Pedraza, and other Tiguas had feared, the state ignored Houser’s plan and viewed tourism as the path towards Tigua self-sufficiency.\textsuperscript{71}

Thus, Diamond and the Tiguas negotiated continuously throughout the 1960s recognition process. Diamond’s involvement with the Tigua began during their conflict with the city of El Paso over property taxes and continued throughout the recognition process. His connections as a
lawyer and Chairperson for El Paso’s Democratic Party enabled him to negotiate tribal recognition in various bureaucratic settings at both the state and federal levels. Working with Governor Connally, Congressman White, Senator Yarborough, and President Johnson enabled Diamond and the Tigua just enough political capital to navigate the system and pull off the seemingly impossible. In addition, academics like Fontana and Houser, as well as Minter, provided invaluable information that gave Diamond’s network the substance they needed for their case. Ultimately, the Tigua themselves helped the process gain traction through the genuine continuity of their sacred traditions in front of groups like the NCAI and various government officials. In particular, the humility and absence of greed demonstrated by the Granillos influenced supporters and policy makers to advance their cause and help them when they most needed it. Yet after recognition, the Tiguas both clashed and cooperated with the Texas Indian Commission as they adapted to their impositions on traditional tribal culture in relation to tourism and public displays of authentic indigeneity.

Cultural Renaissance, Community, and the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs

On the eve of tribal recognition, the Tiguas either did not know about the various programs available for low income communities or they did not gain access to them because of the red tape involved. For the most part, they only wanted to be free of property taxes and establish a reservation where they could practice their traditions and maintain their cultural identity. Seeking access to education and healthcare, they wanted job training and the chance to be able to make enough to send their children to school with shoes on their feet.72

After recognition, the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs Superintendent Alton Griffon pushed the state’s agenda upon the Tigua. First, he sought to transform Ysleta into a tourist “Indian
village” without the Tribal Council’s approval. This approach went against the initial agreement that outlined the powers and duties of the commission at the time of their federal emancipation into trust under the state of Texas, which stated that superintendents would only advise tribal councils. Offended that the Texas Indian Commission made these plans without consulting them, Tigua leaders initially resisted on the grounds that tourism would damage the integrity of their most sacred ceremonies and commercialize them, turning them into a spectacle for public consumption.  

While state funding allowed Tiguas to buy back some of the land they had been dispossessed of, it came with conditions such as the establishment of blood quantum to determine eligibility for tribal membership, a tribal roll, and a formal constitution. In addition, the Commission wanted to move the Tuhla from the War Capitan’s house to new location that they proposed would have public bathrooms and resemble New Mexico’s Pueblo kivas.

Concerned that the Commission would place outside Indians on the tribal roll, Cacique Jose Granillo complained after the tribal program increased from 150 to 300 Indians. The presence of many non-Tigua Mexican Indians threatened to dilute the tribe’s traditional dances and ceremonies of their cultural authenticity. Although Tiguas had welcomed outsiders into the community in the past, these had been peoples who lived according to and respected tribal ways. The new influx obviously did not meet the Tribal Council’s criteria for membership. Yet this did not seem to matter to the Texas Indian Commission. In 1967, the tribal roll accounted for 267 Tiguas, including women and children. Yet by 1970, membership had increased to 439 individuals. Although the Tiguas based tribal membership on community involvement and ceremonial participation, the Commission viewed blood quantum as the main determinant for tribal membership and allowed anyone who could establish Tigua ancestry onto the tribal roll. This alarmed Tigua leaders such as Joe Sierra, who worried that outsiders in search of financial gain
would destroy the customs and traditions.\textsuperscript{76} By 1969, the Commission had rejected the tribe’s plans for a community development program in favor of making Ysleta a major tourist attraction, which included a theme park and various carnival like displays in order to attract outsiders.\textsuperscript{77}

In response, Diamond aired tribal grievances in a letter to the Chair of the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs that critiqued their aggressive approach towards the Tigua. The first issue involved the assumption that the approach taken with the Alabama-Coushatta would work for the Tigua. Here Diamond rebutted that it was not necessary for the Commission to superimpose their own notions of indigeneity to create a false image of Tigua society, because the Tigua already have their own cultural traditions, which had survived for hundreds of years.\textsuperscript{78} Another grievance involved Commission Superintendent Alton Griffon’s failure to consult with the Tribal Council over matters concerning tribal government. In particular, Griffon sought to establish a new tribal constitution, often interfered with tribal elections, and made major administrative decisions without discussing them with tribal leaders. Here Diamond contended that Tigua self-sufficiency depended upon their ability to govern themselves without outside interference.\textsuperscript{79}

Concerning the tribal roll issue, Diamond estimated that about 299 Tiguas lived in Ysleta. Yet the Commission’s eligibility requirement, which consisted of a “one drop” rule for blood quantum with minimal tribal affiliation, would dramatically increase the rolls because, as Diamond rhetorically pointed out, over 10,000 people in El Paso could meet this requirement. As such, Diamond proposed that the Tribal Council approve their own tribal roll.\textsuperscript{80} In response to the Commission’s idea to transform Ysleta into a carnival like amusement park, he explained that while this works for the Alabama-Coushatta, it has no place at a historical site like Ysleta’s mission-Indian community, which contains Texas’ oldest buildings, a vital living Indian culture,
and “a people who are timid and very resentful of a public display of their cultures.”\textsuperscript{81} Regarding tourism, Diamond argued that tourists already visited Ysleta and that the creation of a circus like atmosphere would be harmful to the Tigua and insult their dignity. Instead, he proposed that the crafts program be adopted at the Mission Candelaria Home Complex, instead of the commercial plan turn it into a living Indian village with free housing for the Tiguas.\textsuperscript{82}

Yet the need for economic survival caused the Tigua to reconsider tourism. Although many like Jose Granillo deplored the idea of dancing for bureaucrats, they eventually agreed with the views of Joe Sierra and others who viewed tourism as a “survival issue.” At a Tribal Council meeting to discuss tourism, Sierra convinced most tribal elders to accept tourism. According to Miller, tribal member Ray Apodaca viewed tourism as “the only real economic alternative available to the Tiguas at that time.”\textsuperscript{83} In this context, the Tiguas entered into a cultural renaissance in tentative cooperation with the Texas Indian Commission that involved a rebirth of Pueblo culture and a partial adaptation of cultural elements from other Indian groups, such as using Plains Indian style war bonnets.\textsuperscript{84}

By 1972, the Tigua community embraced tourism on its path towards self-sufficiency without turning Ysleta into an Indian centered amusement park. With state funding, federal grants, and loans, they restored the 1744 adobe Candelaria hacienda and turned it into a museum that included a community meeting room, dance plaza, and kitchen with two adobe \textit{hornos} outdoors for baking bread.\textsuperscript{85} Then they constructed a meeting room \textit{Tusla} for tribal members and leaders. Yet they still retained their original structure of government. At this time, Jose Granillo served as Cacique, Miguel Pedraza as Governor, Pablo Carbajal as Lieutenant Governor, Trinidad Granillo as War Capitan, and Joe Sierra as \textit{Aguacil} or Sergeant at Arms.\textsuperscript{86} Plans for additional projects included a twenty-two acre housing complex with thirty homes and apartments, the use of existing
buildings for an arts and crafts center, where the Tiguas would relearn the lost crafts of making pottery, jewelry, and baskets, and the construction of a crafts store and kiva. Other plans involved the development of a twenty-acre archeological site about thirty miles east of Ysleta, dating back to 1200 AD, and Hueco Tanks State Park, where they sought to build a riding stable, café, and trading post.87

In this revival period, Ysleta’s Tiguas relearned and publicly practiced some aspects of their culture in order to appear “more Indian” to outsiders. They initiated programs to learn the Tiwa language, religious chants and dances. By 1975, they completed their Arts and Crafts Center with funding from Office of Economic Opportunity and Economic Development Association programs and hired someone from Isleta Pueblo (New Mexico) to teach various Pueblo Indian crafts, such as woodworking, leather-crafting, pottery making, and basket weaving.88 They also charged admission to Indian dance performances at the Ysleta mission and invited various outside Indians, such as Sioux and Zuni, to compete for cash prizes. Working jointly with the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs, they formed the Tigua Tribal Enterprise and managed their craft shop, museum, and restaurant.89

During the 1970s, numerous stories in El Paso newspapers documented Tigua cultural events and presented the tribe as both resilient and persistent. In 1974, the El Paso Times posted a photo of Irma Jurado, a Tigua woman, making pottery at an exhibition of Native crafts off the reservation at El Paso’s Rushfair Shopping Center.90 In 1976, the Times illustrated how Rosalia Granillo, wife of Trinidad Granillo, coped with the amputation of her right leg due to complications from diabetes and a leg injury. Noting that Mrs. Granillo taught tribal dances, the article explained how determined she felt to live up to her title as “segunda cacique.” Born in 1916, Mrs. Granillo gave birth to sixteen children, seven of whom were still alive and living in Ysleta’s Tigua
community. A photo of Mrs. Granillo in a wheelchair demonstrating the use of the tribal drum during dance ceremonies illuminated her determination. In 1977, another Times article reported “Tigua dancers To ‘Speak to Dead’,” declaring that “Indian dancers from throughout the southwest will ‘speak to the dead’ in traditional religious ceremonies on the final day of Fiesta de San Antonio…on the Tigua Indian reservation.” Explaining that teams from various tribes competed in traditional dances over the weekend, this article featured vibrant photos of Apaches and Pueblos. One in particular illustrated Tigua Javier Loera performing the Eagle Dance. Throughout the 1970s, numerous articles like these appeared in local newspapers, revealing how Tigua culture underwent a rebirth after tribal recognition.

The construction of new housing during this period signified a major improvement for the community. Miller explains that most of the adobe houses in the Barrio de Los Indios lacked utilities and plumbing by the early 1970s. After securing $1.7 million in grants and another $237,151 from the state, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) subsequently loaned the tribe enough to begin construction in December 1975. This HUD Mutual Help Program stipulated that homeowners contribute a required amount of “sweat equity” hours building the home as a down payment. Accordingly, each family was required to work 250 hours before they could move in. In 1976, the reservation possessed a housing development of 114 new Pueblo style homes with running water and electricity. According to Joe Sierra, these modern homes offered a chance for Tigua children to improve their education because they “could study in private, lighted rooms for the first time.” Yet housing alone could not break the Tigua out of the cycle of poverty that had long existed in Ysleta.

By 1978, weaknesses in the state’s self-sufficiency program became apparent, causing Tigua leaders to emphasize education as a means for economic success. Between 1967 and 1977
the average level of education received by tribal members increased from a third grade to a sixth grade education. At the same time, median annual yearly incomes for families jumped from $950 to $4,250. In this context, many Tiguas could not attain economic self-sufficiency. Seeing this as a systemic problem, Tribal Governor Sierra held up a dollar and exclaimed, “This is the white world…and living in it still is not easy.” Sierra explained that tourism did not offer enough jobs and income to provide the community with basic services like healthcare and education. With these concerns in mind, he and other tribal leaders viewed education as a path towards economic autonomy. Having only graduated the third grade, Sierra understood the value of an education. In contrast, tribal member Frank Apodaca, who had replaced Griffon as the tribal superintendent, attained an MA in Public Administration at New Mexico State University. Apodaca knew that education opened many doors and also believed it could break the cycle of poverty that existed for the Tiguas.

Tribal Director Armando Ortiz also viewed education as a means to break the community out of poverty. As the only Tigua to graduate high school within the past decade, Ortiz understood the economic hardships that pulled tribal members from school to work in the cotton fields before graduation. In order to increase education, the tribe opened day care facilities for working mothers to expose children to educational materials at an early age. They also opened community libraries, collaborated with local schools to ensure regular attendance, and required adults without diplomas, who had been placed in jobs through the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA), to work two hours weekly towards their high school equivalency diploma. In addition, the tribe offered limited college assistance for members like Mary Belia Silvas, who attended El Paso Community College for business administration, and Darlene Muñoz, who enrolled in the
In this way, the tribe sought to improve access to education in order to help its people become economically successful.

Despite tribal gains in housing and efforts towards education, another specter loomed on the horizon that involved budget shortfalls and problems with the state’s logic of self-sufficiency. From 1976 to the mid-1980s, the state annually allocated between $200,000 and $300,000 for the Tiguas. In 1977, the tribe overspent the state allocation by $2000 and borrowed $22,000 to cover its tribal education budget. That same year, the tribe experienced a 40% unemployment rate. Initially, funding for tribal projects and services had been provided by federal grants, state appropriations, and private sources. By 1978, the state had supplied approximately one-fourth of the funds used by the Tigua and Alabama-Coushatta, and legislators had grown weary of spending tax money on them, wondering when they could become self-sufficient. This created a dilemma for Texas Indian Commission officials, who described the process of acquiring funds from the state legislature as “pulling teeth.” To persuade legislators to allocate more funding for the tribes, Commission officials set 1982 as the final “termination date” for state funding for the Tigua and Alabama-Coushatta. This panicked the Tigua, who forecasted their 1982 budget for basic services at $250,000. After both groups attacked the Indian Commission for mismanaging funds and mandating programs that did not lead to economic self-sufficiency, the Commission responded that they always hoped to terminate state funds, replace white administrators with Indians, and let them run their own “businesses.” Although the Commission gave Texas tribes more autonomy after the Governor appointed Apodaca Executive Director, state funding always remained an issue. Seeking to help the tribe, Apodaca introduced legislation that gave the Tigua non-profit status and exempted them from state taxes. By this time, the Texas business model of self-sufficiency
seemed out of reach for the Tigua. As this tense relationship between the Tiguas and the state persisted, new problems arose as state officials assaulted the tribe’s rights to state funding.

Texas legislators and state officials had grown weary of funding the Tiguas and Alabama-Coushatta and sought to terminate funding for the Texas Indian Commission. Although the state continued to fund the Tiguas after 1982, another termination crises began in 1983 after a game warden arrested two Alabama-Coushatta men for off-season hunting.\textsuperscript{103} Subsequently, the Texas Attorney General gave an opinion based on the state’s Equal Rights Amendment that viewed Indian reservations as unconstitutional, proposing that state appropriations for Indians were illegal. In response, the Tigua and Alabama-Coushatta sued the state in federal court over its trust responsibility. In the meantime, the state ended funding for the Indian Commission and reduced funding for the Tiguas.\textsuperscript{104}

Reminiscent of 1950s termination era policies, these events threatened the tribe’s economic sustainability. For the 1984-85 biennium, the state legislature appropriated $646,000 for the Tigua. For 1986 and 1987, Governor Mark White proposed $626,842. In jeopardy of losing these funds and worried about the outcome, Diamond and the Tiguas turned to attorney Don Miller of the Native American Rights Fund and crafted a bill to give the Tigua and Alabama Coushatta federal status and receive federal funds by restoring them to federal status. Here Diamond and Miller took a longshot because the Tiguas had never been under federal jurisdiction aside from being recognized and immediately transferred to state wardship. Hoping that the Tiguas could ride in on the coat-tails of the Alabama-Coushatta, Diamond and other political advocates for the Tiguas decided to go with this approach. Subsequently, Congressmen Ronald Coleman and Charles Wilson of Texas sponsored the bill. On October 17, 1985, five Tiguas along with members of the Alabama-Coushatta testified in the U.S. House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In
response, the Department of Interior’s Bureau of Indian Affairs office asked for a delay to determine if the tribes met recognition criteria. Well aware that the process could take up to two years, Diamond and the Tigua dug in and prepared for another battle.\textsuperscript{105}

Thus, the Tigua cultural revival that occurred in the years following their initial recognition exemplifies the tribe’s response to external pressure from the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs. This resulted in an increased cultural awareness that enhanced the community’s Indigenous identity as tribal members associated with outsiders, including Indians from other tribes, and learned various components of their traditional cultures. Emphasizing tourism as the path towards economic self-sufficiency, the underlying logic of the Commission’s plan for the Tigua invoked the assimilationist policies of the termination era in a way that led to the tribe’s release from state trusteeship. Yet because this transition occurred before the tribe could actualize true self-sufficiency, it reinforced the tribe’s dependency status because tourism alone could not economically sustain their community needs. Faced with the threat of community dissolution due to the state’s termination of recognition and funding, the Tiguas turned to the federal government.

**Federal Recognition**

As the Tigua continued to receive state funding, they embarked on another quest to prove their cultural authenticity to the federal government, other Indian tribes, and the public in general. In response to their 1985 presentation before the House Committee, Hazel E. Elbert of the BIA stated that the federal government had never fully evaluated nor recognized the Tigua and stated that the federal government had never held jurisdiction over the Tigua because they had transferred all trust and responsibility over to the state at the time of recognition. Seemingly defending Termination Era ideology, Hazel feared that the federal government would restore the Tigua to “a
federal status they never had.” Nevertheless, with the full support of the Texas Congressional delegation, the House surprisingly passed legislation that December restoring the trust relationship between the Tiguas and the federal government. Yet the bill did not get through the Senate. Initially, Senator Phil Gramm of Texas opposed the bill because Texas Comptroller Bob Bullock rejected it because it did not comply with state gambling regulations. As the bill stalled in the Senate in June 1986, the Department of the Interior approved it under the condition that it included a section defining the criteria for tribal membership for those receiving federal benefits. At the same time, Texas approved $523,000 for the Tigua for the 1986-87 biennium, only cutting $70,000 from their state budget. This coincided with a federal court decision that rejected the 1983 state attorney general’s position that viewed the Tigua and Alabama-Coushatta as ineligible for state funding and restored their state trust status. Despite these events, the Tiguas viewed federal status as their best option.

The Tiguas undoubtedly realized that federal trust status would help them more than recognition by state did. In March 1986, newly elected Tribal Governor Miguel Pedraza Jr. remarked that the tribe no longer trusted the state and indicated that their primary goal involved convincing the U.S. Congress to pass the recognition bill. Pedraza had good cause to distrust the state because five months later, Governor Mark White proposed cutting $59,192 from the Tigua’s budget. Responding to Comptroller Bullock and Senator Gramm’s concern’s over gambling, the tribe passed a resolution declaring that they would obey state gambling laws and submitted it to the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, where they amended the bill. Aside from inserting a clause on gambling, the Senate bill required that tribal members have a minimum one-eighth blood quantum to receive federal benefits. Although most tribes set their own blood
quantum criteria, the Reagan administration insisted on this policy because they feared that the amount of applicants applying for federal benefits would increase.\textsuperscript{111}

By late September 1986, almost a year after Coleman and Wilson first introduced it, the Senate returned the revised restoration bill to the House for approval. For Ysleta’s 1,124 Tiguas, this bill’s approval meant roughly $700,000 annually in healthcare, education, and other benefits. It also meant that the government would protect the tribe’s land in El Paso County, which was already held under state trusteeship.\textsuperscript{112} Although the bill passed both chambers of Congress in the fall of 1986, Senator Gramm and Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole pulled a parliamentary maneuver to vitiate or rescind the previous vote that approved it, thus killing the bill. Gramm argued that the General Accounting Office had failed to answer his questions on the bill’s estimated costs and that the vote occurred before he had been adequately notified. In response, the National Congress of American Indians and the Native American Rights Fund worked with the Tigua and Alabama-Coushatta and rallied public opinion against Gramm, causing him to reconsider his actions.\textsuperscript{113}

In a surprising twist of fate, this political pressure caused Senator Gramm to cooperate with the Tigua and support the bill during the spring of 1987. After Coleman introduced it, the House approved the bill on April 21, and Gramm pushed it through the Senate.\textsuperscript{114} That July, the Senate passed it after some minor revisions and sent it back to the House for approval. On August 18, 1987, President Reagan signed it into law.\textsuperscript{115} The Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act redesignated the tribe from its former title, the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Texas, to Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, rearticulating the bureaucratic semantics that underscored tribal identity in relation to place and people.\textsuperscript{116}
In accordance with Gramm’s demands, the new recognition law established a one-eighth blood quantum requirement for tribal membership and appeared to prohibit gambling at first glance. Yet the ambiguous and seemingly paradoxical language in the gambling clause, which stated that “All gaming activities which are prohibited by the laws of the state of Texas are hereby prohibited on the reservation and on lands of the tribe” allowed the Tigua to engage in gaming activities in 1991, when Texas passed the State Lottery Act.\textsuperscript{117} In an interview, Diamond explained that the bill’s language

\begin{quote}
opened the door enough for us to get our casino going. It was only because the Senate Select Committee pulled a fast one on Senator Gramm. Senator Gramm never realized that…the language in that bill had been changed. He never realized it. The lieutenant Governor of Texas never realized it. They knew we had amended the bill a little bit, and I’ll be honest with you, I wasn’t looking forward to a gambling opportunity either. I was just mad because we were being forced to take this position. It was wrong.\textsuperscript{118}
\end{quote}

Although the Tiguas never intended to open a casino when Congress debated this legislation, language that prohibiting gambling impinged on tribal sovereignty and set a bad precedent for other tribes, because the Tigua and Alabama-Coushatta were the only recognized tribes with gambling prohibitions. Responding to allegations that the Tiguas caved in to external pressures on the gambling issue, Miguel Pedraza Jr. stated that they had no desire to open a casino because they were in the restaurant business. The BIA also departed from its usual policy of letting tribes establish their own membership criteria. In order to appease politicians, who feared the possibility of providing services to an increasing tribal population, the Tiguas agreed to a one-eighth blood quantum for tribal membership.\textsuperscript{119}

Despite these impositions on tribal sovereignty, the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo Restoration Act greatly benefited the Tiguas. Placing the tribe under federal trust, it made them eligible for “all benefits and services furnished to federally recognized Indian tribes.”\textsuperscript{120} It also allowed them to continue their form of tribal government, to receive state services, and administer both state and
federal funds to provide such services as their own discretion. Establishing a federal reservation, it held their land in trust and protected it for the benefit of the tribe. Although it placed the reservation within the state’s civil and criminal jurisdiction, it stipulated that the federal courts had exclusive jurisdiction over any violations of state gaming codes.\textsuperscript{121} Thus, the tribal restoration act of 1987 improved the status of the community and solidified it by eliminating the termination era dilemmas due to the lack of state recognition and funding.

Yet the process of federal recognition involved more than just political maneuvering and policy negotiations in Congress. It also involved the increased continuation of the cultural revival movement that began during the late 1960s when the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs proposed tourism as the tribal road towards self-sufficiency. In fact, tourism and public presentations of indigeneity had engrained the idea of Tigua cultural authenticity into the local historical memory so much that they received a considerable amount of public support from El Paso businessmen and community leaders. Various Native American groups also supported the Tigua, including New Mexico’s All Indian Pueblo Council, the Kiowa, and the National Congress of American Indians. According to Apodaca, tribal elders from these groups rallied in common cause for Tigua recognition after meeting and realizing that they were indeed “real Indians.” Giving elders a chance to reconcile their histories and clarify misunderstanding from the past, Tiguas and Kiowas compared oral histories over the nineteenth-century conflict at Hueco Tanks. And, the Tiguas explained to New Mexico’s Pueblos that those who migrated to El Paso in 1680 did so as “slaves and burden bearers” for the Spanish in order to dispel the myth that they had betrayed the revolt. These meetings caused New Mexico’s Pueblos to support the Tigua, and their endorsement is one of the main reasons why the BIA reversed its position on Tigua recognition in 1986.\textsuperscript{122}
Throughout the recognition process of the 1980s, Tiguas intertwined their culture with political activism and reinforced their tribal identity. At this time, various accounts in the press enabled tribal members to voice their concerns and affirm their social standing as Native Americans. For example, in 1985, twenty-five year old Manny Silvas moved from ceremonial dancer to tribal governor. Advocating for education, medical care, and jobs, Silvas voiced his concerns in the press over state cuts in tribal funding and emphasized the need for “kids over 18 to get their GED and go to trade school.” Then in March 1986, Joe Sierra traveled to Europe for fifteen days as a delegate for the Greater El Paso Civic Convention and Tourist Center. Sierra’s presence gave the Tiguas worldwide recognition. The day before he left, the BBC interviewed him, and he appeared before over 20 million viewers. Then in London, he met Princess Diana while wearing an “eye-catching” headdress that resembled a multi-feathered Plains Indian style war bonnet. Sierra then cooked chili for 3,000 people. Also there, Texas Governor Mark White complimented Sierra’s cooking. After London, Sierra went to a large tourist convention in Germany. Giving the Tigua global recognition, Sierra’s trip exemplifies how tourism and popular media served as a venue for publicity. As an early advocate for tourism among the tribe, Sierra likely understood the political significance of his appearance as well as any cultural implications.

Weary of white stereotypes about Indians in films and on television, Tiguas successfully joined forces with the local Hispanic activist group, El Concilio de El Paso, in 1986 and boycotted a Western film festival that the city had been planning for two years. Contending that Hollywood’s insulting portrayals of Native Americans and Mexicans promoted false histories and values, the boycott undermined the film festival by reducing its budget. At the festival itself, only forty people showed up to watch the movie “Silverado,” which had already aired on Showtime weeks before.
Thus, Tigua involvement in the boycott signifies community agency in collusion with others within El Paso’s political arena.

These events reveal that as the tribe attained recognition, they transitioned from their battle tested strategies of strategic adaptation, accommodation, and negotiation and increasingly used public activism to voice their discontents. Seven months after boycotting the film festival, Miguel Pedraza and various tribal members participated in a public demonstration with Consejo Tarahumara Indians from Guachochic, Mexico. Meeting on the Bridge of the Americas, the two groups went to the Juarez Civic Center and discussed their concerns over the problems faced by their communities.\textsuperscript{126} In another instance, Tribal Governor Miguel Pedraza Jr. rebuked President Reagan’s statement that Indians maintained their “primitive lifestyle” to gain access to reservation lands and that many Indians on reservations did not have American citizenship. In that Reagan made these remarks relatively soon after the federal government had recognized the Tigua suggests that he was referring to them. In response, Pedraza described the President’s statement as insulting and explained that the Tigua’s had been given over 40,000 acres of land by the King of Spain, of which they only possess 63 acres in El Paso’s lower valley.\textsuperscript{127} Pedraza’s statement reflects how colonial pressures from Mexico and the United States had transformed the community from a land-rich mission-Indian pueblo to a fragmented and landless Indigenous enclave struggling for survival by the twentieth-century.

The fragmentation of community members who left Ysleta in search of economic opportunities elsewhere is reflected in the 1987 tribal roll. At this time, the Tigua census contained 1,124 tribal members. Although the core of Tigua society resided in Ysleta, many Tiguas moved across the southwestern United States. Examining birth dates and birth locations in the 1987 tribal census reveals that from the early 1900s to the 1980s, various community members migrated to
California, Arizona, and New Mexico, where they searched for economic opportunities not available in Ysleta and worked as agricultural laborers and factory workers.\textsuperscript{128}

Table 6.1: Birthplaces of Tribal Members, 1900s-1980s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Number of Tribal Members Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ysleta, TX</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces, NM</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tortugas, NM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deming, NM</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other NM locations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other TX locations</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juarez, MEX</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaragoza, MEX</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senecú, MEX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased Listed in Census</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Total</td>
<td>1,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1987 Tribal Census indicates that the core of Tigua society was born in Ysleta and El Paso, Texas. It is likely that many members with unknown birthplaces were born in Ysleta, El Paso, or Juarez, where the majority of their siblings were born.\textsuperscript{129}

The return of many Tiguas to Ysleta from outside of the core community caused a rift in Tigua society and a distinction in identity. Conservative Tiguas, who viewed participation in community activities and traditional ceremonies such as Saint Anthony’s Day as a requirement for tribal membership, viewed returning Tiguas as newcomers to the tribal rolls. Thomas A. Green explains that the conservative faction of Tigua society was made up of the core group who had always lived in Ysleta. They viewed “new Indians” as those who had stopped participating in community events, moved out of the community, or assimilated into Mexican or Anglo-American
society. This conservative element of Tigua society believed that Tiguas from outside of the core community only returned to Ysleta to receive the benefits and services gained from tribal recognition. Yet Tiguas had experienced difficult economic conditions all over, and returning to Ysleta likely appeared to be the best alternative when compared to struggling for access to resources in places like Los Angeles and Dallas.\textsuperscript{130}

This reflects how economic hardships and poverty pressured tribal members to migrate from Ysleta in search of employment elsewhere, and then return. For example, Tigua Cacique Enrique Paz spent most of his life in Ysleta. Then he served in the Army during World War II and worked outside of the community as a laborer for the railroad. During the recognition period, before being elected as Tribal Cacique, he worked as a building custodian for Ysleta’s federally funded Head Start program.\textsuperscript{131} Paz’s experience reflects how Tiguas who had left the community had not lost their identities as being Tigua. This is a messy area for identity negotiation because Tiguas often adapted to mainstream society as a survival strategy. Yet this did not mean that they had forgotten where they came from.

Despite the major gains involved with tribal recognition, tribal members on the streets of Ysleta experienced a bleak economic environment with limited job opportunities by the end of 1987. Although the community collectively received a boost in funding through federal benefits, tribal members only received about $3,000 each. As tribal leaders pleaded with government officials for improvements in education through grants and vocational programs, unemployment on the reservation soared to 50 percent, and alcoholism and drug addiction increased in unison with the crime rate. In June 1988, the Tribal Council requested $36,389 for a community drug and alcohol rehabilitation program and soon after, various tribal members engaged in an anti-drug crusade.\textsuperscript{132}
In this context, self-sufficiency transitioned into self-determination, as tribal members learned how to navigate the federal bureaucracy and apply for grants and other funding to keep services such as health care and education available for the community. Notwithstanding the poverty that still existed in the wake of tribal recognition, the Tiguas, with the help of Diamond, Coleman, and various other Native American organizations, emerged from the termination era as a federally recognized tribe within a state that sought to reduce them to their pre-recognition status. Although Cacique Jose Granillo passed away before federal recognition in 1987, his brother Trinidad Granillo and Miguel Pedraza Sr. both witnessed it. The following year, both Pedraza and Granillo departed, leaving their legacy to the community. Pedraza had contributed greatly to the tribe’s knowledge of the traditions, which he learned from his grandfather, Benselado Granillo. At the time of his passing, Pedraza’s son, Miguel Jr., served as the Tribal Governor. Trinidad Granillo had become Tribal Cacique after his brother died in 1981. These three tribal elders each played a significant part in helping Ysleta’s Tigua maintain their cultural identities and gain federal recognition.

Thus, 1987 was a major turning point for the Tigua community of Ysleta del Sur. They received a federal reservation and attained semi-sovereign status as a recognized tribe. Although state laws applied to the reservation, they retained their own tribal government structure and asserted their own jurisdiction over reservation lands. Whether transferred from the state trust or individual Tiguas, their land went into federal trust. In the decades following federal recognition, the Tiguas opened a casino, established a tribal court and police department, and administered various self-determination initiatives, such as the Tigua Indians Employment and Training and Higher Education programs. In 2002, the federal government closed the casino after a drawn out legal battle with the state. Although this setback inhibited the community’s economic growth, the
tribe persisted and changed directions and implemented various economic development programs, such as the Tigua Community Development Corporation and Tribal Enterprise Support for Tigua Inc., which promoted entrepreneurship and business opportunities for tribal members. Significantly, New Mexico’s All Indian Pueblo Council welcomed and recognized the Tigua of Ysleta del Sur as members, reuniting them with their northern Pueblo brothers and sisters. In this way, federal recognition empowered the Tigua by creating the space for community members to keep being Tigua.

Conclusion

From 1955 to 1987, the tribal recognition process revitalized the Tigua community and enhanced the collective identity of its members. Beginning during the 1950s Cold War context in which conservative politicians sought to terminate government programs towards Indians and break up federal reservations, these Termination Era policies implicitly and ironically steered Tigua tribal recognition. Although the Tigua had avoided the direct consequences of relocation and termination of federal benefits because of their non-recognized status, they still experienced many of the hardships that recognized Indians faced at this time. Already living in an urban environment interspersed among Mexican Americans and Euro-Americans, most Tiguas had integrated into wage labor capitalism as agricultural workers and laborers in other professions. They had also lost practically all of their land in the Ysleta Grant and their traditional lifeways had been significantly disrupted by U.S. colonization. In this context, various factors influenced the Tigua tribal recognition process.

When the City of El Paso annexed Ysleta in 1955 and imposed property taxes upon the Tiguas and threatened to dispossess them of what little land they had left, this launched the
recognition process. In this sense, I concur with Thomas A. Green, who argued that the external pressures of city annexation and state and federal recognition spurred the Tigua cultural revival of the 1960s and 70s, which placed an emphasis on Pueblo traditions and created a sense of unity in the community. While city annexation served as a catalyst to recognition, many other external factors influenced it as well. First, the federal government terminated its responsibility over the Alabama-Coushatta in 1954 and placed their reservation into state trust. This transfer subsequently influenced the state to create the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs and establish a working relationship with a recognized Indigenous community. Second, Tom Diamond took up the Tigua cause and crafted a two part strategy to attain both state and federal recognition. Ingeniously, Diamond coopted Termination Era policy and strategically twisted it in favor of the Tigua by gaining state recognition in 1967 and federal recognition in 1968, and then the immediate termination of federal oversight and transfer to state wardship. As an attorney and Chair of El Paso County’s Democratic Party, Diamond possessed a vast and powerful political network in Texas politics that reached into the offices of officials such as Congressman Richard C. White and President Lyndon B. Johnson. Yet these are only some factors that enabled tribal recognition for the Tiguas during the Termination Era.

At this time, the Tiguas contributed to their own recognition by being themselves and performing their traditional dances and chants for various public figures and politicians. Importantly, their performance in front of the National Congress of American Indians in 1966 gained them instant membership into the organization and the support of various Pan-Indian power brokers, such as Vine Deloria Jr. These types of face to face encounters served as an informal prerequisite to federal recognition and also enhanced tribal identity, as Tiguas interacted with members of various other Native American communities. NCAI also contributed greatly to the
recognition process by lobbying for the Tigua and pressuring Congressmen to support them. Thus, Diamond’s strategy and political network worked in unison with public pressure by groups such as NCAI and AIM during the 1968 tribal recognition.

During the post-recognition period, the Tiguas experienced a cultural renaissance that invited tourism to the community and reified their status as Pueblo Indians. Yet this cultural revival had been pushed upon the Tigua by the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs. Similar to their approach with the Alabama-Coushatta, the state sought to make the Tigua community self-sufficient community so that they could eventually incorporate into the mainstream political economy. Despite the state agenda, the Tiguas rearticulated their new social environment and enhanced their own identities by creating spaces for community interactions amongst themselves and members of other tribes, such as Apaches and Pueblos, during dance competitions and public displays of Indigenous culture. Yet self-sufficiency through tourism had not provided the Tiguas with adequate education, employment, and health care as many had hoped. By the early 1980s, state officials grew weary of funding the Tigua and wondered when they would become self-sufficient. Tensions increased when the Texas Attorney General declared funding for Indian reservations unconstitutional and the state reduced its appropriations for the Tigua.

As it became apparent that Texas had regressed into the termination era logic of the 1950s, the Tiguas decided to attain federal recognition. By 1985, Diamond and the Tiguas had organized a network of supporters and introduced legislation to jointly return both the Tiguas and the Alabama-Coushatta to federal status. Various policy makers roadblocked this legislation out of fear that the Tiguas would open a casino. Others argued that the Tiguas had never been under federal trust because they had been transferred to the state upon federal recognition. After two years of negotiation, the Tiguas agreed to establish a one-eighth blood quantum rule and to abide
by state gaming laws. This violated their sovereignty because federally recognized tribes set their own membership criteria. Although the Reagan administration insisted on the blood quantum rule to limit the amount of federal benefits received by the tribe, it surely understood its potential to incrementally reduce its population eligible members over time. Nevertheless, the Tiguas agreed with those policies and gained federal recognition in 1987. In this sense, they adapted and negotiated the federal government’s demands to achieve the best possible outcome.

Similar to the 1960s, Tigua federal recognition would have been impossible without the assistance of various Indigenous groups. The National Congress of American Indians and the Native American Rights Fund continuously lobbied for them in Congress. The region’s Pueblos and Kiowas also helped the Tigua by pressuring BIA officials after the Tiguas also established common bonds of friendship and kinship with them. Once again, these face to face interactions enhanced their sense of belonging to a larger Pan-Indian movement, which in turn reinforced their individual tribal identities as Tiguas.

Federal recognition in 1987 solidified the process of recognition that began during the late 1960s. Within this time span, the cultural revival that occurred enhanced a tribal identity, as the community struggled to establish its sovereignty within a volatile political climate. Although the Tiguas had always been somewhat heterogeneous, federal recognition seemingly homogenized them into one category defined by the one-eighth blood quantum requirement. This policy seemingly negated their diverse lineage that included various Piros, Mansos, and others as well as their sovereign right to absorb outsiders into the community. Despite this, the core group of Tiguas in Ysleta benefitted greatly from federal recognition because it protected their community and offered them a sovereign space to be themselves.
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Conclusion

As a borderlands community, the Tiguas of Ysleta del Sur have resiliently adapted to and negotiated numerous external pressures while internally maintaining their identities through various community interactions and activities that served as identity markers for being Tigua. Through a symbiotic relationship between community and identity in which one reinforced the other, they have navigated the external pressures of Spanish, Mexican, and American colonization. Experiencing colonial disruption, migration, disease, detribalization, warfare with groups such as the Apache, land dispossession, and wage labor capitalism, Ysleta’s Tiguas maintained notions of community through internal social interactions based on bonds of kinship and reciprocity. As colonization and the creation of various borderlands altered the world in which they lived, they rearticulated their own space within these dynamically changing social environments. These rearticulations involved various instances of contestation and cooperation in which community members interacted through collective activities such as agricultural labor, migration, military service, and traditional dances and rituals while maintaining their own distinct identities as Tiguas.

Although agricultural labor and their connection to the land played a major role in Tigua society, they are also a historically migratory people. These migrations are evidenced through their emergence from the earth in origin stories, the consolidation of sedentary communities in present day New Mexico by 1,000 A.D., and the movement of Mogollon and Anasazi peoples into the Rio Grande Valley well before Spanish colonization. Influenced by environmental factors such as drought and the arrival of Athapaskan peoples from the north, these people formed a series of settlements in New Mexico’s Rio Grande valley near the Sandia and Manzano mountains known as Tiguex by early Spanish explorers. After colonial Spain destroyed these settlements in 1540,
the survivors migrated and formed new settlements in the area of New Mexico’s lower Rio Grande and Manzano Mountains. By the mid-seventeenth-century, drought caused many to migrate from mission settlements near the Manzanos such as Quarái to Isleta in New Mexico. The most significant migration occurred in the aftermath of the Pueblo revolt of 1680 when numerous Tiguas and Piros migrated to the El Paso del Norte area. Their migrations did not end, as the Tiguas subsequently participated in circular migrations to gather resources throughout the region and access economic opportunities outside of the core Ysleta community. The latter becomes apparent when one considers that some moved to Tortugas, New Mexico, Los Angeles, California, and other locations during the American period.

Before federal recognition, the Tiguas maintained a heterogeneous community through intermarriage and kinship relations with members of other Indigenous groups. As a mission-Indian community in Ysleta, the Tiguas did not live in isolation from the surrounding mission pueblos, such as Socorro, Senecú, and Guadalupe in El Paso del Norte. During the Spanish period, they maintained kinship ties and intermarried with Piros, Mansos, and others who lived amongst them within the space of El Paso’s colonial settlements. These relationships enabled Ysleta’s Tiguas to regenerate and maintain their population during the eighteenth-century when diseases such as smallpox and typhus plagued the region and significantly reduced the community’s numbers. These relationships also permitted Tiguas access to the region’s land and its resources through obligations of kinship and shared reciprocity over land rights and access to hunting grounds and other natural resources. In this way, the region’s Sumas and Mansos transferred much of their territory to the Tiguas and Piros who settled in the area during Spanish colonization.

During the Mexican and American periods, the heterogeneous nature of the Tigua community was evidenced by their absorption of numerous Piros. By the time of Mexican
independence, kinship ties between Ysleta and Senecú brought people together through shared experiences in the missions, shared language, community events, and a broadly common Pueblo Indian cultural heritage. Many Piros also moved to Ysleta and Tortugas during the mid-nineteenth-century because of flooding and fear of losing their land after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo placed much their best land in the Senecú Grant into United States territory. From the 1850s into the Mexican Revolution, pressures from the Mexican government also caused many Piros and Mansos to leave Senecú and present day Juarez. Many of these families settled in Ysleta, intermarried with Tiguas, and became part of the community through participation in public events and shared cultural traditions between Tiguas, Piros, and Mansos that had been well known and accepted among them. One of the main reasons why the Tiguas retained their identity and cultural traditions is because the main faction of their leadership had migrated to Ysleta del Sur in the aftermath of the Pueblo revolt. Their status among the people and their knowledge of the traditions gave them the necessary social capital to organize the community and maintain its identity as Tigua. Because participation in community affairs and shared culture had always been a strict requirement for community membership, the absorption of other Indians into the pueblo through intermarriage and extended kinship enhanced Tigua identity more than fragmented it. In this way, the Tiguas balanced group cohesion with ethnogenesis and maintained their community identity.

Despite the impositions of the Franciscans, the Tigua community possessed various degrees of cultural sovereignty as the respected wards and residents of the Ysleta mission, which in turn enabled them to maintain their identity. Tiguas negotiated their position within the mission in various ways. Initially, Don Diego de Vargas sought to avoid another major Indian uprising and gave the Tiguas a significant amount of social space in the Hinojosa Grant of 1692. Colonial officials also separated and assigned missions to El Paso’s Indians according to their group
identities. As Indigenous auxiliaries for the Spanish (and later Mexico and the United States), the Tiguas received some status in colonial society for their military service defending the settlements from Apaches. The 1751 Ysleta Grant signifies the colonial recognition of Tigua sovereignty over the land surround the mission. During the period of Bourbon reforms, tensions between colonial church and state reduced the ability of the friars to pressure the Tiguas and the church periodically left Ysleta’s mission vacated during the late 1700s. This gave the Tiguas a significant amount of autonomy to practice their traditions in spaces outside of church surveillance. When the church did provide Ysleta with its own friar, Tiguas contested those who did not let them practice their own cultural traditions, which led to their removal in some cases. Moreover, the Franciscans had a vested interest in giving the Tigua some degree of cultural autonomy because they used the presence of Indigenous culture to justify to colonial officials why their missions should remain functioning and not become secularized, largely because the mission as a civilizing institution had not yet fully assimilated its Indians into colonial society. In this paradoxical sense, Tigua cultural continuity meant job security for the Franciscans.

The continued recognition of the Ysleta Grant during the Mexican period illustrates how local officials recognized and respected Tigua political sovereignty. Despite Mexico’s new policy that recognized all Indians as citizens, the Tiguas retained their community identity and sought to protect their land. Local and state officials such as Julian Bernal agreed with them and surveyed the boundaries of the Ysleta Grant, thus reaffirming their possession of the land. Although numerous vecinos moved into Ysleta during the Mexican period, the Tiguas retained most of their land. This is important because Tigua identity in Ysleta del Sur had always been rooted in their connection to the land and their relationships with other Indians in the area. This connection between place, people, and identity is symbolized by the Ysleta Grant and especially the Ysleta
mission church as a significant marker for community identity. Yet this sense of belonging to a specific place would not have persisted as well if the Tigua had not retained a somewhat sovereign connection to the land as residents of the Ysleta mission under Spanish and Mexican colonization.

Agricultural activities also served as a marker for identity and helped the Tiguas maintain group cohesion by invoking familiar knowledge about land and water management and transposing it to new social settings. During the Spanish period, Tiguas constructed acequias and farmed crops such as corn and squash in group contexts that enhanced their social identities in relation to themselves and others in colonial society. Working for colonial officials also gave them some colonial status and protected their land through obligations of reciprocity for their services. It also brought them together in face to face encounters with Indians from El Paso’s other mission settlements, such as Mansos and Piros, enhancing cross community ties between them. During the mid-1800s, Ysleta possessed a rich agricultural cornucopia including vineyards, livestock, and cornfields that surprised recently arrived Anglos. Yet by the early twentieth-century, these new arrivals had dispossessed the Tiguas of most of their land and reduced them to wage labor status on land that had once belonged to them. As agricultural wage laborers, whole families worked in the fields to make ends meet. These group labor settings strengthened community bonds of family and kinship among the Tiguas as they negotiated and persisted through the harsh realities of their social status within the capitalist system.

Military service during the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods also symbolized Tigua identity in opposition to rival Indigenous groups such as the Apache, Kiowa, and Comanche. While the Tigua did receive heightened status in colonial society for their service in defending the region against incursions from these groups, they did so less out of conformity to colonial ambitions and more from their desire to use their new allies against old enemies. In this way,
Tiguas such as Bernardo Holguín rearticulated old military traditions into new social contexts, seeking honor and reciprocity in return for their efforts. Military service also benefited the Tiguas by giving them colonial recognition and access to resources such as captured livestock. Although the Tiguas served as scouts and guides for the United States army and the Texas Rangers, they only received superficial recognition for their efforts, as the state did nothing to recognize them and protect their land during the nineteenth-century.

The creation of the United States-Mexico border significantly altered the historical trajectory of the Tigua community and set the stage for the dispossession of their land. Between the 1820s and 1850s, various shifts in the Rio Grande River worked in unison with the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and placed San Elizario, Socorro, and Ysleta into United States territory within the state of Texas. The community’s residency in the state of Texas proved unfortunate for the Tigua, because Texas viewed Indigenous peoples in a very unfavorable way and retained full legal jurisdiction over its public lands and Indian policies upon its annexation into the United States. Although the state had been obligated to protect their land per the 1848 Treaty, they ignored any Mexican land claims to Ysleta. Yet the Tiguas should have been granted the same rights as Mexican citizens because Mexico’s Plan de Iguala declared them so after Mexican independence. Moreover, Texas jurisdiction isolated Ysleta’s Tiguas from any chance at federal recognition and protection of its lands and enabled land speculators, the railroad, and government bureaucrats to dispossess the Tiguas of practically all of their land in the Ysleta Grant as well as the surrounding subsistence landscape.

The Tigua land dispossession at the hands of speculators and bureaucrats severely threatened the community and coincided with contemporary late-nineteenth-century ethnographic notions that Indians would disappear and assimilate into mainstream American society. Yet bonds
of kinship and family connections provided a network for the community to resist full assimilation into Mexican society, as anthropologists like Fewkes had forecasted. Speaking back to these colonial pressures during the early Progressive Era, the Tiguas produced a tribal constitution in 1895 that declared their objective to remain culturally and politically sovereign from mainstream American society. Around this time, the Tiguas lived amongst various Mexican-Americans in Ysleta’s Barrio de Los Indios, and many outsiders predicted that they would soon vanish as they lost their authentic cultural traditions. Like Houser, I consider kinship and the retention of their tribal government as markers for community continuity in response to the external pressures of land dispossession and their impoverished status under wage labor capitalism. During the Progressive Era, the constitution signified their collective sense of self-awareness as a tribal entity in opposition to the dominant political structure and hegemony of the U.S. nation-state. It served as an assertion of sovereignty and counter-hegemony in resistance to these external pressures in a way that evidences the community’s agency through the rearticulation of this changing social context to their own best advantage.

Considering change and continuity in relation to how the Tiguas adapted to the tenets of modernity and incorporated them into their daily activities and community functions, their adoption of modern traits did not undermine their identities as Indians from Ysleta. Nor did it dilute the meaning of their traditional dances and ceremonies in relation to that identity. As S. K. Adam explains, traditions such as Saint Anthony’s Day always remained constant for the Tigua. What changed may have been particular customs related to those traditions. Thus, the customs could shift from using muskets during the festival to using shotguns. Yet the tradition and meaning of the festival itself remained constant as a symbol or signifier for community and identity. Bringing community members together through shared values and beliefs based on their cultural
identity as Tiguas, Saint Anthony’s Day involves myriad interactions that reinforce the pueblo’s collective identity within a modern context.

Looking at Saint Anthony’s day in a larger historical context, it signifies how the Tiguas negotiated and adapted to Spanish colonization by rearticulating their traditional ceremonial cycle during the planting season, which culminates with the Corn Dance, into the calendar of the Catholic Church, in which Saint Anthony’s day happens to occur at the same time. This syncretism as pragmatically applied by the Tigua did not dilute the traditional meaning of the ceremonies associated with the planting season. Instead, the Tigua rearticulated the customs associated with this tradition by dancing in front of the church in order to make the priests believe that they venerating a Catholic God. Over time, Tiguas adopted Saint Anthony as a deity. Yet its celebration had always been based around the traditional Tigua concepts associated with springtime and planting. Saying that this has somehow diluted the original meaning associated with the tradition robs the Tiguas and other Indigenous peoples of their ability to make their own decisions and somehow suggests that they will be less Indian for making one choice over another. It also pigeon-holes Indigenous peoples into the trap of cultural authenticity, which freezes them within anachronistic time and space and negates their ability to exist and make decisions in the present. This type of strategic negotiation, however, went much further than just performing sacred traditions and dances within the community. It also eventually symbolized Tigua responses to the impositions of the colonial state and their ability to assert their cultural sovereignty.

During the Progressive and New Deal eras, the Tiguas used presentations of dances, singing, and cultural traditions to assert their community identity within the public mindset and reify their popular historical significance within the region. Although the Tiguas had always practiced their traditional dances and ceremonies within their community, they began using
cultural performances of Indigeneity during the late nineteenth century in public spaces, such as state fairs, to assert their own cultural sovereignty and establish themselves as real Indians. These functions also brought community members together, strengthened their tribal identity, and empowered them to speak back to the hegemonic discourses that assumed their disappearance into Mexican society. At these performances, Tiguas articulated a public identity predicated upon their cultural traditions that met the needs of the general public’s criteria for authentic Indigeneity. Despite the appearance that they only were “playing Indian,” these representations of Indianness in public spaces held very real meanings for community members. These performances peaked when Cacique Demasio Colmenero and a group of Tiguas appeared at the 1936 Texas Centennial celebration in Dallas and declared President Franklin Delano Roosevelt an honorary tribal cacique. These events enhanced the community identity as people struggled to survive during the Great Depression.

Participation in Indian boarding schools at the turn of the twentieth-century also paradoxically reified the identity of some community members despite the objectives of these institutions to assimilate Indigenous peoples into mainstream American society. In general, the boarding school experience traumatized Indian children. It uprooted them from their homes, denied them the ability to speak their first languages, and attempted to erase all traces of Indigenous culture from them. Although not denying that boarding schools traumatized Tiguas, my research indicates that the Tigua boarding school experience appears quite different than that of other American Indians who lived on isolated reservations and communities on the fringes of American society. The Tiguas had already adapted to over two hundred years of colonization and had learned how to negotiate Catholicism, the Franciscan missions, and their own cultural sovereignty in Mexican and American society. Boarding schools also offered many Tiguas such
as Melitón Holguín a chance to escape the poverty of the barrio and receive food, clothing, and shelter, as well as an education that reflected the changing society around them. And, many tribal elders viewed education as a way to improve the community and encouraged their children to go. At the Albuquerque Indian Boarding School, Tiguas lived among other Indians from the borderlands region, such as Pueblos, Piros, and Mansos. Despite the oppressive nature of these institutions, contact with other Indians likely enhanced their self-awareness as Tiguas from Ysleta. Significantly, after some Tiguas returned from the boarding school, they told others of their experience, and these others willingly volunteered to attend. In this sense, the Albuquerque Boarding School symbolized a seeming rite of passage for some Tiguas and served as an identity marker for them during the early Progressive Era.

At this time, one’s residency within and connection to the Barrio de los Indios in Ysleta also signified their community identity. Kinship bonds, family ties, and community events maintained the interpersonal networks needed to reinforce the collective Tigua identity among the people. Because the tribal war captain lived in the Barrio and the tusla was located outside of his house, this neighborhood served as the core of community cultural activities apart from the mission-church located a few blocks away. As such, the Barrio, also referred to as the old pueblo by some Tiguas, served as a cultural symbol for Tigua identity, connecting community with place through historical recollections and contemporary interactions. Between the 1940s and 1960s, these networks enabled the core Tigua community to persist among their Mexican-American and Anglo neighbors in Ysleta.

Tribal recognition ushered in a new era for the Tiguas that revitalized their community and politically reinforced its tribal identity. While it could be said that the Tiguas danced their way into federal recognition by gaining the National Congress of American Indian stamp of approval, the
Termination Era political environment and recognition process would have been practically impossible for them to navigate without the help of Tom Diamond. Working with the Tiguas, Diamond deployed a brilliant political strategy that led to their tribal recognition during the apex of the federal government’s termination era policies. Inserting the Tigua recognition process into the termination process, Diamond coopted the latter to enable the former by attaining state recognition first (1967), federal recognition second (1968), and then agreeing to the federal government’s termination of wardship and emancipation into state jurisdiction. As El Paso’s Democrat County Chair, Diamond possessed a considerable amount of political capital that reached from the local bureaucracy and state legislature to the U.S. Congress and the White House. His networking skills actually made tribal recognition a reality for the Tiguas.

After tribal recognition, the Tiguas embarked on a cultural renaissance that invigorated their community identity. With state and federal funding they built a community center, housing development, and various other facilities such as a restaurant and kiva. In this context, dancing and performing in public brought community members together and united them under the new tribal identity that emerged. This revival of Pueblo and Pan-Indian culture, however, had been imposed upon them by the Texas Commission for Indian Affairs in order to make the community economically self-sufficient enough to eventually be released from state wardship. Seeking to fast-track the community into economic assimilation, the state’s approach mirrored termination era policy objectives that had been directed towards the Alabama-Coushatta just a decade earlier. Despite the ulterior motives of some state officials, the Tiguas themselves chose to follow this path and resiliently rearticulated their Indigenous culture to establish themselves in public as a real Indian community. In this way outside pressures and internal community action worked in unison to reinforce Tigua identity.
By the 1980s, the Tiguas pragmatically embarked on a path towards self-determination and sought federal protection after some Texas officials threatened to take away their tribal sovereignty. As a recognized and accepted American Indian community among the region’s Pueblos and others, Tiguas such as Jose Granillo, Trinidad Granillo, and Miguel Pedraza gained enough political and Pan-Indian support to restore the tribe to federal status in 1987. Under the name, Ysleta del Sur Pueblo, the identity of community members solidified in relation to place. Yet federal status also undermined the Tiguas because it enabled federal officials to impose a one-eighth blood quantum requirement for tribal membership. Negating the tribe’s sovereign right to establish its own criteria for membership, the blood quantum requirement stemmed from the fear of conservative politicians that too many Indians would become eligible for federal benefits. One of the biggest problems with this racist policy is that the Tiguas, like all Indigenous communities, never existed in a timeless bubble of homeostasis. They had always been somewhat heterogeneous, and tribal membership always depended upon one’s involvement in the community and its traditional culture.

Another significant factor that government officials overlooked is that Ysleta del Sur Pueblo had always been a borderlands community that negotiated and adapted to various external pressures such as disease and colonization by absorbing outsiders into their community. Isolating the tribe through a superimposed blood quantum denied them the ability to regenerate on their own terms and established a baseline for population decline as tribal members become numerically excluded from the tribal rolls. In short, the blood quantum requirement guaranteed that the tribal community would be subjected to the assimilationist objectives of the termination era despite federal recognition status. If the Spanish had imposed a blood quantum requirement in 1692, the likelihood that Tigua identity would have persisted for over three hundred years is doubtful. Yet
tribal identity did persist within the community of Ysleta del Sur, as the Tiguas adapted to the social changes that occurred around them and negotiated them to their best possible advantage.

During the Spanish, Mexican, and American periods of colonization and national expansion, the Tigua people of Ysleta del Sur maintained their Indigenous identities through their connection with the community and the various collective spaces, events, and activities associated with it. Family and kinship connections played an integral role, as community members migrated, worked, worshipped, and celebrated together in various activities that both symbolized and enhanced their identities and distinguished them as an Indigenous pueblo. Importantly, face to face interactions in public reinforced their sense of belonging. Within an often dynamic and volatile borderlands environment, they both resisted and cooperated with various outsiders to maintain their community that simultaneously reinforced their identities as Tiguas.
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