

Bucknell University

## Bucknell Digital Commons

---

Faculty Journal Articles

Faculty Scholarship

---

2018

### The Southwest's Unven Welcome: Immigrant Inclusion and Exclusion in Arizona and New Mexico

Elizabeth Durden

*Bucknell University*, [tdurden@bucknell.edu](mailto:tdurden@bucknell.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac\\_journal](https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/fac_journal)



Part of the [Migration Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Durden, Elizabeth. "The Southwest's Unven Welcome: Immigrant Inclusion and Exclusion in Arizona and New Mexico." *Journal of American Ethnic History* (2018) : 5-36.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Bucknell Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Journal Articles by an authorized administrator of Bucknell Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [dcadmin@bucknell.edu](mailto:dcadmin@bucknell.edu).



UNIVERSITY OF  
ILLINOIS PRESS

Immigration & Ethnic  
History Society

---

The Southwest's Uneven Welcome: Immigrant Inclusion and Exclusion in Arizona and New Mexico

Author(s): Robin Dale Jacobson, Daniel Tichenor and T. Elizabeth Durden

Source: *Journal of American Ethnic History*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Spring 2018), pp. 5-36

Published by: University of Illinois Press on behalf of the Immigration & Ethnic History Society

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/jamerethnhist.37.3.0005>

## REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/jamerethnhist.37.3.0005?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/jamerethnhist.37.3.0005?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

University of Illinois Press and Immigration & Ethnic History Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of American Ethnic History*

# **The Southwest's Uneven Welcome: Immigrant Inclusion and Exclusion in Arizona and New Mexico**

**ROBIN DALE JACOBSON, DANIEL TICHENOR,  
T. ELIZABETH DURDEN**

## **INTRODUCTION**

IN FEW POLICY AREAS IS THE AUTHORITY of the federal government presumed to be more dominant than immigration. In four phases during the nineteenth century, the Supreme Court advanced a dictum of exclusive federal power to regulate the admission and expulsion of non-citizens. In the century that followed, the Court was consistent and unequivocal in expounding the “plenary power” doctrine that “over no other conceivable subject is the power of Congress more complete.”<sup>1</sup> Federal laws governing immigrant rights have received stricter scrutiny from the courts, but again federal authority and policy have routinely trumped state and local regulations. Despite these legal verities, however, states have always played a pivotal role in governing the inclusion or exclusion of immigrants in American life. State governments preceded their federal counterpart in constructing an elaborate set of regulations controlling immigrant admissions and rights, actively recruiting new settlers, and building bureaucratic systems and capacities for inspecting and monitoring new arrivals. An important and growing literature has begun to highlight the enormous significance US states play in governing immigration and immigrant rights.<sup>2</sup> But our understanding of how different states have influenced the lives of newcomers and their families in distinctive ways over time remains remarkably limited.

To understand how states and contrasting regimes govern newcomers, New Mexico and Arizona from their formation in the Progressive Era to the Second World War are especially revealing. Today, most immigration observers in the United States readily acknowledge a wide gulf in the reception and membership rights of immigrant communities in these two neighboring states. Arizona gained notoriety in 2010 when it enacted

legislation—SB1070—requiring state and local law enforcement officers to determine the immigration status of anyone involved in a lawful stop, detention, or arrest where “reasonable suspicion exists” that the person is unlawfully present. As Arizona became ground zero in a contentious struggle over porous borders and Latino rights, undocumented immigrants living next door in New Mexico were granted driver’s licenses and in-state tuition. New Mexico has a broadly celebrated Latino heritage and a strong emphasis on integration in which community groups and state and local governments work together to incorporate the foreign-born into the collective fabric.<sup>3</sup> These contrasting governing regimes for immigrants have deep historical roots unseen on the surface level of contemporary American politics. As we demonstrate in this article, these governing regimes of immigration reflect significant and distinctive relationships that developed over time between each of these states as well as with the nation. The history of immigrants in these two states also shows that contemporary contrasts obscure a checkered past in New Mexico as well as areas of policy convergence reflecting complex developmental pathways.

The contrasts between Arizona and New Mexico in terms of immigrant governance today are particularly striking due to their shared geography and historical annexation into the United States, as well as their shared border with Mexico. Both drafted constitutions and made a case for statehood in identical years. And by far the largest immigrant group in each of these southwestern states comes from Mexico. Yet how do we explain the notable variations in the immigrant-governing regimes in these two states? Equally important, why did New Mexico in the past at times pursue policies that were repressive toward newcomers of particular ethnic backgrounds, an approach seemingly at odds with its inclusionary traditions and contemporary reputation?

Linda Noel’s exemplary research on New Mexican pluralism and Arizonan marginalization strategies during statehood debates of the early twentieth century serves as an important starting point. Strikingly, Noel finds that the complex national political debates and policy outcomes concerning immigrants in this period were influenced by how Arizona and New Mexico framed the relationship between Mexicans and American identity. Indeed, after examining processes of marginalization and pluralism in the origins of Arizona and New Mexico, Noel leaves behind the individual states to illuminate how these strategies were employed in immigration politics on the national stage. For reasons all too familiar to immigration policy scholars, pluralist ideals were overwhelmed in the 1920s by marginalization blueprints

that elevated notions of the temporary Mexican worker in national debates over immigration restriction. Furthermore, Noel illustrates the common ground found between those using a marginalization strategy and the exclusionists to explain the repatriation of Mexican workers in the 1930s.<sup>4</sup>

While Noel's writing on the legacy of statehood debates in the American Southwest sheds light on national political responses to Mexican immigrants writ large, our interest in this subject is driven more by similarities and variations in how Arizona and New Mexico responded to new immigrants and national political pressures in the early decades of the twentieth century. Put another way, an important story can be told about immigrant inclusion and exclusion in the states that complements national conceptions of belonging. Pluralist and marginalization approaches evolve in Arizona and New Mexico, separate from their use at the national level, and impact the treatment of not just Mexicans or Mexican Americans, but other immigrant groups as well, often in unexpected ways. This article argues that while at its founding, New Mexico was a more inclusive space for a Mexican-origin population and Mexican immigrants, other immigrant groups received a chillier if not repressive response. In particular, New Mexico highlights ways in which inclusive political culture and policies do not extend to all immigrants but only immigrants who have already fought for and won inclusion for their cultural or racial identity. Inclusion of some often rests on triangulation with other "outsiders." For its part, Arizona continually refused to integrate immigrants and non-white ethnics into their state, but remained steadily reliant on immigrant labor. As we shall see, Arizona would follow a model not dissimilar from the Southern Confederacy, driven by the twin catalysts of economic expediency and racial hierarchy. In surprising ways, then, our Southwestern research uncovers that inclusion can be racially specific while at the same time exclusion does not have to be so. These insights lead us to argue for a more cautious understanding of what counts as an inclusive or exclusive state, a binary that has been present in much work on state-level immigration policy.<sup>5</sup> New Mexico and Arizona complicate neat categorization of inclusion and exclusion and help us see patterns of long-term political development and historical (in)consistency. Our findings also highlight the extent to which immigrant experiences, even in relation to key national policies, often vary across states.

This article trains a spotlight on immigration politics and policies in Arizona and New Mexico in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. We begin by briefly discussing the distinctive constitutional and statehood struggles in Arizona and New Mexico, yielding divergent power structures

and claims to national belonging that cast long shadows on how each state received immigrants and responded to federal demands and national issues of the day. The bulk of this article, however, carefully examines how Arizona and New Mexico sought to govern two key immigrant groups—new European arrivals and Japanese settlers—during their formative years through World War II. This in-depth historical comparison of two neighboring southwestern states with conflicting ideological traditions and power structures provides a glimpse of the analytical value of studying subnational places of immigrant inclusion and exclusion.

### ETHNIC POWER AND SUBJUGATION IN THE SOUTHWEST STATEHOOD DEBATES

The contrasting strategies and claims advanced by Arizona and New Mexico in their pursuit of new constitutions, statehood, and national standing can be traced to the relationship between Anglos and people of Mexican descent in these adjacent territories during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, ratified in 1848, forcibly incorporated roughly 525,000 square miles of previously Mexican territory, bringing an estimated 75,000 people of Mexican descent under US jurisdiction. Most of these long-term natives of what we now call the US Southwest lived along the Rio Grande: sixty thousand in the territory that would become the state of New Mexico, only one thousand in Arizona, and the rest in California, Texas, and Colorado.<sup>6</sup> These *nativos* or *Hispano Americanos* had one year to accept US citizenship, and with it full rights and immunities under the law, which nearly all did.

Arizona began as a far less populous state than its neighbor but grew steadily as federal legislation in the late nineteenth century (including the Desert Lands Act of 1877 and the Dawes Act of 1887) distributed land at low cost and with few restrictions to new Anglo settlers. The Army Corps of Engineers and Reclamation Service also initiated irrigation projects in this period that directly benefited new Anglo farming, ranching, and mining ventures and corporations, while shifting water away from small landholders of Mexican descent.<sup>7</sup> The historian David Berman estimates that the Latino population in Arizona dropped sharply from 45 percent of the state's total population in 1870 to just 20 percent by the turn of century. In addition, over time those of Mexican descent in Arizona increasingly were Mexican immigrants and temporary workers who came to fill unskilled jobs for large Anglo mining, ranching, and agricultural operations.<sup>8</sup>

By contrast, New Mexico from the start had the largest population of Spanish-speaking people in the region. With roughly sixty thousand of the roughly seventy-five thousand original *Hispanos* residing in the state's territory when it was forcibly incorporated into the United States in 1848, this group remained the majority in New Mexico in the decades that followed. By 1900, scholars estimate somewhere between 50 and 75 percent of New Mexico's 195,000 residents were of Mexican descent. Unlike the many disenfranchised Mexican Americans in Arizona, *Hispanos* exercised considerable political clout in New Mexico, where they comprised at least half of the votes (but usually more), had influence in both major parties, and held notable shares of local and state elected offices during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>9</sup>

The fact that people of Mexican descent were numerous, economically diverse, and politically influential in New Mexico was anathema to the Anglo American economic and political elite of Arizona. Indeed, these territories formally separated during the Civil War era precisely because Anglo Americans migrating west came to dominate Arizona while Anglo newcomers shared power with the more dominant *Hispanos* of New Mexico. As Ginger C. Stull writes, it was a fundamental divide “. . . between Hispanic American populations in what is now New Mexico who wanted the rights [guaranteed by the Treaty of Hidalgo] protected, and Anglo American populations in what is now Arizona who were denying Spanish speakers the rights to vote, hold office and participate in schools.”<sup>10</sup> For four decades, these contrasts between neighboring territories received negligible attention. In the Progressive Era, however, these two territories gained prominence on the national agenda when the US Senate Committee on Territories, led by Albert Beveridge (R-IL), conducted a fact-finding tour in the Southwest that placed a heavy emphasis on ethnic, racial, and linguistic characteristics of Arizonan and New Mexican populations. Beveridge supported US expansion but opposed statehood for territories with large Latino, Asian, or Native American populations. During hearings in New Mexico, Beveridge and his colleagues worried about bilingualism and *Hispano* influence across the territory.

Against this backdrop, the federal government proposed in 1906 to join the two territories into a single state as a means of mitigating the influence of *Hispanos* and fostering greater Anglo American control over the entire region. The Arizona Territory immediately protested, however, arguing that its unchallenged regime of Anglo American dominance over economic, social, and political life would be compromised by New Mexico's contrasting system of ethnic power-sharing. Striking differences in language

policy for education, elections, and government business was an especially important flashpoint between the territories.

The quest for statehood meant that each territory had to make its own individual case to the president and Congress. The Senate Committee on Territories stated that both states must limit Spanish in an official capacity. More specifically, the use of interpreters would not be allowed in conducting affairs of the government. Furthermore, public schools were to be conducted entirely in English. Consistent with its history of power sharing between *Hispanos* and Anglo Americans, the New Mexican constitution defied the edicts of the Senate Committee on Territories by stipulating three provisions to protect Spanish. The constitution stated that persons did not have to speak English to vote, hold office, or sit on a jury. Training was provided so that teachers could become proficient in both English and Spanish, and children of Spanish descent would never be classed in separate schools. The constitution did, however, also state that public schools would be conducted in English.<sup>11</sup> There was a language difference but not a racial chasm in New Mexico; the state was defining *Hispanos* as being “of Spanish descent” but not a separate race. The founding documents, however, recognize the threat of racial discrimination and its authors wrote protections into the initial constitution: “This State shall never enact any law restricting or abridging the right of suffrage on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.” As additional protection, the constitution reaffirms the inviolability of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hildago in its bill of rights.

The constitution of Arizona, in striking contrast, required language of instruction to be in English and provided no allowance for public documents or ballots to be translated into Spanish.<sup>12</sup> Legislation within the first year of statehood furthered discrimination based on language: “No person who cannot speak, write and read the English language shall be eligible to hold any State, county, or precinct office in the State of Arizona. . . .”<sup>13</sup> This ensured Arizona would not face the same power sharing in the near future as that experienced in New Mexico, where over half the initial representatives were *Hispanos*. Additionally, in that first year Arizona passed legislation that stated, “All schools must be taught in the English Language.”<sup>14</sup> Arizona’s exclusive understanding of American identity as white, and white as tied to English and an Anglo culture, was more in step with understandings of belonging across the country.

Arizona and New Mexico, each securing statehood in 1912, employed contrasting strategies on how to sell their worthiness to the larger United



States. Arizona marginalized Mexican heritage, explicitly arguing that the Mexican descendants would either remain under the control of the dominant Anglos or return to their own country. In contrast, New Mexico pursued an inclusive strategy with regards to the existent *Hispano* population. Arizona's tactic, more aligned with dominant federal understandings of race and American identity, firmly situated the state within the nation, opening up space for Arizona to align with anti-federal racist ideologies and a virulent early nativism.

In contrast to Arizona's racist, anti-immigrant politics in early statehood, New Mexico consciously argued that the Mexican origin population within their territory would become members of the United States as Spanish Americans, much like the European ancestors of other Americans. This relied on triangulation against other "outsiders" at the moment, both Indians and African Americans.<sup>15</sup> New Mexico pushed to include *Hispanos*, even without cultural assimilation, specifically calling on their right to speak Spanish.<sup>16</sup> The New Mexican fight for inclusion of this population, however, resulted in institutional resources that future citizens could draw on for defense of a limited ethnic pluralism.<sup>17</sup> It also resulted in a state with an insecure footing in American identity, an insecurity that would allow cultural concerns to drive much of the response to early immigration.

Reductionist accounts of the origin stories of Arizona and New Mexico could conclude that the inclusion and exclusion evident in present-day legislation is a direct legacy of diverging approaches taken to secure statehood. As we detail below, however, a more complicated reality unfolds in both states, as New Mexico's defense of its *Hispano* population not only led to an insecure place within white American identity but also encouraged an exclusionary response to other immigrant groups. Due to economic concerns read through the lenses of racial hierarchies and states' rights, Arizona pushed to keep immigrants within its borders when doing so served those in power. Through close historical analysis, we see the nuanced official responses of Arizona and New Mexico to both European and Japanese immigrant groups, approaches that challenge simple characterizations of New Mexico as inclusive and Arizona as exclusionary. Extending from their distinctive origins and struggles for statehood, we shall discern the lasting importance of contrasting ethnic group power and claims to national belonging as each state responded to both new immigration and fresh pressures from the federal government.

## THE INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION OF EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS

The competing traditions of limited pluralism and racial subjugation dominant in New Mexico and Arizona help us understand their early responses to immigrant groups from Europe. The unique ethnic power sharing that defined New Mexico from early statehood did not create a broadly inclusive pluralism. In fact, we see a heightened need for state symbolic action that sharpened the edges around the distinctive claims to an American identity that included those of Spanish descent by excluding others. Calls for exclusion and targeting of other suspect European immigrants as a contrast to Spanish Americans was one attempt to shore up acceptance of New Mexico as part of the United States. Arizona's marginalization strategy for achieving statehood also echoed through their early nativist stances against Europeans, but with different outcomes for European immigrants in the state. Calls for exclusion appeared when European immigrants presented a challenge to the racially segmented and pliable workforce; if, however, immigrants could be incorporated into such a labor market while still promoting Anglo dominance, no such vibrant calls for restriction emerged.

Serving as Arizona's first governor from 1912 to 1917 and again from late 1917 to 1919, George W. P. Hunt, a Democrat and successful businessman, took the lead in rousing state government to restrict immigrant rights and admissions for "new" European immigration and other newcomers deemed undesirable. In December 1914, Hunt and the state lawmakers worked together to codify an "Act to Protect the Citizens of the United States in Their Employment against Noncitizens of the United States." The measure required any Arizona employer of more than five workers "regardless of kind or class of work or sex of workers" to reserve at least 80 percent of their positions for native-born workers.<sup>18</sup> This was designed to favor native-born English, Irish, German, Scandinavians, and other older stock groups. "Other persons of European descent such as Italians, Spaniards, and those from Eastern Europe were not considered full members of the broader 'white' community," as Luis Plascencia explains. "This racialized scheme positioned Mexicans below these two groups, and Native Americans below Mexicans."<sup>19</sup> Under the new law, employers who failed to adhere to this mandate faced \$100 fines and possible imprisonment, as did workers who falsely claimed native citizenship to obtain employment. Less than a year after its enactment, the US Supreme Court ruled that the legislation violated

the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. As Charles Evans Hughes's majority opinion noted,

It is sought to justify this act as an exercise of the power of the State to make reasonable classifications in legislating to promote the health, safety, morals and welfare of those within its Jurisdiction. But this admitted authority, with the broad range of legislative discretion that it implies, does not go so far as to make it possible for the State to deny to lawful inhabitants, because of their race or nationality, the ordinary means of earning a livelihood. It requires no argument to show that the right to work for a living in the common occupations of the community is of the very essence of the personal freedom and opportunity that it was the purpose of the Amendment to secure.<sup>20</sup>

Undaunted by this judicial setback, Hunt warned in 1916 that Arizona could not flourish so long as traditional Northern and Western European settlers were overshadowed by Mexicans and "new" Europeans. Reporting to state lawmakers that 55.5 percent of convicts in Arizona prisons and 55.1 percent of patients at the State Hospital for the Insane were of "alien blood" or "belong either to Mexican or other foreign races," Hunt questioned "why the State of Arizona should continue to encourage a kind of immigration that imposes upon the taxpayers between 50 and 60 percent of the total expense incurred for the care of deficient classes."<sup>21</sup> Hunt's animus toward "foreign races" was shared not only by Arizona legislators, but also by the state's congressional delegation.

During World War I, however, questions about labor created clashing interests on the question of immigration admittance. The focus on maintaining a racially segregated labor force can be seen in the call from Arizona to loosen up restrictions for Mexican immigrants. Cotton growers in southern Arizona were especially vexed by restrictions on their access to Mexican migrant labor as a result of the 1917 literacy and head tax. Arizona Senator Carl Hayden joined other western and southern lawmakers in advocating for the "temporary admission of illiterate Mexicans" in the late 1910s and early 1920s. Arizona governor Thomas Campbell wrote Hayden in 1920 that he was "being importuned by the agricultural forces in the State" to allow "the importation of Mexican labor for the sole purpose of relieving the agricultural labor shortage here." Hayden also received urgent requests for assistance in facilitating Mexican labor from the president of the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and other business leaders. The same year, Hayden testified to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that

access to Mexican foreign labor was essential: "There is no other way of meeting the immediate agricultural labor needs in southern Arizona, except by the temporary admission of Mexicans."<sup>22</sup> He added that this arrangement would be mutually beneficial for Mexican laborers and Arizona employers. "Arizona and Sonora are separated by an arbitrary border line," he insisted, "with people on the Mexican side seeking this seasonal work and people on the American side needing their assistance."<sup>23</sup> While politicians worked to create pathways into Arizona for Mexican laborers, many of whom could return to Mexico, new European workers in the early 1920s were a threat to Anglo workers.

New Mexico, however, more concerned about cementing its place in America than on its labor needs, became focused on routing out disruptive forces rather than maintaining or recruiting foreign workers. The depths of suspicion and exclusion from American identity faced by New Mexico can be seen in a 1918 letter to the editor entitled "America's Unguarded Gateway" that appeared in *The North American Review* under the pseudonym Henry Wray. The author suggested the southern border with Mexico presented a danger to America in wartime:

South of the American-Mexican border, lives a race that is strange to us and little understood. It is of mixed blood, interbred, and physically and mentally degenerate. The average Mexican is burrow-like, stubborn, uncertain, ignorant and vindictive. Within his vestigial body blazes a hatred for the gringo and the gringo's country. He has an intense disgust for the cowardly gringo and thirsts to spill gringo gore.

Germany could use this hatred, suggested Wray: "A few German officers and some German gold effectively placed could assemble this army and start it northward." New Mexico, Wray continued, is more Mexican than American, presenting a key threat to the country in this time of war:

The State has remained Mexican in every sense of the word. One may travel a hundred miles, pass through town after town and be unable to converse in any language save Spanish. There are whole districts without any English speaking persons, where the school boards and school teachers are unable to read, write, or speak English. All school teachers are compelled by the State to be examined in Spanish. The legislature is conducted in Spanish. The courts, State and Federal, are conducted in Spanish. A foreign language is one of the most potent aids to the success of a conspiracy. By retaining Spanish as the language of the courts, schools, public gatherings, press, religion and politics, the Mexican population of New Mexico

keeps itself Mexican. And it looks forward to the Mexican day when New Mexico will again take her rightful place as a state of Mexico.

The controversy that followed this publication reveals the centrality of concerns about New Mexico's belonging that informed the state's responses to federal pressures and immigration long after achieving statehood. County councils, concerned citizens, the Education Conference and others from across the state expressed outrage at such questioning of New Mexico's loyalty. The chairman of the Executive Committee of the State Council of Defense, Charles Springer, wrote to the US Assistant Attorney General that the article was a "jumble of vicious and malignant lies about the people of New Mexico and conditions existing in the State, and as to the loyalty of our people. It is unnecessary to state here that the loyalty and patriotism of the American citizens of Spanish ancestry . . . have been demonstrated beyond question by their support of the Government in three wars." American citizens of Spanish ancestry were not referred to as Spanish American citizens at this time, distinguishing them from other ethnic groups that might be "hyphenated" Americans. Springer wanted the author of this piece to be prosecuted; the "vicious attacks . . . that a state of treason exists in this part of the United States . . . should be punishable under the amended Espionage Act or other laws."<sup>24</sup> Similar to its claims for statehood, New Mexico's claims for inclusion of citizens despite their Spanish heritage or use of the Spanish language did not extend to calls for inclusion for other language or ethnic groups.

New Mexico, like many other states, used language and education policy as a key tool for anti-German campaigns during World War I. Thirty-one states issued legislation between 1917 and 1921 either making English the language of instruction or limiting the teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools.<sup>25</sup> Interestingly, Arizona was not among those states. The state's original documents already instructed Arizona public schools to use English. The bilingualism written into the constitution of New Mexico, on the other hand, required the need to address the anti-German hysteria in policy. Earlier inclusive policies actually opened the door, not for more inclusive policies generally, but for restrictive policies in later moments of national nativism toward different racial or ethnic groups.

New Mexico's Board of Education in early April of 1918 passed a resolution recommending that German be taken out of the public schools. On April 21, the Board of Regents of the University of New Mexico decided to discontinue teaching German.<sup>26</sup> The chair of the county council wrote to

the state council that “it was the unanimous feeling of the members of the county council of defense that it would be unwise at this time for a university or school anywhere in the state of New Mexico to employ an alien enemy in teaching, as we all felt that such relations could not be harmonious and that the greatest opportunity in this country for combating German propaganda and inculcating patriotism is through our public schools and colleges.”<sup>27</sup> In 1919, New Mexico passed a law making English the language of instruction in public elementary schools.<sup>28</sup>

Different expressions of the hysteria and 100 percent Americanism during World War I in the Southwest stemmed from the legacies of statehood strategies, both the contested and insecure belonging in New Mexico and the neo-confederate origins of Arizona. These contrasting orientations altered approaches to Germans and German Americans and enforcement of wartime loyalty. After passage of the Espionage Act of 1917, people across the country were reporting on their neighbors’ so-called street talk, anything that questioned the righteousness or the inevitable success of the United States in the war, the failure to buy bonds, or failure to perform patriotic acts that would suggest a disloyal nature. In New Mexico, many of these accusations made their way through county and state councils of defense and to federal prosecutors. In contrast, Arizona had difficulty organizing the state and local councils of defense<sup>29</sup> and such formal channels were supplemented by private actions. While Arizonans suspected of such crimes were formally charged through federal courts, a range of state and local organizations as well as communities also took matters into their own hands, accusing, judging, and meting out their own punishment.

New Mexico demonstrated vigorous participation in the wartime federal programs monitoring “enemy aliens” and other pro-German activity. The New Mexico Council of Defense received numerous reports of disloyalty: individuals being offered money to be German spies, teachers avowedly pro-German, Jewish postmasters sowing disloyalty among the “natives” (here meaning Spanish Americans), and hospitals refusing to fly an American flag because “every person up there is an Alien,” among other complaints. The New Mexico Council of Defense received “so many stories of Pro-Germans and disloyalty these days that we do not believe any of them until they are corroborated.”<sup>30</sup> In letters to the Council of Defense of the State of New Mexico, Germans were described as being “lower” than Indians or generally unable to be trusted. A rancher wrote: “The case of the German-American is so important that it should be considered by itself. While I am confident, . . . that the great majority of New Mexico German-Americans

are perfectly loyal in act and intent, at the same time I notice among them . . . a tendency to a certain dishonesty of view that rules out complete mental loyalty on their part.” During World War I, New Mexico was stuck between the national distrust of German and other “hyphenated” Americans and a defense of their state and its Spanish American population as loyal Americans. The move to claim an American identity for Spanish-speaking citizens did not, however, soften the anti-German rhetoric in the state. Tomas Jaehn states that during World War I, ethnic Germans encountered not only suspicion but accusations and actions. Even if we were to accept his characterization of these hostilities as “mild” and “insignificant,”<sup>31</sup> the existence of anti-German sentiment within New Mexico is keenly notable in contrast to its embrace of Spanish and Mexican Americans at its time of statehood. This ethnically distinctive state frequently used formal channels to report on suspicious Germans, and its visible actions against the German language were used as public signals to assert belonging in the American political community.

While New Mexico was emphasizing its key place within the United States, Arizona, more certain of its Americanness, was engaging in acts protective of the nation but also protective of Arizona, distinct from the nation. As previously established, Arizona had established its American credentials through earlier racial and linguistic restrictions.<sup>32</sup> While editorials in Arizona newspapers indicated suspicion toward Germans, the incidents of prosecution and persecution crossed ethnic boundaries. Germans in Arizona, along with others, faced attacks from private organizations and vigilante groups. A mob attempted to shave the corners off a German resident’s mustache.<sup>33</sup> Mexicans and Mexican Americans also fell victim to the wartime loyalty concerns. In Bisbee, a sixteen-year-old Mexican student reportedly refused to salute the flag one afternoon. After a two-hour hearing, classmates determined the punishment for the “rebellious alien” was to learn the Star-Spangled Banner and perform it while saluting the flag. Should he fail to do so, he would be forced to carry a flag all day while being subject to beatings from the student court members. Another “Mexican” worker who did not salute the flag when requested almost met serious injury by a mob in Prescott. This person was saved from the mob by a judge and thrown in jail to await a trial. Newspapers reported prosecution of utterances about the war effort in federal courts in Arizona or through community-enforced sanctions such as tar and feathering, forced saluting of flags and other public displays of shaming and forced patriotism, as well as beatings. These accounts suggest, however, that Germans or German Americans were not



central targets, but one group of many, as most do not carry any indication of the ethnic background of the accused.<sup>34</sup>

Arizona displayed a vigilante vigor in its policing of loyalty; this, however, was primarily about radical labor and the rough and tumble world of party politics in the state. Concerns about disloyalty in Arizona were dominated by attacks on the IWW and the broader Red Scare campaign. Throughout World War I gubernatorial candidates used loyalty as a central dividing line, headlines regularly connected strikes, unions, and loyalty to America, and politicians of all levels in the state were asked to make explicit statements about their views on the possible disloyalty of the IWW. Germans—to the extent that they were part of the larger subversive work force—faced threats from the state and local communities. And Mexicans—to the extent that they were good workers—were understood as loyal. Consequently the state would fight the federal government for their admittance into the racially subjugated workforce. For Arizona, then, debates about belonging happened at the intersection of labor and loyalty, with ethnicity playing a secondary and supporting role.

In relation to European immigrants, New Mexico worked to publicly exclude ethnic others as a way to reinforce its own identity and worthiness as an American state. New Mexico's tolerance did not extend beyond those who already shared power (Anglos and *Hispanos*). Due to the previous work undertaken by Arizona to establish its identity as racially and linguistically pure, a display of anti-German sentiment was not needed to underscore the loyalty and even patriotism of the state, and therefore focused on the threat to the labor market in the state. Arizona's response to immigrants continued to be founded in economic concerns.

### ANTI-JAPANESE SENTIMENT

Looking at the response to Japanese immigrants in the first half of the twentieth century, we see more similarities than differences between the treatment Japanese received in Arizona and New Mexico. The limited inclusion developed toward *Hispanos* and Mexicans in New Mexico did not extend to Asian immigrants, as New Mexico joined its Southwestern neighbor and much of the West in a sustained campaign limiting the rights of Japanese and Japanese Americans from statehood through World War II. Despite small numbers of Japanese workers and residents, both states jumped on the regional bandwagon to call for restrictions on Japanese immigration, to set up barriers for Japanese to own land, and ultimately



to play key roles in internment.<sup>35</sup> The fact that states with very different approaches to dealing with the meeting of a Mexican population created similar legislation to limit rights or prevent residence of Japanese immigrants illuminates the limited reach of New Mexico's push against white supremacy. New Mexican tolerance and an established sense of a tri-cultural state (i.e., Anglos, *Hispanos*, and Mexicans) provided no protection to the Japanese in the early twentieth century. In fact, for a state uncertain of its place in American identity, publicly excluding a race that was being demonized in the nation was important, even if the economic competition was not a large concern. In Arizona, however, the centrality of economic exploitation to sustain Anglo dominance led similar anti-Japanese policies to have different implications for those living within the state.

Arizona was an early adopter of the anti-alien land laws, attempting to restrict immigrants' ability to own land, targeting those from Asia and in particular from Japan. Arizona passed such a law in 1913, the same year as California.<sup>36</sup> In 1921, Arizona passed an additional measure tightening restrictions on landholding in an attempt to remove loopholes that might let family members hold land for the Japanese.<sup>37</sup> New Mexico joined in the anti-Japanese movement as well in 1921; Governor Mechem's list of recommended legislative measures for that year included an alien land law and a law preventing non-citizens from possessing firearms.<sup>38</sup> Later that year the New Mexican constitution was amended to exclude individuals ineligible for citizenship and corporations whose majority stockholders fell into that category from owning land.

By joining the anti-Japanese movement in the western states, despite limited economic competition, New Mexico made a clear statement that although Spanish Americans were included side by side with Anglos, this inclusion did not extend to others. In the face of a rumor of forty Japanese families considering moving to Mesilla Valley, the farm bureau of Donna County wrote in the *Las Cruces Republican*:

The Spanish American population of the state, and the American, get along very nicely together—one supplies the majority of the labor, the other the bulk of the capital. There is practically no antipathy between them, in fact, some of the former are among the most influential and progressive in our state, and the vast majority are no longer Spanish-American, but just plain American, rapidly adopting the standards of living and education of the American, and seeking not to lower the standards, as does the Jap, but to come up to the American standard. He is a citizen of long standing, in fact, the first in the state in the point of time.<sup>39</sup>

Making an argument for the exclusion of the Japanese required a forceful distinction between the Spanish Americans and this new racial other. Spanish Americans, they argued, evidently belonged because of their long history of citizenship and similar standards of living as Anglos, both relics of the strategies developed during the statehood debates. The Japanese, on the other hand, would work for lower wages and undercut the American standard of living. As farmers in the border valley attempted to raise the alarm about the threat of the Japanese, they drew on racialized fears of the inability of Japanese to assimilate, religious differences, miscegenation, and permanent loyalty to another country.<sup>40</sup> The *Las Cruces Republic* in 1920 told New Mexico to “Wake Up”: “The Japanese are industrious, they are good farmers—perhaps better than the average American—but they are not Anglo-Saxon and never can be. . . . Will you look pleasantly on the picture of your daughter being brought up in the public schools with a yellow boy as her seat mate, with his oriental ideas of morality? . . . Let us not allow cowardly diplomacy to force another mixture in our already over mixed race.”<sup>41</sup> Racialized arguments to exclude the Japanese from land ownership, heard throughout the West, carried a different meaning in New Mexico. Acceptance of the tri-cultural pluralism of New Mexico led to drawing a tight circle around those groups and a need to exclude racialized others. While limited economic competition in the border area may account for the origins of concerns about the Japanese, economic threat does not explain why the restrictions on alien land ownership were approved by the state’s voters in 1921. As anti-Japanese sentiment swept through the West, Anglos and *Hispanos* throughout New Mexico joined together to alienate Asians, underscoring what Jamie Bronstein labels New Mexico’s “nationalist *bona fides*.”<sup>42</sup>

In Arizona, alien land laws were far from symbolic but part of the ongoing contested politics around subjugation of non-whites who had a role to play economically but not socially or politically. Despite the land laws of Arizona, by 1930 there were over one hundred independent Japanese farms in Maricopa County. Anti-Japanese feelings came to a head in 1934 when farmers formed an “Orientals Exclusion League” and announced a “Jap Moving Day” on August 25th, a day by which all Japanese should leave Phoenix. The threat to diplomatic relations if expulsion or violence were to occur drew the attention of the national and international community. Governor Moeur of Arizona received worried telegrams from the Japanese Consulate in Los Angeles and the US Acting Secretary of State. The British Consul contacted the governor saying that there were threats of mob

violence against the East Indian community. The governor's response to each of these inquiries was very similar; he was sure that the "common sense of the people of Arizona will prevent any violence" and that "the laws of this state will be enforced without fear or favor."<sup>43</sup> At first, the governor's reassurances seemed an accurate prediction. The threat of forced removal did not occur by the date announced, but court proceedings did begin against the Japanese for violating the Alien Land Law. Such "common sense," however, did not last.

From September through November, violence against the Japanese, including shooting, bombing, flooding of farms, and arson, occurred in the Salt River Valley, bringing criticism from forces within Arizona, as well as from Washington, DC, and Japan. The Japanese government again appealed directly to the governor as well as the Secretary of State to stop such incidents. Governor Moeur responded to the Japanese embassy's retelling of the acts of terror against Japanese farmers with a statement that "there has not been, and from every indication will not be, any serious violence." He attributed specific incidents to "communistic or 'Red' activities in the Salt River Valley," putting the origins of any unrest back onto the federal government, whom he implored to cooperate with their anti-Communist efforts: "It is essential that we have the fullest cooperation from the Department of Justice and the Immigration Department in our endeavors to curb these Communistic activities."<sup>44</sup> Here the governor suggested any problems were from foreign agitators within the labor movement, and the federal government failed in their tasks. The remedy, according to the governor, was for the federal government to provide support for the state to continue its mission of weeding out the communists.

Governor Moeur also received pressure from within the state to stop the violence. The Southside Ministerial Association, for example, issued a resolution and petitioned the governor to use law enforcement agencies to stop the violence and arrest the bombers. Mr. Wilke of the Arizona Peace Officers' Association told the governor in the beginning of November that something drastic needed to be done to end "this reign of terrorism" against Japanese and Hindu farmers. These calls fell on deaf ears. By the end of that month, the Japanese Consulate wrote in clear exhaustion one last time about his distress that not a single perpetrator had been charged while the violence continued with no indication of any law enforcement efforts to help. In December, the governor once again dismissed accusations of acts against Hindu growers as exaggerations and ensured the Secretary of State it was under control.

While no action was taken against those engaged in terror in the fall and early winter of 1934, legal action against the Japanese farmers continued, and new ways to restrict access to land were devised. In the beginning of October, Governor Moeur formed a committee to look into the “problems surrounding the enforcement of Arizona’s Alien land law.” A new, even more stringent law was introduced into the state legislature in 1935 that would have prevented Japanese from leasing or even entering onto land to do any farm work. This law drew national attention, in part for further threatening diplomatic relations with Japan, and the governor was encouraged to veto it.<sup>45</sup> The bill that would have challenged not just Japanese ownership of land but also potential use of Japanese labor by others did not pass.

While the legislative responses of the states look similar, Arizona’s controversy and enforcement of alien land laws surpassed those of New Mexico. Arizona’s alien land laws were targeting not just the small number of Japanese farmers but also Chinese and Indian farmers. Here we see economic competition and a strong white identity driving Arizona’s subjugation of a broad range of outsiders. While the alien land laws of New Mexico were less aggressive than its neighbor’s, the existence of the laws and underlying anti-Japanese sentiment should be strongly noted. The land laws here were not focused on economic considerations, nor were they evidently met with the same grassroots violence seen elsewhere. There was a muted politics of exclusion.

Similarly, during World War II, racialized understandings of loyalty drove responses in both states; their origin stories, however, influenced their responses to internment. The desire to exclude as well as to display their belonging to the nation dominated New Mexico’s response to Japanese and Japanese Americans during the war. While Arizona initially responded with a similarly racialized drive to exclude, as the war progressed, Arizona turned to the interned Japanese in response to labor shortages during the war. Again we see the binary labeling of states as either inclusive or exclusive ignores the nuanced negotiations often at work within a single state.

In January of 1942, the federal government asked all non-US citizens who were Japanese (along with Germans and Italians) to re-register at post offices and receive a Certificate of Identification. The next month the United States Attorney General declared those areas that surrounded critical infrastructure restricted or prohibited. Eighteen such areas were declared in Arizona, causing the removal of “enemy aliens.” In New Mexico, Japanese enemy aliens from the Clovis area were taken into custody by Immigration Services and kept at Fort Stanton, an INS-operated detention area for prisoners of war

and enemy aliens.<sup>46</sup> The early concentration of Japanese caused complaints from the nearby community in Capitan, leading the INS agent in charge to remove the school children due to the “hostile sentiments.”<sup>47</sup> This was the beginning of what would be years of struggle in both New Mexico and Arizona with Japanese residence and relocation during World War II. New Mexico and Arizona initially hoped that relocation would mean moving Japanese Americans and Japanese *out of the state*, further east. Neither state welcomed the idea of inheriting new populations of Issei, first generation Japanese immigrants, or Nisei, second generation. Both states, however, became sites for internment camps.

Prior to relocation, Arizona had about 630 individuals who would have been targeted for relocation, and many hoped they would be moved out of the state.<sup>48</sup> Instead, Arizona became home to two large relocation centers, one near Poston that housed up to eighteen thousand people and one on the Gila River that housed up to thirteen thousand.<sup>49</sup> New Mexico, which had over 180 Japanese who would be subject to internment, became the site of four different centers. Fort Stanton, Lordsburg, Santa Fe, and Old Ranton Ranch all held concentration camps during the war years, alternating between processing centers for Japanese internees, POW camps for Germans and Italians, and camps for Japanese and Japanese American men who were thought to be dangerous or causing trouble in the other internment camps.<sup>50</sup> Between March 1942 and April 1946, over 4,500 men were held in the Santa Fe Camp alone.

Racialized conceptions of loyalty and the support of relocation emerged from the highest offices and from the populace in both Arizona and New Mexico. Governor Osborn of Arizona noted of the Japanese who had been evacuated to Arizona, the “general attitude . . . is that while they would be willing to fight against Germany or Italy, they are not willing to fight against Japan” and that no Japanese Americans or Japanese have “denounce[d] the activities of . . . spies to our authorities.” These “facts,” Osborn concluded, meant that the loyalty of those of Japanese descent ultimately lay with a foreign government. The governor did not make a distinction based on whether one was born in the United States or not. However, when considering policy responses nativity mattered; for those Japanese not born in the United States the answer was clear: deportation. Meanwhile, “the disposition of native born Japanese is a very serious and vexatious question.”<sup>51</sup> The challenge was dealing with citizenship and attendant legal protections: “While a disposition of the native born citizens of Japanese blood is not so simple, still it must be worked out in line with realities. It is hard to use

sentiment and consideration for people who have shown that they regard such motives as weakness.”<sup>52</sup> In language eerily similar to contemporary conversations about becoming radicalized by visits to the Middle East, he wrote that “particularly dangerous, are those who were born here and have visited Japan in the last ten years.”<sup>53</sup> Loyalty was not about time in the United States but about race, as the loyalty of first generation Japanese “differs from young Americans of German or Italian parentage.”<sup>54</sup>

Letters from citizens to the Governor of Arizona also displayed a view of loyalty and membership grounded in genetic predispositions: “They [the Japanese] are the most treacherous people on the earth and their words and promises does [*sic*] not mean a thing. It does not matter if they are U.S. citizens or not, they will put all their efforts in favor of Japan. . . . A Jap is and always will be a Jap in the interest of Japan.”<sup>55</sup> The governor replied to the letter writer, C.H. Nelson, noting that most United States citizens agreed with his sentiment and that he believed the Japanese would not be “dumped” on Arizona; in fact, he noted, any Japanese currently residing in Arizona would be required to move further east.<sup>56</sup> Organizations such as the Elks Lodge issued resolutions addressing the state being “infested” with Japanese, some of whom were actively plotting to attack America. Delay in addressing this problem would be “deadly.”<sup>57</sup> While supportive of federal action and internment, Arizonans did not initially want the Japanese interned in Arizona. At the beginning of March 1942, the governor received an outpouring of support on the stand he took against resettling Japanese in Arizona.

Similarly, New Mexico, while supportive of internment and concerned about the Japanese problem, did not want to see Japanese settling in the state. In early March, concerns about a plan to move forty to sixty thousand Japanese to New Mexico rippled through the state. The plan came from a private individual hoping to capitalize on brokering the deal; initial confusion, however, led some to think the plan came from the federal government. Upon hearing of the plan, Governor Miles of New Mexico immediately informed the War Department that he supported interment, which they hoped would come with heavy guards, but opposed moving Japanese to the state in part because of the economic problems associated with such a massive resettlement: “The movement of Japanese seeking employment presents an entirely different problem. In fairness to all concerned, I believe I should point out at this time it will be virtually impossible for Japanese workers to find employment in New Mexico since we have a large number of our own residents idle and others dependent on the Wpa [*sic*] for their livelihood.”<sup>58</sup>

Communities throughout New Mexico protested such a move as well. The Espanola Chamber of Commerce offered to help forcibly put Japanese aliens or citizens of Japanese descent in “concentration camps,” but continued that they were “unalterabl[y] opposed to any colonization or the acquisition of land by the above classes.”<sup>59</sup> The Albuquerque mayor Clyde Tingley said, “California can keep her Japs—she has plenty of desert to keep them in and so has Arizona.”<sup>60</sup> In the mayor and former governor’s objection, we hear a demand for New Mexico not to be treated as a second-class state in relation to its southwest neighbors, harkening to their deep-seated insecurity of not being seen as a “Real American State.” The governor also made publicly known his stance against the unpoliced movement of Japanese into the state, adding that the threat to New Mexico was both economic and social in nature.<sup>61</sup> The fears about Japanese “colonization” continued to stir citizen concerns, even in the face of a lack of evidence about the sincerity of such a plan, causing, according to Richard Melzer, “a public outcry seldom equaled in New Mexico history.”<sup>62</sup>

In Deming, on the border with Mexico, residents held a protest in response to rumors that 350 Japanese planned to arrive within a few weeks. The chairman of the Chamber of Commerce wrote to the governor applauding his stance against Japanese moving to New Mexico and supportive of further restrictions on Japanese owning land. He noted that the majority of residents stood firmly against Japanese moving to the area: “It so happens that we have had a few radical citizens who individually would like to see the Jap settlement. However, such citizens do not amount to one in a thousand. You may rest assured that Luna County is back of you one hundred per cent in your effort.”<sup>63</sup> In Maxwell, New Mexico, a debate over selling land for a Japanese settlement revealed how the desire to exclude Japanese in the state was stronger than the lure of economic benefits to be gained by their settlement. Many voiced opposition to the settlement of some two hundred Japanese families in the area, but the mayor suggested that those petitions in opposition were not representative of the city and certainly not of landowners. After the mayor interviewed almost all the resident farmers of the area, thirty-two signed a petition in favor of Japanese settlement and thirteen did not. The mayor noted that eleven of the thirteen preferred not to sign but would be willing to sell their land to Japanese, indicating concerns about how a signature on a petition supporting Japanese settlement would be perceived.<sup>64</sup> Governor Miles, however, fully opposed to settlement of Japanese, called on the Attorney General Edward Chase to investigate limits on the capacity of anyone of “the Japanese race” to acquire real estate in New



Mexico through legal proceedings, and if necessary bring a case, funded by the governor, to the Supreme Court.<sup>65</sup> He also encouraged western governors to participate in the effort to bring a test case to encourage the Supreme Court to revisit an earlier ruling that the children of Japanese immigrants born in the United States should be granted birthright citizenship status.<sup>66</sup> The potential economic benefit to the Maxwell farmers, then, was not enough to overcome the governor's anti-Japanese sentiment, which echoed much of the popular sentiment from around the state. Maxwell was the exception to the rule in New Mexico, which included anti-Japanese associations forming in places like Doña Ana County and pledges from land owners not to sell land to the Japanese, thousands in Mesilla Valley alone.<sup>67</sup>

While many western governors agreed on the issue of Japanese internment and relocation, the Oregon governor's unorthodox stance shows that this was not an inevitable response to this pressure. Governor Sprague advocated investigating individual Japanese families and allowing those shown to be dependable to live privately and to be dispersed, not concentrated. He hoped that this would "prevent the deterioration of Japanese-Americans into citizens with anti-American feelings and we will enable them to make effective contribution of their labor."<sup>68</sup> While Sprague noted the possibility of Japanese labor being a contribution, such labor in New Mexico was understood as competition.

Arizona came to capitalize on Japanese labor and further marginalize the population so they would not be economic competitors. In March 1943, Arizona enacted a law that required anyone with business dealings with "persons of restricted movement" to register the transaction in triplicate. The *Gila News-Courier*, a paper published by those at the Gila relocation center, noted that this law would eliminate the ability of persons of Japanese ancestry from conducting any business. The interned Japanese writing the editorial believed that "with this law California's restrictionaries have been outdone in a discriminatory, un-American practice."<sup>69</sup> This law moved further toward the marginalized and pliable labor desired in Arizona.

During the war there was a shortage of labor to pick the long staple cotton grown uniquely in Arizona and centrally important to the war effort as it was used to weave parachutes for the military. The governor and other actors in the state considered a wide range of different groups to help fill this role. Individuals incarcerated in the state prison in Florence were made to pick the cotton. Papagos, or native Indians who moved back and forth across the border, were also key to the cotton-picking effort.<sup>70</sup> Japanese internees were another source of workers used to address the labor shortage. The governor,



along with representatives from various affected counties, requested and received approval from General Dewitt and the War Relocation Authority to recruit up to eighteen thousand interned Japanese to work the in the cotton fields.<sup>71</sup> Arizona moved quickly from an initial desire to exclude Japanese and Japanese Americans at the start of the war to understanding them as another group ripe for racial subjugation feeding the white state.

Indicative of the neo-confederate Anglo identity driving the search for labor at this time, when General Dewitt rescinded permission to employ internees in November, the governor requested “colored” soldiers stationed at Huachuca be asked to pick the cotton. There was pushback against such a request, both from within the army and from others. The secretary of the NAACP wrote: “It is characteristic of uninformed white people to think that the mentality of the majority of Negroes is such that prior to enlistment in the Army they could do nothing but pick cotton. There is further affirmation of your derogatory attitude towards American Negro citizens in the fact that you conspicuously neglected to include in your request that white soldiers stationed in Arizona be assigned as cotton pickers.”<sup>72</sup> The governor responded to the NAACP denying that he asked specifically for black soldiers but any soldiers in the state who were available. In other writing on the matter, however, he was more revealing; he noted that many black soldiers from Huachuca might “know nothing about picking cotton. On the other hand, I am sure that we all agree that many are experienced cotton pickers.”<sup>73</sup> Turning from Japanese workers to other groups, the search for pliant labor highlights racial subjugation at the core of Arizona’s political culture.

Japanese interned labor was used to fulfill other needs in Arizona, including the production of camouflage nets or training models for the navy, as well as needed infrastructure in the state. The land for the Poston Relocation Center, leased from the Department of the Interior, was sited on the Colorado River Indian Tribe reservation. Before the war, the reservation lacked critical infrastructure, such as irrigation, preventing relocation of a larger population of Native Americans. Internment provided a way to draw federal dollars and free labor to build up the reservation. The Japanese and Japanese Americans confined to the sprawling complex at Poston developed schools, dams, roads, and canals transforming the Indian reservation. After the war, the Office of Indian Affairs was able to attract more tribes to live in the revitalized reservation, now with productive farms. As tribes were consolidated at Poston they took up residence in the very housing the Japanese and Japanese American workers had lived.

## SPACES OF INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION IN ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO

Through the early twentieth century, a time when federal power had unquestionable supremacy in the realm of immigration, we see immigrants encountering different terrains in two neighboring states. New Mexico and Arizona, although neither a bastion of American pluralism during the tumultuous war years, have distinctive traditions that informed their responses to new national pressures. Arizona's strategy of entering the union through promises of marginalizing its non-Anglo population, fulfilled through denial of fundamental citizenship rights, cast a long shadow of economic and political subordination of racial others that informed each subsequent interaction on questions of how to respond to immigrant residents. German immigrants were a danger when they threatened native Anglo economic superiority. Arizona quickly found a use for Japanese and Japanese Americans during World War II in their racially stratified labor system. New Mexico's origin story, replete with promises of pluralism and power sharing, established different pressures. The claim to include Spanish-speaking Americans as full and equal partners in governance sat uncomfortably with notions of race in the United States at the time, leaving New Mexico with the need to continually reassert their "Americaness." As a result, New Mexico vigorously fought the inclusion of European and Japanese immigrant groups in the first four decades of the twentieth century.

Comparing these two states, then, allows us to discern how the economic and political clout of ethnic and racial groups can be mediated by the racial terrains and narratives of belonging that are distinctive to particular states or subnational places. In Arizona, for example, official responses to immigrants can only be understood in light of the ways newcomers impacted white economic dominance in the state. In New Mexico, one cannot understand the treatment meted out to new immigrants without an eye to the ongoing power sharing between Anglos and *Hispanos*. But the extraordinary power sharing between these two groups enshrined in the state's constitution and subsequent political processes contributed to an enduring insecurity about not being part of the dominant Anglo American landscape through World War II.

The history of each state presents a challenge to the idea of a simple binary of inclusive or exclusive treatment of immigrants or to a static notion of states' approaches to immigrants. New Mexico's repression of the use of German during World War I cannot be disentangled from earlier protections

of Spanish in its constitution. Limited pluralism for some can beget exclusion for others in later moments, especially when power sharing with non-Anglos yields an unsure footing within the nation. The legacies of a state's formative experience can be long and uneven. The prohibitions against aliens holding land in New Mexico, a powerful declaration of New Mexico's Americanness at the time, was only removed from its constitution in 2006. While New Mexico was one of the last states to retain the remnants of the alien land laws,<sup>74</sup> the removal was not uncontested. Only four years earlier a ballot measure to remove the language failed to pass.

Moving beyond simple binaries of ethnic and immigrant reception also squares with the fact that immigration is a powerful cross-cutting issue in American politics, one that defies the standard liberal-conservative divide and often polarizes major party coalitions. As discussed in earlier work, four rather durable ideological traditions have emerged over time in US debates and political struggles over immigration.<sup>75</sup> Historically, US cosmopolitans like Jane Addams and Horace Kallen embraced the universality of the American experiment, professing deep faith in the social, economic, cultural, and political benefits of diverse mass immigration. By contrast, nationalist egalitarians (protectionists) opposed porous borders and soaring immigration on the grounds that they imperil the material security of the nation's working class and its least advantaged citizens. In the 1870s, for instance, Frederick Douglass favored limits on immigration, lamenting that "every hour sees the black man elbowed out of employment by some newly arrived immigrant."<sup>76</sup> Free-market expansionists (pro-business conservatives) historically tended to favor an unfettered flow of immigrant labor to meet the needs of various US employers while opposing broad immigrant rights. During the Gilded Age, capitalists like Andrew Carnegie described the flow of tractable immigrant workers into the country as a "golden stream," valuing each newcomer as worth \$1500 because "in former days an efficient slave sold for that sum."<sup>77</sup> Finally, classic restrictionists have responded to significant shifts in the ethnic, racial, or religious composition of immigration by advocating stringent border control, tough limits on alien rights, and reductions in immigrant admissions. As Harvard President A. Lawrence Lowell, a supporter of the Immigration Restriction League (IRL), argued during the Progressive Era, "the need for homogeneity in a democracy" justifies policies "resisting the influx of great numbers of a greatly different race."<sup>78</sup>

Tellingly, the ethnic politics and immigrant policies of Arizona and New Mexico during the first decades of the twentieth century reflect not one,

but several of these ideological traditions. Arizona policymakers clearly embraced most of the classic restrictionist ideals and goals of Lowell, the IRL, and other nativists. This was particularly true of their ardent support for Asian exclusion, literacy test legislation, and the rise of the national origins quota system. Yet Arizona's leadership also shared the free-market conservatism of Carnegie, aggressively pursuing cheap, tractable labor to meet the demands of its farming, mining, and ranching enterprises. New Mexico's ethnic and immigrant politics during these years also defy simple characterization. Compared to Arizona's system of racial subjugation, the ethnic power sharing of New Mexican leaders and the defense of *Hispano* and Mexican American political rights comes close to realizing many of the key ideals of cosmopolitans like Addams and Kallen. Yet their uneasy claims of national belonging, especially during depression and wartime, fed restrictionist and protectionist tendencies in response to German and Japanese immigrants.

Understanding the differing state responses to immigrants adds a vital, often overlooked element to our understanding of American immigration history. Federal government policies and national pressures mediated by state governments and local communities have the capacity to create decidedly different experiences for immigrants depending on the specific places where they live. While both Arizona and New Mexico put into place alien land laws, for instance, the vigorous and violent enforcement in Arizona against a range of immigrant groups was absent in New Mexico. Likewise, the federal government's efforts to encourage spying on one's German neighbors during World War I was taken up with unmatched enthusiasm in New Mexico. Today, as in the past, the American immigrant experience has been shaped over time by not just who an immigrant is and when one arrives, but also *where* one settles within the United States.

## NOTES

1. Chae Chan Ping v. United States, 130 U.S. 581, 603 (1889); Gerald Neumann, "The Lost Century of American Immigration Law," *Columbia Law Review* 93, no. 8 (1993): 1893–1901; Hiroshi Motomura, "Immigration Law after a Century of Plenary Power: Phantom Constitutional Norms and Statutory Interpretation," *Yale Law Journal* (1990): 545–613.

2. See Monica Versanyi, *Taking Local Control* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010); Nancy Foner, "Immigration Policy: Bringing in the City, State, and Region," *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History* 5 (2008): 67–68; Pratheepan Gulasekaram and S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, *The New Immigration Federalism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Carissa B. Hessick and Gabriel J. Chin, *Strange Neighbors: The Role of States*

in *Immigration Policy* (New York: New York University Press, 2014); Hiroshi Motomura, "What State and Local Role?" in *Immigration Outside the Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 56–85; Alexandra Filindra and Daniel Tichenor, "Raising Arizona v. United States: Historical Patterns of American Immigration Federalism," *Lewis and Clark Law Review* 16, no. 4 (2012): 1215–46; Justin P. Steil and Ion B. Vasi, "The New Immigration Contestation: Social Movements and Local Immigration Policy Making in the United States, 2000–2011," *American Journal of Sociology* 119, no. 4 (2014): 1104–55; Vickie D. Ybarra, Lisa M. Sanchez, and Gabriel R. Sanchez, "Anti-Immigrant Anxieties in State Policy: The Great Recession and Punitive Immigration Policy in the American States, 2005–2012," *State Politics and Policy* 16, no. 3 (2015): 313–39.

3. Randal Archibold, "Arizona and New Mexico, Divided over Immigration," *The New York Times*, May 11, 2010.

4. Linda C Noel, *Debating American Identity: Southwestern Statehood and Mexican Immigration* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2014).

5. See Jorge M. Chavez and Doris Marie Provine, "Race and the Response of State Legislatures to Unauthorized Immigrants," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 623, no. 1 (2009): 78–92; Jill Nicholson-Crotty and Sean Nicholson-Crotty, "Industry Strength and Immigrant Policy in the American States," *Political Research Quarterly* 64, no. 3 (2011): 612–24; Timothy Marquez and Scot Schraufnagel, "Hispanic Population Growth and State Immigration Policy: An Analysis of Restriction (2008–12)," *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 43, no. 3 (2013): 347–67; Sophia Wallace, "Papers Please: State-Level Anti-Immigrant Legislation in the Wake of Arizona's SB 1070," *Political Science Quarterly* 129, no. 2 (2014): 261–91.

6. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Excluded Student: Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1972).

7. Linda C. Noel, "'I Am an American': Anglos, Mexicans, *Nativos*, and the National Debate over Arizona and New Mexico Statehood," *Pacific Historical Review* 80, no. 3 (2011): 348–49.

8. David Berman, *Reformers, Corporations, and the Electorate: An Analysis of Arizona's Age of Reform* (Denver: University Press of Colorado, 1992), 8–11.

9. Noel, "'I Am an American,'" 433–38.

10. Ginger C. Stull, "Language, Borders, and Education: Language Policy and the Making of New Mexico and Arizona," *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* 27, no. 1 (2012): 2.

11. New Mexico, Constitution of 1911, art. 21, sec 4. While the section of the state constitution laying out its system of education indicates that teachers would be trained in Spanish in order to facilitate teaching of all of New Mexico's children, a later section "Compact with the United States" notes, in seeming contradiction to the earlier section, that "schools shall always be conducted in English."

12. Noel, "'I Am an American,'" 430–67.

13. Arizona, Rev. Stat. 1913, sec 158.

14. Arizona, Rev. Stat. 1913, sec 2769.

15. Noel, "'I Am an American.'"

16. *Ibid.*

17. Arthur Seligman, "Inaugural Address and Legislative Message," January 1931, Box 8, Folder 205, Seligman Papers, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa

Fe, New Mexico. In 1931, nineteen years after the writing of the state constitution, New Mexico governor Seligman's inaugural address again called for the defense of Spanish. "The state constitution provides that printing of the laws in Spanish language is not required after January 21, 1931. It would be a serious mistake to do away with the established use of the Spanish language, whether required by law or not. I urge the legislature to pass the necessary legislation to continue that practice, an action with the constitution provision leaves to the legislature."

18. Carl Hayden, "Speech, February 4, 1915," Box 653, Folder 15, Carl T. Hayden Papers 1851–1979, The Arizona Collection, Arizona State University.

19. Luis Plascencia, "Attrition Through Enforcement and the Elimination of a 'Dangerous Class,'" in *Latino Politics and Arizona's Immigration Law SB 1070*, ed. Lisa Magana and Erika Lee (London: Springer, 2013), 10.

20. *Truax v. Raich*, 239 US 33 (1915).

21. Carl Hayden, "Restriction and Immigration," Box 653, Folder 15, Carl T. Hayden Papers 1851–1979, The Arizona Collection, Arizona State University, 7–8. Hunt's report is quoted at length by Hayden.

22. Carl Hayden, "Temporary Admission of Illiterate Mexican Laborers," January 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and February 2, 1920. Hearings Before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 262–63, 276.

23. Carl Hayden, "Temporary Admission," 275.

24. Letter from Charles Springer to S. Burkhardt, August 16, 1918, Folder 26 "Alleged Hispano Sentiment and War," New Mexico Council of Defense, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico. The U.S. Attorney General in New Mexico responded that he would ask his department to investigate, although proper jurisdiction would be in Missouri, as he believed the burden of proof would fall to the author to prove that the intent of the slander was not to aid or give comfort to the enemy.

25. Other examples of states focusing on education and language in the anti-German environment of World War I include New York and others implementing laws that required teachers to be citizens, and Governor Harding of Iowa turning beyond the schools to issue a decree requiring people to only speak English.

26. At the time there were only two students taking German, and they let go the one teacher (whose name they also forwarded to the local Council of Defense for "early and thoro investigation"), but it was decided that it should be advertised that "the teaching of German had been discontinued by the University of New Mexico."

27. Letter from Alonzo B. McMillen to Charles Springer, Chairman of State Council of Defense, April 26, 1918, File 38, Adjutant General Council of Defense, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

28. I. N. Edwards, "The Legal Status of Foreign Languages in the Schools," *The Elementary School Journal* 24, no. 4 (1923): 272.

29. Party politics in Arizona interfered at the outset with the State Council of Defense. Initially in Arizona, the State Council of Defense was created through a gubernatorial order and funded through individual contributions, and most of the labor was voluntary. In contrast, New Mexico's state legislature had approved \$750,000 for their state council. The Arizona council was finally approved and funded by the legislature in June of 1918. The State Council of Defense in Arizona focused much of its attention on the needs of agriculture during the war, engaging in a crop survey in its first year and considering questions of labor.



30. Letter from Chairman of New Mexico Council of Defense to George L. Kile, May 4, 1918, File 38, Adjutant General Council of Defense, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

31. Tomas Jaehn, *Germans in the Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005): 139.

32. In Arizona, while restrictions were not necessary as the centerpiece of their response to immigrants and the war, a campaign to remove pro-German materials from the libraries was conducted, and Americanization campaigns took place through the Women's Committee in the Council of Defense. These included opening night schools to teach English in over twenty-five states enrolling over two thousand students. (Arizona State Council of Defense, "A Record of the Activities of the Arizona State Council of Defense," 27; 37).

33. "Frustrate Shearing Bee by Placing Man in Jail," *The Arizona Republican*, April 10, 1918, p. 12.

34. Of the over thirty incidents of disloyalty that were reported in the *Arizona Republican* between 1917 and 1919, only three mention the suspected German heritage of the accused.

35. At the time both achieved statehood, Arizona and New Mexico had very small populations of Japanese immigrants. In 1910, the census reports that there were 258 Japanese living in New Mexico and 371 living in Arizona. The numbers fluctuated in the next decade and by 1920 there were 550 Japanese in Arizona but only 251 in New Mexico.

36. California's law became the center of national and international controversy because it denied the right to own land to anyone who was "ineligible to become a citizen." This explicit targeting of the Japanese led to protracted diplomatic negotiations with Japan that all western states watched closely. In contrast, Arizona's 1913 law restricted ownership from aliens who had not declared their intention to become a citizen. The law, however, was construed too broadly, as there was concern that wealthy Mexican residents and European capital would possibly be kept from investing in the state ("Arizona May Have Trouble with Japan," *The Copper Era*, May 2, 1913). In 1915, the Nogales Chamber of Commerce and the Yavapai County Chamber urged for a revision of the law in order to permit desired investment while still preventing Japanese from owning land. ("Ask that Alien Land Law Be Amended," *Weekly Journal-Miner*, June 30, 1915, p. 3). In 1917, Arizona passed a revised law that mirrored the clear targeting in California's law: "No person, other than a citizen of the United States, or who had declared his intention to become such, or who is eligible to citizenship . . . shall hereafter acquire any land. . . ." *Acts Resolutions and Memorials of the Regular Session Third Legislature of the State of Arizona*, Phoenix: The McNeil Company, 1917, p. 57.

37. Vince Murray and Scott Solliday, *City of Phoenix Asian American Historic Property Survey* (Arizona: Arizona Historical Research).

38. Merritt C. Mechem, "Legislative Papers, Messages of Governor to the Fifth Legislative Assembly," Folder 124, Merritt C. Mechem Papers, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 7–8.

39. "Japanese for Las Cruces," *Albuquerque Morning Journal*, October 8, 1919, p. 5.

40. See also Jamie Bronstein, "Sowing Discontent: the 1921 Alien Land Act in New Mexico," *Pacific Historical Review* 82, no. 3 (2013): 370–373.

41. "Wake Up New Mexico," *Albuquerque Morning Journal* (reprint of Las Cruces Republic, July 24, 1920, p. 4).

42. Jamie Bronstein, "Sowing Discontent: the 1921 Alien Land Act in New Mexico," *Pacific Historical Review* 82, no. 3 (2013): 376.

43. B. B. Moeur, "Telegram to British Consul," August 23, 1934, Box 5A, Folder "Aliens," Governor Moeur's Files 1933–1934, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

44. Letter from B. B. Moeur to Secretary of State Hull, October 4, 1934, Box 5A, Folder "Aliens," Governor Moeur's Files 1933–1934, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

45. Vince Murray and Scott Solliday, *City of Phoenix*.

46. See John Culley, "World War II and a Western Town: The Internment of the Japanese Railroad Workers of Clovis, New Mexico," *Western Historical Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (1983): 43–61. Following the attacks at Pearl Harbor, the Japanese in Clovis, who were there predominantly working on the railroads, faced the threat of mob violence. Some New Mexicans were relieved to see the federal government take control of such a volatile situation.

47. Letter from Everett Grantham to Opal Miles, February 9, 1942, Letters of Japanese Internment 1941–1942, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico. Of note: When trying to figure out what to do at this early stage if this community would not host them, the Japanese clearly stated they did not want to go to Phoenix. This sentiment possibly indicates their views on how they would fare there or simply that they did not have relatives or a history there. Those that were asked stated that they would prefer to go to California.

48. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to General DeWitt, March 4, 1942, Box 15, Folder "Aliens," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records. Governor Osborn writes to General DeWitt, "we in Arizona are firmly of the opinion that Arizona being a state which borders on a foreign country and but a few short miles by air from the Pacific and the Gulf of California, and for the further reason that Arizona produces more than forty percent of the copper of the nation, which product is not only essential but vital to the war effort, that no enemy aliens, or second generation Japanese, should be evacuated into Arizona, nor should enemy aliens be placed in concentration camps within this state. More than that we are firmly convinced that enemy aliens now residing in this state, together with all Japanese, should be evacuated east of the Rocky Mountains . . ."

49. In addition to the relocation centers controlled by the War Relocation Authority, Arizona was the site of two facilities operated by the one small assembly center, an emergency makeshift location that housed up to 245 people before more permanent camps could be established as well as an isolation center for internees who officials believed were troublemakers. The isolation center was established in an old abandoned American Indian boarding school in Luepp that incarcerated around seventy individuals.

50. Unlike other major internment centers, these camps were not run by the War Relocation Authority but by the Department of Justice, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Army.

51. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to Richard Baldwin, October 6, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

52. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to Frank A. Michel, May 14, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.



53. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to Tom Stewart, March 23, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

54. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to Charles A. Sprague, November 5, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

55. Letter from C.H. Nelson to Sidney Preston Osborn, March 1, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

56. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to C.H. Nelson, March 4, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

57. Resolution Submitted by the Tucson Lodge, B.P.O. Elks, March 17, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

58. Wire from John E. Miles to Henry L. Stimson, March 3, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Japanese Matters," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

59. Wire from Espanola Chamber of Commerce to John E. Miles, March 20, 1942, Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspondence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

60. "Colonization Plan for Japs," *San Bernardino Daily Sun*, March 7, 1942.

61. "New Mexico Chief Acts to Stop Jap Plan," [news clipping], April 7, 1942, Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspondence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

62. Richard Melzer, "Causalities of Caution and Fear: Life in Santa Fe's Internment Camp, 1942–1946," in *Essays in Twentieth-Century New Mexico History*, ed. Judith Boyce DeMark (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 216.

63. Letter from Poatelle Cooper to John E. Miles, April 9, 1942, Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspondence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

64. Letter from Mayor York Denton to John E. Miles, April 11, 1942, Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspondence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

65. Letter from John E. Miles to Edward P. Chase, April 29, 1942, in "Protests of Japanese Internment," Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspondence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico. In May of that year, the attorney general of Colfax County filed a suit against Japanese Americans looking to buy land.

66. Letter from John E. Miles to Herbert Haw, April 25, 1942, in "Letters Utah Oregon," Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspondence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

67. Marie Tighe, "The New Mexico Home Front During World War II," *Southern New Mexico Historical Review* 10, no. 1 (2003): 16–28.

68. Letter from Charles Sprague to John E. Miles, October 28, 1942, in "Letters Against Internment," Governor John E. Miles Papers: Japanese Relocation Programs, Correspon-

dence 1942, Folder 342, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

69. "Arizona State Law Aimed at Evacuees Enterprises," *Gila News Courier*, Box 24, Folder "Japanese-Relocation Centers of Arizona," May 27, 1943, Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1943–1945, The Arizona Collection, Arizona State Libraries.

70. Letter from Beulah Head to Evan L. Flory, September 22, 1942, Box 15A, Folder "Cotton," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records. There was discussion about preventing the Papagos from returning to Mexico for a fiesta in order to keep them in the cotton fields. However, the superintendent of the Indian Agency suggested this move would be one that would anger the Papagos so much they might not return to the cotton fields.

71. Sidney Preston Osborn, "Approval of Internee Employment," September 15, 1942, Box 15A, Folder "Cotton," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

72. Letter from Walter White to Sidney Osborn, November 5, 1942, Box 15A, Folder "Cotton," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

73. Letter from Sidney Preston Osborn to William R. Smith, November 24, 1942, Box 17, Folder "Labor," Governor Sidney Preston Osborn's Papers 1941–1942, Arizona Department of Library, Archives, and Public Records.

74. Florida is the only state that kept such language in its constitution longer.

75. Daniel J. Tichenor, *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).

76. Adrian Cook, *The Armies of the Streets* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1974), 205.

77. Andrew Carnegie, *Triumphant Democracy* (1886; New York: Cosimo, 2005), 27.

78. Tichenor, *Dividing Lines*, 38.