AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 19:3 (1995) 33–70

Santa Fe Indian Camp, House 21, Richmond, California: Persistence of Identity among Laguna Pueblo Railroad Laborers, 1945–1982

KURT PETERS

Historian Michael McGerr wrote in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that, during the past two hundred years, American corporations failed to "remake" either workers or culture. The exceptional nature of the United States may be "the persisting sense of human agency" rather than the power of corporations, he said, adding, "We need to explain why."[1] As the end of the twentieth century approaches, Native American societies remain isolates at the periphery of the more powerful, statebound social and economic entities. Their existence at the margins is arguably self-imposed and maintained in part as one act of resistance against complete assimilation. Embedded within these acts of resistance, however, are threads of change spun from the frayed edges of cultural contact. This essay addresses such contact between nineteenth-century people of the Laguna Pueblo in New Mexico and the mechanized embodiment of United States westward expansion, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. The investigation narrowly focuses on the processes by which the Laguna

Kurt Peters is an assistant professor of ethnic studies at California State University, Sacramento, and a visiting assistant professor of Native American studies at the University of California, Berkeley.

participants played out the results of that railroad contact later, in Richmond, California, a setting far removed from their home pueblo. The central theme considered here is cultural persistence and the maintenance of tribal being in an urban labor camp, and the consequent effect on identity.

Discussions of Native American-federal relations usually refer to historic government processes designed to draw Native Americans into mainstream, and therefore largely metropolitan, society. Frequently cited as the government policies that gave birth to twentieth-century Native American migrations are the twin assimilationist strategies of tribal termination and urban relocation, which occurred principally between 1950 and 1970. The offer made by the government to Native America utilized employment and vocational training as incentives for accepting a change of locality. Acceptance meant separating forever from tribal homelands and fusing with the industrialized flow of urban America. Federal promise, native expectation, and the actuality of city life did not converge affably for many who participated. In fact, for some the result proved disastrous: They either returned home as failures or succumbed to the destructive elements present in large cities. Others found urban living an agreeable balm for past discouragement, while still more continue living today in alien metropolitan environments. Nonetheless, the myth that Native American urban migration grew mainly from the seeds of termination and relocation policies continues as a social and economic theme obscuring historical reality. In contrast, significant numbers of people of color migrated to the San Francisco Bay area from 1922 through 1945, principally as workers for the expanding empires of the automotive, railroad, and shipbuilding industries and as emergency wartime employees. These movements heavily infused the region near Richmond, California, along the San Francisco Bay north of Oakland, with migrant laborers. One significant group of newcomers to the area comprised men and women from the Laguna Pueblo in New Mexico, responding to an oral agreement made in 1880.

A convenient route to California necessitated railroad construction through New Mexico during the late 1800s. The Laguna people did not seek the presence of the railroads in their homeland; rather, circumstances surrounding United States expansion westward set the scene for a meeting of Manifest Destiny and the Native Americans of the Southwest. The Atlantic & Pacific Railroad, predecessor to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe in the

area, began laying track west from Albuquerque toward Laguna Pueblo in 1880. However, the Laguna people halted the work crews, and a compromise with the railroad resulted. The Atlantic & Pacific passed through the Laguna territory unmolested, in return for a promise to "forever" employ Laguna people for building and maintaining the system. This oral agreement in 1880, called the "Flower of Friendship," gave the Laguna people a guarantee of jobs and the railroad an assurance of unhindered right-of-way. Subsequent yearly meetings of the Laguna and the railroad, referred to as "Watering the Flower of Friendship," reaffirmed the contractual terms.[2] Laguna men began their employment building track, working from Albuquerque, Gallup, and other locations along the rail line both within and outside the tribal lands. The arrival of the steam locomotive in the Southwest offered the Laguna alternative employment, leading to the departure of many to regions both culturally and geographically distant from their home pueblo.

Purchase in 1897[3] of the Atlantic & Pacific lines in New Mexico by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe carried with it the spirit of the original negotiation, and permanent camps of Laguna laborers appeared in the train yards at Gallup and Winslow. By the early 1920s, railroad and government animosity toward labor unions erupted during a series of railroad strikes when management tried to rescind World War I wage gains. One such confrontation, the Shopmen's Strike of 1922, strangled the operations of the railroads nationally.[4] A request from company management "Watered the Flower" of the Laguna Pueblo agreement, and men from the Laguna and nearby Acoma pueblos moved into the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe terminal at Richmond, California, to replace striking workers. Following the settlement of the strike, some laborers remained, forming the first "Indian village" in the Richmond train yards. A second, more permanent community of Laguna workers formed in the Richmond terminal during the late 1930s.[5] Subsequent waves of Laguna workers, again buttressed by their Acoma neighbors from New Mexico, came in and out of the Indian village, adding a sense of identity and permanence to the setting with each passing decade.

By World War II, there were six historic villages on the Laguna Reservation and four settlements elsewhere along the railroad lines. The Laguna communities at Gallup, Winslow, Barstow, and Richmond applied to their pueblo governor at home for recognition as "colonies of the Laguna Pueblo in New Mexico" and

received this status.[6] Eventually, the company provided more permanent housing in converted boxcars set in rows on track sidings. The Richmond residents maintained their village, until it disbanded in 1982, as an extension of their pueblo. Only the persistent sense of being Laguna survived, changed forever by an amalgamation with the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroading experience and supported by the ritual of Watering the Flower of Friendship. The Laguna at the Richmond Indian village functioned for more than sixty years as a sociological and psychological satellite of their community in New Mexico. Continuity in Laguna railroad life flowed through the umbilical cord of the Flower of 1880, connecting the sojourning laborers to the mother pueblo. The symbol of the Flower received its vitality from mixture into the essence of Laguna being and from renewal through the annual Watering the Flower of Friendship rituals. Over time, maintenance of tribal unity as railroad laborers amalgamted with the myriad of culture traits unique to the people involved at Richmond, California.[7]

In 1857, John Nicholl built his home on two hundred acres acquired from the San Pablo Grant, along San Francisco Bay eleven miles north of Oakland. He also bought 152 acres of land now known as "Ferry Point," the site to be considered by Robert W. Watt in 1897 as a railroad terminus for the new San Francisco and San Joaquin Valley Railroad Company.[8] The California of 1862 remained isolated from the rest of the United States and could be reached only by ship around Cape Horn, jungle route through Panama, or the rigors of the "overland stage" across still-forbidding territory.[9] Railroad empire builders during the 1800s envisioned connecting California's Pacific Coast ports with Chicago's industrial hub. An 1895 duck-hunting trip led real estate developer A.S. Macdonald to the "mud flats of Point Richmond"[10] and, like Watt, the image of the area as a rail terminus.[11] Through development efforts by Macdonald, the city of Richmond emerged in 1899 when the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad gained a "right-of-way to the bayshore."[12] The headline of the one-page edition of the *Point Richmond Record,* volume 1, number 1, 7 July 1900, read, "Santa Fe Trains . . . Point Richmond Now the Terminal Station of the Greatest Overland Railway on the Continent." Beneath this was an assurance that "[t]here are no Japanese at work for the Santa Fe about Point Richmond." Furthermore, "[t]he Chinese are limited to cooks at the boarding camps," the headline declared, with a final an-

nouncement that "[w]hite men have full sway here."[13] The Japanese, Chinese, Mexican, and Native American laborers were all elsewhere in 1900, maintaining the Chicago connection to an all-white Point Richmond.

Fitting the railroad's presence, a freight car served as Richmond's "first office building," a railway ticket office.[14] Using lines of the newly acquired San Francisco and San Joaquin Valley Railway, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe operated its first direct San Francisco-Chicago service beginning in 1900.[15] Before starting, the company established freight ferry stations on each side of the bay, at China Basin in San Francisco and at Point Richmond, where workers labored two months "in 24 hour shifts" erecting buildings and ferry terminals. These locations forged the last link in the railroad's transcontinental chain.[16] Subsequent to the establishment of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe terminus at Richmond, the Standard Oil Company arrived, buying eighty-five acres for a refinery site in 1901.[17] By 1905, Richmond boasted a population of 2,118 and incorporated. Another large industry, Ford Motor Company, opened an assembly plant in 1931, signaling a greater influx of low-skilled labor.[18] In contrast to the "whites only" declaration of the *Point Richmond Record,* the Richmond train yards of 1900 represented the consummate future setting for a permanent Native American labor camp, confined reservation-like within the terminal and surrounded by the larger community.

At the end of World War I, the federal government returned the control it had seized during the war effort to the owners of the railroads. There ensued a period of anti-union cooperation between railroad management and the government, a repressive condition challenged by a strike vote in 1922, revolving around issues of wage cutbacks and use of nonunion labor. The resulting Shopmen's Strike of 1922, the largest strike in a generation, claimed forty thousand participants, created work stoppages, and seriously curtailed railroad service.[19] Following a management request to Water the Flower of the 1880 contract, the governor of Laguna Pueblo sent more than one hundred men to the Richmond yards as strikebreakers and others to reinforce Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe personnel elsewhere on the lines. Aware of their significant role in the Shopmen's Strike of 1922, the Laguna later viewed strike participation as the proper action under their agreement with the railroad and the only proper response to direction from their governor in New Mexico.[20] Railroad manage-

ment responded to the crisis by dealing harshly with the strikers, initially refusing to end the conflict by signing the "Baltimore Agreement" covering railroads nationwide. Even though the agreement placed all substantive power over returning employees in management's hands by eliminating seniority rights among union workers, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe continued its own systematic infusion of reduced ranks with replacements. Settlement of the strike produced an ignominious defeat for the unions and initiated a sharp decline in membership.[21] The Laguna governor also asked Acoma Pueblo to send men to Richmond, offsetting an insufficient supply of Laguna replacements. This involved Acoma people as workers in the Richmond terminal, but Laguna people interviewed during the 1990s adamantly diminished the Acoma role, noting that the Acoma did not come under the umbrella of the 1880 contract.[22]

As the southwestern lands were settled further and the railroad tracks extended, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe work force grew; employment of Native Americans in the shops and on section gangs increased correspondingly. The Meriam report of 1928 investigated living conditions of Native American labor along the railroad lines. Termed "Industrially Housed Indians," the Laguna at the Winslow and Gallup yards compared favorably to other groups in the survey with regard to cleanliness, dress, social and religious life, and work ethic. The assimilationist bias of Meriam's survey vitiated the measure of Native American workers by their own concerns and desires. The study revealed a pueblo tendency to remain slightly apart from outsiders while participating selectively in mainstream society. For example, Catholic railroad workers attended mass regularly but reportedly refused to "mix" with white people for other purposes, even church social functions.[23] Often railroad wages supported the home pueblo, since the Laguna people remaining on the reservation in New Mexico suffered from the effects of economic depression in the United States. However, railroad earnings dropped in response to the crisis, and, coupled with herding and farming declines, layoffs led to overall hardship among the Laguna population until the late 1930s.

During 1933, social worker Lucille Hamner investigated the desirability to the Laguna of the federal government's building a consolidated high school for tribal children on reservation land in New Mexico. Her report embraced a door-to-door survey of each family living in the six villages of the reservation in New Mexico

and the railroad camps at Gallup and Winslow. She included observations and replies to questions regarding household income and sources thereof. In her report to the commissioner of Indian affairs on 28 February 1933, Hamner commented that, due to natural disasters and the "fact that the members of the [families] who are working for the railroad are usually getting only about four days a week," the people despaired over their finances. The survey of the reservation village of Paguate, comprising one-third of the tribe and the "more prosperous" members, revealed financial hardship, but none outwardly attached blame to declining railroad earnings.[24] L.L. Waters observed, "Early in 1932 employees of the Santa Fe . . . voluntarily accepted a 10 per cent [pay] cut." This reduction "was to last one year, but because of the continuance of the depression, the period of the cut was extended twice . . . a total of seventeen months."[25] Waters also noted that in 1934 railroad management and the unions agreed to a "gradual" restoration of wages to the 1931 level and accomplished this by 1935.[26]

Richmond's "all white" designation of 1900 changed by the 1930s, largely due to shifting industrial population demographics. Eleanor Ramsey observed that, by 1920, each "ethnic group" employed at the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe yards occupied "boarding camps" either on company property or nearby. A Mexican "camp" in the yards, near San Pablo and Barrett Avenues, housed a section gang. Other Mexican workers and their families lived between "B" and "C" Streets, west of Macdonald Avenue.[27] Former Laguna residents at Richmond recalled the first of three successive Native American villages in place by 1922 on "Pennsylvania Street, across the tracks." Mary Roberts Coolidge wrote the federal government's Sacramento Indian agency in 1933, inquiring about the number of Native Americans living "as residents or workers" in Alameda County [Oakland area]. She received a reply at her Berkeley home from agency superintendent Oscar Lipps. He stated that, "according to the federal census of 1930," the Native Americans numbered 182 in the area referenced. He added, "[W]e have little contact with Indians living in the Bay district," since, for technical reasons, they escaped the jurisdiction of the Sacramento agency. Lipps noted, "There is nothing being done by the government for the Indians in your county."[28] The small, industrial town atmosphere characterizing Richmond changed irrevocably with the United States' entry into World War II, bringing a substantial increase in Laguna ranks at the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Richmond shops and a perma-

nent village in the train yards. Prior to 1941, Richmond remained an undistinguished, "dull industrial suburb" of 24,000 residents. It consisted of the oil refinery, the Ford assembly plant, and the railroad yard and shops, but, by 1943, the population exceeded 100,000. James Gregory's *American Exodus* referred to the city as the "quintessential war boom town," due to the coming of World War II, the arrival at Richmond of the Kaiser wartime shipyards, and the consequent enormous population increase.[29] The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe and the city of Richmond soon felt the pressures of World War II. Birth statistics indicate the demographics of the population, as quoted by Shirley Ann Moore in *The Black Community in Richmond, California, 1910–1963:* "Dr. Charles R. Black [Richmond] city Health Officer . . . noted in 1939 that of 314 births, 298 [were] Caucasian, 15 [were] Mexican and one [was] Japanese."[30] The ratio of Caucasian residents to people of color began shifting with the influx of wartime labor. White men no longer "held sway" in 1940 Point Richmond. Postwar shifts produced equally dramatic results.

The early war years opened up jobs with corresponding "dependency" checks for families of the military living in the area, but dependents found this income in jeopardy by the war's end. Although California accounted for nearly 11.5 percent, or 1,518 miles, of the company's 13,073 total miles of track, sudden and massive federal cutbacks resulting from the decreased demands of military production affected the Richmond shops' labor needs after 1945.[31] The city, observed Hubert Owen Brown, designated "most" of North Richmond for razing by 1950. Richmond was "equally determined" to destroy the unwanted temporary government housing occupied by 78 percent of Richmond's "Negro" population.[32] Both the "Mexican village" near Macdonald and Nevin Avenues and the Indian village in the train yards, however, remained intact in the postwar years, although the latter community continued with diminished numbers.[33] But rather than a gradual return of Native Americans to their homelands, the reverse phenomenon occurred.

"Increasingly since World War II," writes Steve Talbott, "Native Americans have been forced to migrate to major cities . . . to search for employment or to avail themselves of government programs." Once in the cities, Talbott argued, these migrants became "unemployed or underemployed," largely due to bureaucratic indifference to the urban masses. Postwar median income reflected an abundance of unskilled labor, with nearly

half of the employed Native Americans in blue collar jobs.[34] Nonetheless, wage work of the pueblo people in general continued following 1945. "For the most part," reported Edward P. Dozier, "pueblo Indians work locally and return to their pueblos in the evening and on weekends." Dozier stated, "An increasing number are beginning to be absent seasonally on jobs at considerable distances from their homes."[35] Indicating a company shift away from general recruitment of native workers, *The Santa Fe Magazine* announced the reassignment of "Indian labor" specialist L. Hubbell Parker to system employment supervisor. The article noted that, since 1945, "he has devoted most of his time in recruiting and directing Indian labor on Santa Fe Coast Lines" and that "[i]n his new position he will perform similar duties."[36] One Laguna who remained at Richmond during the war years recalled "over 100" pueblo employees at the shops, but only fifteen workers returned to Richmond afterward. He added ruefully, "The war ruined everything." This retiree was one of "maybe 30" Laguna at Richmond not inducted into the military. "Some of the men didn't go because the rest of them went," he explained. Then the company called for Laguna women to come to Richmond to fill vacant positions. The observer said that, at the war's end, "[t]hey lay them off, you know, cut them off." Asked about other returning Laguna, he replied, "Some of them went as far as Barstow, some went as far as Winslow and Gallup [but] they didn't come up to Richmond anymore."[37] Edward Spicer wrote that, by 1950, "small colonies" of Native Americans, including Laguna, were "scattered" along Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe lines from Albuquerque to Barstow as "extensions of the reservation." By continuing to maintain social and ceremonial relations with the home pueblo, the enclave's inhabitants forged a bond linking them with reservation families.[38]

In August 1952, Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe president F.G. Gurley spoke during the opening meeting of a three-day seminar at the Intertribal Ceremonial in Gallup, New Mexico. Titling his address "Indians and the Southwest," he detailed the relationship between the Native Americans and the railroad. According to Gurley, natives are people "with strong family ties, deep devotion to the faith of their soul and a definite touch of artistry"; therefore, Gurley said, they possessed a "less pronounced" grasp of the Anglo-American's idea of economics. He continued, "I think we must accept as fact that while he may retain the faith and traditions of his ancestors and continue the habits and practices the

Indian has already become a part of the complex American economy and it seems to me the further fact is that he will become more and more a part of the complex economy." President Gurley related a "long and friendly connection" between the "railroads and the Indians," then descended into imagery centered on company portrayal of Native Americans in its marketing. "I think it is fair to say that through our advertising including our calendars we have endeavored to portray the American Indians as they are ... people of dignity, intelligence and capacity," Gurley asserted.[39] Margaret Irwin Hauke, former wartime women's director of personnel, noted that "especially on their trains," the company was interested in [Native American] art. "You know," she said, "they'd have the different Indian designs on the china, like on the Super Chief and the El Capitan and all."[40]

The company's calendar art and advertising ostensibly recognized and captured in vitro representations of Native American artistry, dignity, intelligence, and "capacity." In reality, however, native heritage as well as native labor molded and drove into the American imagination the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe themes of a romantic precontact Western tradition. The railroad empire builders unquestionably believed theories about a "long and friendly" connection drawing Native Americans increasingly into the complexities of the United States' industrialized society. Instead, the Flower of 1880 drew railroad employment experience in as one additional aspect of the complex weave of a charismatic Laguna society, a change unnoticed by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe corporate structure.

Gurley added, "We are perhaps the largest employer of Indian labor in the United States," with positions not restricted to that of common laborer. Gurley declared, "We have had the opportunity that comes to an employer in observing the habits and characteristics as well as the handicaps of the individual Indians whom accepts [sic] our employment." For the year 1951, 13,705 Native American railroad employees earned approximately $13 million, or about $948 per capita. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe employed 7,614 of those Native Americans and paid them $7,150,000 in wages, a little more than $939 annually per worker. Their jobs included locomotive and car repair, machinist, boilermaker, diesel mechanic, and car inspector. "They could not qualify" Gurley declared, "without a reasonable education," since these [skilled] positions represented higher pay than that of laborers.[41]

When asked about the presence of Laguna people at Richmond following World War II, one pueblo man replied, "Yeah, some of them, they're around, maybe one or two." Then, "I guess they got laid off [at Richmond] and they sent them different places [on the system]." Finally, he added, "I was the only one left in Richmond that was there for a long time," retiring in the late 1970s after nearly forty years of service.[42]

The narrator had come to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe as a manual laborer without a grade school education. Through a combination of persistence, natural skill, and pride in his work, this man had progressed to a coveted position as a skilled electrician. During an interview at his Laguna Pueblo home, he recalled that he "[a]lways took vacation time at Laguna [Pueblo]." While he was there celebrating his sixty-fifth birthday, the company unexpectedly issued his mandatory retirement papers. On returning to the Richmond Indian village, the Laguna man took advantage of company policy allowing him to bring his personal belongings home by rail, free of charge. A considerable pile of used bricks and lumber from behind his boxcar residence in the Richmond yards stands outside his adobe home at Laguna Pueblo today, a relic of his railroading career in the enclave at Richmond.[43] The Indian village at Richmond replicated life in the home pueblo, with the two locales thereby representing a coefficient interchangeablility of their constituent elements.

Edward P. Dozier commented in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change* about the high level of "indigenous pattern" retained by the pueblos. Important to an understanding of pueblo isolation, Dozier wrote, "is not so much the degree to which the Pueblos have succeeded in keeping out foreign invasions, but . . . the desire and the effort expended" in keeping the native system "pure."[44] Regardless of the location, either Richmond, California, or Laguna Pueblo, New Mexico, the worker's system endured, because it was of their own choosing. The system's dynamic reflected change that was acceptable on the laborer's own terms and within the structure of the Flower of 1880, abetted by corporate accommodation of their enclave and enveloped by the steel-and-steam environment of the Richmond terminal. In "The Road to Middle Class America," Michelene Fixico wrote, "Perhaps nothing more illustrates the attachment to their cultural heritage than the Indian's need to be with other Indians where they can just be themselves."[45] Eleanor Ramsey quoted a 1954 *Richmond Independent* newspaper article, noting that the village

during that era constituted "the barren strip of land lying Northwest of Richmond between the Santa Fe Railroad and Standard Oil Company." By the time of Ramsey's research in the early 1980s, the village covered a "considerably smaller" rectangular area of about two thousand square feet. "What remains of the original site," observed Ramsey, lay "nestled between tracks and a swampy marsh along the railroad yard's western edge,"[46] adding to the impression of a geographically and culturally secluded community. Her investigation concluded that the village inhabitants considered the train yard village not as a "new home" but rather an "occupational settlement." The people "maintained cultural and political ties" with their pueblos, she noted. Children spent summers in New Mexico, and villagers returned there frequently for visits; after an employee's retirement, the family routinely left Richmond for the home pueblo.[47] In addition to scholarly investigation, the Indian village sometimes drew unwanted attention from outsiders.

Judith K. Dunning, of the University of California, Berkeley, interviewed longtime residents of Richmond for the Bancroft Library oral history project in 1985. During closing interviews with a Black family, Dunning encountered a "surprising" comment. The subject was Marguerite Williams, descended from Louisiana slaves, a Richmond resident since the age of fourteen. She remembered the treatment of poor migrants and their children as outcasts during the depression and the influx of workers to the San Francisco Bay area during World War II. Contrary to Dunning's expectations, Williams revealed satisfaction about more affluent people moving into Richmond, because she was "tired of Richmond's blue-collar, industrial image."[48] Williams remembered hearing that all the military transportation trains came to Richmond during World War II for cleaning.[49] "That was what the women did," she recalled. Vacuuming, cleaning the windows, and "getting them ready" was a "little booming industry" at the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe terminal, according to her narrative. Many of the women still lived in the area after the war. The company "kept a lot of them on just cleaning trains," said Williams. Several of them, "about ten or twelve," lived at the village.[50]

The population of the Indian village customarily chose to mix judiciously with outsiders. "What can you tell me about the Indian Village?" Dunning asked Williams. Williams's chance to view and judge the living conditions at the village came only after

prolonged contact with the local elementary school's Parent Teacher Organization. The school organization proved a common meeting ground for Williams and village mothers. When one "Indian lady" came to a meeting, Williams and a Black friend tried to enlist more people from the village for their organization. The Native American woman described the villagers as "old-fashioned" and said they did not like to "be around" other people. Nonetheless, the two Black women succeeded in getting "ten or twelve Indian ladies" to the meetings. The pleased school principal commented about previously having tried "so hard" to get them to "become a part of the community." After establishing a friendship and visiting a village boxcar home, Williams reflected on the way the natives lived in the train yards. She asked one why the company did not give them better housing. The Indian woman replied, "Because they feel like if we don't like it here we can go back to the reservation." According to Williams, the woman finally exclaimed, "You know, they're doing us a favor."[51]

"You ought to see the housing," Marguerite Williams stated derisively. She alleged that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe gave these employees a "mere pittance" in exchange for their bringing their families from New Mexico and living "in lieu of salary" in the boxcars. "There was just kind of a little enclave over there," she reported. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe "hired a lot of the Indians from New Mexico, and they gave them housing in Richmond" described by Williams as "just pitiful . . . really pathetic." Reacting to her own perceptions of the conditions, Williams wrote to the local newspaper. "I just said that it was terrible that a big industry like Santa Fe would put those people in those little hovels." She complained further that "[t]hey weren't even as big as this room. . . . They were wood, little wooden shacks."[52] Williams concluded, "They wouldn't have to worry too much about heat because they were so small, but then sometimes they would have to go out looking for firewood."[53]

Williams's letter to the local newspaper, however, brought her the wrath of the villagers. They protested that the letter "hurt their pride, the fact I was acting from charity," said Williams. She remembered that the villagers were concerned that the company "would be thinking that they were out there begging, and then they would make them go back to the reservation," adding, "I had to apologize to them."[54] Although she offered no proof, Williams claimed that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe intimidated the Native Americans and provided "less salary" if the worker brought

his family from the pueblo.[55] Williams mistook the residents' desire to remain self-sufficient, to control their own destiny, and to negotiate their future without uninvited participation by others as acquiescence to exploitation by the railroad. The villagers' selectivity in their relations with the surrounding community exuded purposeful design and resonated with sound judgment when tested against Williams's narrow assumptions.

Asked about the size of the village population, Marguerite Williams replied "about fifteen families" and returned to her description of the housing. Referring to the "little bitty houses," she said, "the only way they would get relief was if one of the girls would get married." If the new husband was a company employee, this meant new boxcar living quarters, but "[o]ther than that, they would have six or seven kids, so eight people were living in one little shack," where privacy involved simple dividers within the boxcar for the mother and children. Williams finished with, "It was really deplorable." The interviewer asked when the village began, and Williams estimated "around 1950," based on her participation in the school organization. She commented that "they still have their houses," claiming that "every once in a while I run into one of the women."[56] Speaking in 1985, she was unaware that only two families occupied boxcar homes by the early 1980s and that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe had razed the remnants of the village boxcars in 1982. Marguerite Williams's suspicions, based on familial roots in exploitation, kept her from understanding the self-determined lifestyle of the village inhabitants.

Although insular people, the Indian workers enjoyed complex and diverse activities, including discriminating participation in the world both inside and outside the train yards. One man recalled that everyone went to a park, probably Nicholas Park near the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, on the weekends. Some villagers rode the ferry or used the electric trolley on the Oakland Bay Bridge to visit San Francisco.[57] Along with other Native Americans, leaders of the Laguna community formed one of the first urban Indian centers in the United States. Begun in 1955 with the support of the American Friends Service Committee, the Intertribal Friendship House in Oakland continues to serve Native American community members today.[58]

Village energy often focused on matters regarding the children. A retiree recalled working all night and then walking his children to their public elementary school when his shift ended. His daughter remembered a "lady from Stanford" obtaining use of

the "Rod and Gun Club at Chevron" for year-end school parties; she also remembered that, at one time, her elementary school of three hundred students had thirty Native American pupils. All were from the village in the train yard. As nominal Catholics, some villagers attended Lady of Mercy church, built in 1902 in nearby Point Richmond. The village residents recalled random memories about the church: Some remembered the sisters being "mean" to them as children, while others remembered Laguna marriages solemnized at Lady of Mercy, with reception dinners following in the Indian village boxcar meeting hall.[59] Martha Maffeo served in the mailroom at Standard Oil Company's Richmond refinery, adjacent to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe terminal. "A devout Catholic," according to the *Standard Oiler* magazine, Maffeo held "weekly [catechism] lessons for the [village] children, at the parents' request."[60] Lady of Mercy church stored the stage set for her annual Christmas pageant at the Indian village. Many people today remember Maffeo's presentation of the Christmas pageant, using the Laguna and Acoma children as actors.[61] Holding the event in the village meeting hall, she adjusted "wings and haloes" and prepared the children for their parts. The Standard Oil journalist acknowledged every person present, except for Maffeo, as a "member of the Laguna or the Acoma tribes of New Mexico." The article, "The Spirit of Giving," pictured several children, including an "Indian girl" in nativity costume. Her parents "migrated from their native New Mexico desert to work on the railroad in faraway California," explained the writer, concluding that the child "symbolizes the faith of Christianity."[62]

A lack of continuity in Laguna language among the children reflected shifting cultural structures at the Richmond Indian village. A photograph in the *Standard Oiler* article about Maffeo's boxcar Christmas pageant noted the choir instructions written in Spanish, once a language familiar to most Laguna people.[63] Until World War II, most people spoke Laguna first, Spanish second, and English third. Now, only a few people born before 1940 can speak both "Indian [Laguna]" and Spanish, explained one Laguna woman. When interviewed about life in the village, an elder commented, "Yeah, at Richmond and Barstow, they spoke Laguna at those shops over there." The elder's daughter also remembered a strict custom that permitted village officers to speak only the Laguna language both at the home pueblo councils and at the meetings in the recognized railroad "colonies." An interpreter

assisted at these mandatory meetings, attended by all males age sixteen and over. While others in her age group learned the Laguna language well, the daughter felt she understood more than she could communicate, since individual families decided about teaching language to children. Finally, she recalled that many people used their "Indian language" every day at the village, but she reiterated that the amount the children learned ultimately "depended on the family."[64] Edward P. Dozier discussed the relevance of pueblo languages, writing in 1961, "English is now an important second language, but the native idioms continue to dominate." As a factor intrinsic in their history of insularity from others, the pueblo Native Americans remain "purists" in language.[65] Although Dozier noted that the language "must not be polluted by foreign loans," he observed that "past generations" of Pueblo speakers also conversed in Spanish.[66]

While language preferences experienced change during the years in Richmond, villagers adapted the train yards to a more strict maintenance of traditional rituals and social events. During the early 1950s, recalled one former resident, some "Jemez boys" came to the Bay Area from New Mexico to find work under the federal government's relocation program.[67] They assisted in the ceremonial dancing by sending home for their traditional regalia and performing in the Laguna feast days. According to several former residents, the village inhabitants regularly held sacred events within their train yard enclave, closed to public viewing. Outsiders could attend open feast day celebrations and social dances on invitation, just as at the home pueblo in New Mexico. In addition, a village "orchestra," begun in the 1940s, continued following World War II. The group's accordion, trumpet, banjo, drums, and guitar provided dance music—a Spanish style only "southwestern people" knew, said the former lead musician.[68]

While the Laguna employed their insularity and self-sufficiency to great advantage at Richmond in terms of collectivity, ritual necessity, and identity, the historic patronage by the railroad regarding employee welfare also abetted the workers' sense of community within the yards. This Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe custom was exemplified by company attention to worker health, with health care provided to employees and their families. At Laguna Pueblo in 1969, the University of New Mexico's Mike Husband questioned a retired elder, asking about the clinics and

health services at the pueblo. The former railroader replied, "They have no beds there [at Laguna] to take care of patients. . . . [T]hey don't really take care of them like they should." Without elaboration, he alluded to racial tensions at the health center by adding, "There's nothing wrong with my people," and, "White people always look down on Indians." The interviewer then turned the discussion to financial responsibility for health services, asking, "When you go down there (Grants or Albuquerque), do you have to pay for [the] hospital?" The elder responded, "No. . . . Of course I, and the old people, we are under the Medicare [and] as for me, I worked on the railroad, so I have no charge."[69] Margaret Irwin Hauke remembered the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe as having a "nice" hospital plan during the war years. The company-sponsored plan charged the employees fifty cents each month for nearby physicians to make weekly visits to their disparate work locations. "If you needed medicine or anything," Hauke recalled, "you could go down and see him." Hauke remembers this as a "great attraction" for recruiting and retaining company employees, but postwar labor conditions led to the replacement of this practice with a union-negotiated plan.[70] The railroad contracted with a local physician in private practice for the Native Americans and other employees at the Richmond terminal. This doctor kept a Richmond practice several blocks away, downtown, but the company provided him an office in the train yards for his visits there. "We all went to the railroad company doctor's office," one former villager said. "As for the medical," she acknowledged, "the Santa Fe took care of the employees." Similar to the public outside the train yards, "[w]e went to a family doctor, just like anybody else." For cases involving surgery or "whatever," the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe paid all the medical bills, according to this informant's testimony.[71]

Laguna workers conducted other, more adventuresome excursions into the surrounding society during this period. According to Wilson and Gutierrez in *Minorities and Media*, world history and technology combined to transform postwar American mass media. Filmmakers increasingly employed Native American themes as "metaphors" for political and philosophical statements on various issues.[72] Some of the Laguna at Richmond began secondary careers as film and theatrical artists shortly after U.S. entry into World War II and continued following the war's end. Many enthusiastically participated in joint ventures between the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe and the federal government in

selling and purchasing war bond issues to finance the military effort. Hollywood recruited several Laguna and Acoma villagers for "cowboy" movies of the late 1940s and 1950s era. The Laguna people interviewed could not recollect the names of the films or their exact dates, although several family albums contained still photos taken during filming. One man, an active member of the Screen Actors Guild for many years, remembered making a movie in Sonoma County, California, about a "little lost girl." The unidentified film featured another Native American remembered only as Red Horse. Other than as an amusement and a money-making distraction, these film appearances seemed to hold no special significance among this man's markers of self-identity.[73]

The same Laguna man remembered many other theatrical appearances, including participation in a part-time variety show produced by a San Francisco city engineer claiming to be a "chief of the Sioux." The Chinese-American producer-participant, Wayne Tom, featured shows with Native American themes. Along with some Laguna and Acoma performers hired from the village, Tom received attention in the *Alameda Times-Star* during 1966, under the title "How an Oakland Chinese Became One of the Country's Leading Indians."[74] Years of selective participation in such high-profile events in the community surrounding their temporary home eventually garnered residents special U.S. Post Office recognition of the train yard community. After several Laguna people appeared as performers in the annual "Pageant of Fire Mountain" held at Guerneville, California, one received a mailed copy of the pageant program addressed simply "Santa Fe Indian Camp, House 21, Richmond, California."[75] Although the Richmond Indian village could not be found on other than U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe maps, its presence and vitality could not be dismissed.

The workers demonstrated their fervor for a diverse Laguna lifestyle in many ways. Leisure and sports activities chosen by the Laguna occupied their spare time in the yards, with the lines of participation often drawn by ethnicity and race, reflecting post-war tensions in Richmond. Many Laguna people kept pictures of the village baseball team as mementos. Reminded of this, one man recollected, "We used to have a team and called them Redskins." He explained that, with all the men away in the war, the team did not start until the 1950s. "Everybody in the 1940s was in the service, but then they came back and we started a team." The

baseball team played various local conferences and was believed to be the first all-Native American team in the Bay Area. "Standard Oil, Ford Motor Company, they got their own teams with white and colored guys," the informant said. "Then we had our own team, all Lagunas, playing at night time in Nicholas Park." He replied to a question about the Redskins' winning record with an evasive "[p]retty good, we came in fourth, I think," then added, "Those other teams are good, you know."[76]

Other local sports opportunities attracted the village residents, especially swimming at the Richmond Municipal Natorium, known as the "Municipal Plunge." In the immediate postwar period, only a few Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians went there. However, this demographic changed in subsequent years with the evolution of Richmond's multiethnic population. In addition, the villagers often walked down to Keller's beach on San Pablo Bay to swim. Laguna people recalled that beach visitors were "mostly white" during the World War II era. An attempt at navigation of the harbor area proved mildly disastrous for some young Laguna. A group of village boys labored to build a "boat" from scrap wood scavenged in the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe train yards. After the boys dragged it laboriously nearly a mile to the water at Richmond Harbor, the craft sank "immediately," to the laughter of the other children.[77]

In a change from the prewar era, some Blacks moved to Point Richmond following World War II. General prior resentment against wartime "newcomer" Blacks and other migrant workers continued to appear, yet the residents of the Indian village received deferential treatment. In 1950s Point Richmond and Richmond proper, restaurants did not allow Blacks in their facilities after dark. The advantages that Laguna people received in comparison to other ethnic groups proved a source of obvious pride to the people interviewed. "When we would go downtown, the blacks would be gone after a certain time from restaurants, but we [could stay and] had credit and everything," explained one woman. In Point Richmond, the Santa Fe Market allowed credit to Native American railroad laborers, and the 4th Street Market on Macdonald Avenue in Richmond did the same. A drugstore near the Catholic church showed favoritism toward village residents returning from Sunday mass by inviting them in to visit. Laguna people remembered one cafe owner fondly for calling in native children returning from the Richmond movies and giving them ice cream cones.[78]

Nonetheless, the Laguna people remained phenotypically and, by choice of conduct, as different from other citizens as did Blacks and Hispanics. The obvious probabilities against a tolerant, even friendly attitude toward them are mitigated by a few cogent and practical considerations. First, they carefully enforced their own choice of living separately in Richmond, enveloped in a world screened off from other residents by train cars and the industrial appliances of railroading. Second, the Laguna did not compete, even during wartime, for the scarce housing in Richmond or occupy "eyesore" buildings scorned by long-time Richmond residents. For example, many family photograph albums contained pictures of the postwar era showing neatly painted boxcar homes with white picket fences and tiny areas of grass, flowers, fruit trees, and vegetable gardens. In addition, painted trim appeared around the base of the houses to cover the stilts that elevated the boxcars following the floods of the early 1940s. Third, the villagers comprised a skilled element of Richmond's founding industry, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. Most citizens as well as merchants no doubt recognized and honored the fact that this represented steady work and a regular flow of pay. Finally, the confined nature of the Indian village created a perception of the residents as self-policing, under the juris of the railroad, and nonthreatening to the general population, as indeed they were.

In 1952, *The Santa Fe Magazine* featured the company's private surveillance system in an article titled "Railroad Police." Former residents referred to these officers as the Santa Fe Bulls. The article said that these special guards protected "passengers as well as . . . billions of dollars worth of freight and railroad property." Their "beat" took them to a variety of company facilities, including freight yards such as those adjacent to the Indian village.[79] A young Laguna recollected his dog and that of an Acoma neighbor fighting continually. One night, the neighbor's dog attacked and was killed by the Laguna's animal. The Contra Costa County Sheriff's Department responded to a call from the Acoma neighbor. However, on arriving, the officers reportedly refused to take action. This conflict was on "private property"—the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe train yards—and the officers referred the call to the company system, the "Bulls," for resolution. The company police also took no action, in turn referring the matter to the Acoma and Laguna community leaders.[80] This accepted method of handling native conflict within the train yards through internal structures remained intact in the postwar period.

In another incident involving the "outside," the Acoma dog owner wrote a response to a local newspaper, claiming that an editorial reference to the village was not complete. His complaint stated that, in 1922, the Native Americans in New Mexico gained employment and housing rights in exchange for land grants to the railroad. The account conflicted with the story of the 1880 Flower offered by the Laguna, who commented that the Acoma "didn't know what he was talking about." He allegedly also engaged in questionable activities, referred to only as "things he should not be messing with." When a falling train car crushed the Acoma to death, many Laguna viewed his demise as an expected supernatural result of his arrogance.[81] The company, however, claimed the occurrence as an "industrial accident." Historian Raymond J. DeMallie posits, "Native understandings frequently involve supernatural events that are causal and fundamental to the story, but, from western rationalist perspectives, are not acceptable as true."[82] For the Laguna people, the causes of the Acoma man's death remained solely a village matter, not measurable by outsiders using their yardstick of truth.

According to accounts of the event, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe shipped the body back to Acoma Pueblo by rail, gratis, as was its historic custom. Although a local funeral home prepared the body, some Laguna people interviewed firmly believed there was no coroner's inquest, based on the perceived influence of the railroad system and on contemporary Richmond's acceptance of railroad sovereignty over internal matters.[83] Village isolation and the railroad's autonomy during the era appear as mutually accommodating, reinforcing the idea of the Indian village at Richmond as an extension of the home pueblo in New Mexico. Asked, "What would you think was the best thing about the village," a retired Laguna said, "I don't know." Then, asked if there was anything he wanted people to know about the Richmond village, he replied emphatically, "I don't think so!"[84] In *The Urban American Indian,* Alan L. Sorkin observed a Native American reluctance in the cities to "accept and interact" with other minorities, especially "Spanish-speaking" and Black urbanites. In Sorkin's view, this reluctance limited social adjustment to the urban community. Because Indian people were already at the margins of the larger, white society, this retreat resulted in an indefinable "Indian community," approaching a nebulous "urban reservation."[85] Such a concept, however, only partially defines the Indian village in the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe

yards at Richmond. The villagers' lifestyle, interacting with outside urban society, did not represent a retreat from mainstream oppression. Rather, the evidence showed clearly a proactive determination to remain Laguna, while chosing to amalgamate railroad employment with their tribal core.

The attitudes of many Laguna people toward their employer resonated in an unsolicited testimonial offered at a 1993 reunion of retired Laguna railroad workers. The narrator had lived, at about age five, with his father and four siblings in four "very small" boxcar rooms. He felt that this had made them "happy children" and the family "even closer." His testimony recalled "one big happy family" that included "neighborhood children" sharing a train yard life. The narrator, recounting fond memories of his father treating the children to a "hamburger dinner" on paydays, said, "I can still remember and cherish those good memories deep down in my heart when I was young and my father worked for the Santa Fe Railroad Company."[86]

Others remember just as strongly the Native American issues inherent in the increasing tensions of the civil rights movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s. In response to intense activism by so-called minorities, California governor Ronald Reagan signed Senate Bill 572 in 1968, requiring schools to teach the role of "Negroes, American Indians, Mexican-Americans and other ethnic groups" in the development of California and the United States.[87] A younger participant at the Laguna-Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe reunion dinner had attended San Francisco State University evening classes during this time of intense political and social activism among Native American students. He had become more vocal about Native American rights, and his supervisors and fellow workers at the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe had branded him a "troublemaker" for his outspoken views on corporate responsibility to the public. "My real outrage," he said, "came when I happened to read some corporate reports as part of my analyst's job." The company studies projected a dramatic shift away from labor-intensive structures, toward technologically based operations. One report section outlined a ten-year corporate reorganization, including dismantling the Indian village at Richmond to accommodate more streamlined freight handling. "I finally realized that I was helping the company do away with my own people, and I confronted my bosses with it, and demanded alternatives." At this point, the former employee said he was "really out," and he resigned under substantial pressure.[88]

In reflecting on the "Permanence of City Residence," Lewis Meriam's report claimed that many Indians viewed the city as a temporary habitation and that they hoped to return to their homelands as soon as they were economically able, noting that "love for the lands of their forebears is often expressed."[89] Even so, Meriam's work in 1928 failed to recognize that the synergetic homelands of reality and remembrance were no longer the same as in the decades that immediately followed the appearance of railroads in the Southwest. This incongruity appeared in the 1960s reflections of a retired Laguna employee, recorded in the Doris Duke Collection of Native American testimony. "Santa Fe is in trouble, I hear," ventured the interviewer. The retiree's reply resounded with years of practical railroading experience: "These freight trains go by here every day, little trains go by here 24 hours. . . . [T]hey are not really making enough [money] to satisfy them [the companies]." He continued, "That is why they are trying to cut out the train," because they "just can't make people believe there is no money in passenger trains." He concluded, "They know that people want them." When asked, "Do they stop here?" he replied, "Well, they cut out this depot here. . . . There were a lot of people here where the train stops [but y]ou can't get on here." He explained, "It doesn't stop unless you get a stop order here."[90]

The lingering hope for railroad work as desirable labor and for improved conditions at the pueblo appeared during some final remarks. The interviewer asked, "Well, are . . . people from here still working for the railroad?" The elder replied, "They call for people when they want men to work, but our people get out of the reservation." He elaborated, "That is why they are moving out [to] go out to work [elsewhere]." Nonetheless, he continued, the "[r]ailroad is [a] good job and they pay good." The crux of postwar economics affecting the Laguna people was brought into focus by the final question, "What do people want to do?" The Laguna answered concisely and clearly, "They want jobs right here on the reservation. . . . There aren't any. . . . There aren't any jobs . . . anywhere."[91]

Steve Talbott noted, "Each racial and national section of the U.S. working class has special characteristics," observing, "It is therefore necessary to underline . . . that most Indian workers are poor, unemployed or underemployed."[92] The testimony of the elder Laguna interviewed in 1969 delineated the dramatic changes in railroad technology and therefore the future ability of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe to hire substantial numbers of

Laguna workers. In 1970, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe officially joined with Amtrak, the quasigovernmental National Railroad Passenger Corporation. One of the first trains discontinued was the company's San Francisco Chief, with its cars based on Native American themes and the "warbonnet" locomotive design in paint dubbed "Indian Red" by the manufacturer.[93]

Other subtle yet sudden changes more directly affected the remnants of the Indian village. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe cleaned and repaired the village housing in 1964, the *Contra Costa Independent* reported. For reasons never fully understood by the four remaining families at Richmond, the company required written lease agreements for housing following 1970. Set against the railroad's reorganization report studied by the young Laguna analyst and probable corporate reaction to the activism of the era, the requirement seems at least explainable. As part of the 1970 leases, the company made additional renovations to bring the homes within local county building and safety codes, a shift from the railroad's autonomous posture of past decades. "The families, 35 people in all, continued to live in the boxcars rent free with the provision that as they retired or moved away or left the railroad's employment the property would revert to Santa Fe," said the news article.[94] Company maps attached to copies of the 1970 leases identified the village as "The Richmond, California Colony of the Pueblo of Laguna." Apparently drafted by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe legal department, the agreements contained concise details, including a one-dollar-per-year lease of the boxcar housing and land, with a provision allowing the lessees to take away their residence when they left. A former villager claimed that, under her lease agreement, railroad employment was specifically not available to her children.[95] The company no longer needed masses of Laguna workers in 1970 to demonstrate through art, advertising, or labor the presumed Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe mastery over the southwestern United States.

The company moved three modular homes into the village just before the time of the 1970 lease agreements. In an ironic twist, the new houses were all claimed by Acoma families. Because the Acoma people were seen as not having the same employment and housing rights granted under the agreement of 1880, their occupation continued as a source of irritation to the Laguna. As provided in their lease, one Acoma family moved their modular house to a Richmond neighborhood after retirement.[96] "Today the Santa Fe Indian Village has been torn apart [and] the last two families, one

from the Acoma Pueblo and the other from the Laguna Pueblo, have moved," announced the *Contra Costa Independent* on 6 August 1982. Page 4 of the newspaper quoted an Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe official as saying, "One of the two remaining families had been given a cash settlement and was moving to El Sobrante [California]." The other resident bought a Richmond city lot to receive his "duplex," and the "boxcars will be removed from the property altogether," the newspaper reported.[97] Santa Fe needed the property for the "continued development of its $12 million intermodal facility," according to the article.[98] The ten-year plan to accommodate the technological changes in railroading did not include the Indian village at Richmond. Physical change after World War II, both at the home pueblo and in the train yards, moved gradually toward an unavoidable end. Only the persistent sense of Laguna identity survived, changed forever through synthesis with the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroading experience.

In *Dream Tracks: The Railroad and the American Indian,* T.C. McLuhan wrote that the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe represented a "preindustrial" southwestern desert life and culture of simplicity, freedom, and nobility. She said the railroad "appropriated the Indian and his culture" as a "meaningful emblem" to "galvanize" the American imagination. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe thereby combined "corporate image making and corporate structure."[99] Regarding the mass media advertising of 1985 and following years, Wilson and Gutierrez stated, "It appears that Native Americans will continue to be treated as the most invisible minority." They finished with, "The noble Super Chief has gone the way of the passenger train [that Native Americans] once advertised."[100] The Richmond village of 1981 remained the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe's only surviving labor boarding camp, with a population that had "waxed and waned" over the years since its establishment in the 1920s.[101] Judith K. Dunning asked Marguerite Williams, "Exactly where was it?" Williams replied, "Make a right on First, go all the way to the end [and] you'll see Pennsylvania [Street] where it curves." She added, "They [the Native Americans] go over the track right there."[102] Dunning also asked whether the village was visible from the road. "Yes," Williams answered, "they live right on the road." She related that the last time she had visited, five or six years prior, "they were living there at the Indian Village."[103]

Others also noted the inexorable fading of the train yard enclave. The *Investigation of Cultural Resources within the Richmond*

Harbor Development Project detailed the existing village structures in 1981. "Newcomers had to live in old boxcars made temporarily by the company," the survey reported. "Partitions were installed, and modifications made to the original boxcars, which became permanent housing, and now have been used for over fifty years." Noting that the company "no longer maintains the buildings as it did in years past," the report characterized the ten remaining houses as in a "deteriorated" condition. "Four boxcars are still being used; families occupy three of them and the fourth is used as a community meeting room," the observer said. The study also stated that the governor of Laguna Pueblo made annual visits to Richmond in "more recent" years, meeting with villagers and railroad officials; "[e]ven now that the Village has only four families, these visits are still made."[104]

On 12 November 1980, the governor met with nonvillage tribal members as well as village residents, an indication of both the establishment of Laguna residence locally, outside the train yards, and a continuing recognition of the Flower of 1880 in modern Laguna life. The study said that, in former years, the meetings included Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe officials in order for the governor to represent the villagers' interests regarding the original agreement.[105] The analysis concluded with, "Native Americans refer to the Governor's Santa Fe conference as Watering the Flower."[106] Interviewed in 1992, a retired village official reported, "The Governor never go out there [after 1982] to Water the Flower. . . . I don't know why."[107] The annual reaffirmation ritual honoring the principles of the Flower faded away, and the dismantling of the Richmond village soon followed. The front page of the 6 August 1982 *Contra Costa Independent* pictured two dilapidated boxcar homes, announcing, "The end of Indian Village." A staff journalist wrote, "Last two families have moved," then completed the village obituary title with, "For 60 years families of New Mexican Indians have lived quietly and extremely privately in a Village of converted boxcars off Garrard Boulevard."[108]

Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe records from the years of annual meetings to Water the Flower reportedly did not survive into 1994. According to a company public relations representative, one of two known sets disappeared during moves of the Coast Lines offices in Los Angeles. Records were "tossed" in 1979 and again in 1989, with exclamations of "We're not a museum" and "Get rid of the excess." The second set disintegrated during flooding at a company storage location.[109] In the final village

article, the *Contra Costa Independent* stated, "There is little information available about the Indian Village." The writer explained that this was due to the resident families' insistence on "privacy in their daily lives as well as ritual events, meetings and social functions"; they received "support" from the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe to this end. "The Indians maintained their cultural identity and political allegiance with their New Mexican pueblos; the Village was regarded as the place to live while the Indians worked for the railroad, not as a permanent home"; on retirement, the families returned to New Mexico.[110]

"We hated to go over there" said a Richmond terminal supervisor in 1993, referring to the former Indian village site. "Those last two boxcars just wouldn't give up; the wood kept splintering, and we broke our hammers." When asked what the wrecking crew finally did, he replied, "We dug a hole and buried them." Asked where, he pointed to the center of a broad expanse of train yard asphalt, exclaiming, "Right over there!"[111] Marguerite Williams claimed there was "another part" of the Richmond village, in the area of the St. Johns Apartments, formerly the "Mexican village." She said, "That had really been an Indian Village at one time, but it belonged to Santa Fe." While the apartments were being built, Williams claimed, "a lot of [Native American] people got upset about it because they said that they had graves over there, and [the railroad] built on top of that." She concluded with, "I imagine that if they were to start excavating they would find Indian relics down there."[112] One of the last Richmond village residents, a Laguna, speculated about the demise of her home. "Do you think," she asked, "those scientists will dig my boxcar up someday?" Then finally, "Will they know it was an Indian house?"[113]

The Rio Grande lies at the western edge of Albuquerque, New Mexico. Old Route 66, now U.S. 40, traverses the city and spans the river, then crosses the quickly developing space west of the city, coming eventually to the Rio Puerco, about ten miles further west. The top of the hill bordering the river allows a view of the landscape and a vantage point for analysis. The highway is a modern thoroughfare, busy with automobiles threading down the grade to the West, joined by campers, four-by-fours, and multiwheeled commercial transports. Looking north, one can track the progress of Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroad trains, long chains of modern technology winding their way around the edge of the mountains bordering the desert. To the

north and south of the highway spreads open land, hindered only by railroad tracks, the Rio Puerco to the east, a seemingly interminable fence line posted "Laguna Pueblo Reservation," and the eventual solemnity of the western mesas. Just before dawn, the desert floor and its surrounding mesas are hued with blue-blacks and grays. A spectacular array of soft reds and lavenders appears at sunrise, with touches of muted yellows and greens on the landscape. Only flecks of color are visible at first, but by midday the reds expand and deepen in the bright sun.

The entrance to the Laguna Reservation is forty miles west of Rio Puerco. A paved exit leaves the highway in a gentle slope to the right, just at the base of the mesas, with sacred Mount Taylor visible in the background. Past the exit pavement, modern-looking Laguna buildings fill the land north of the frontage road. Several display signs announcing various tribal enterprises. The road expands into a wide two-lane after a mile or so, crossing a cement bridge of recent construction. The remains of an old water pump-house near the River San Jose are visible below. Stripped of usefulness as well as equipment, the small stone building is a visual reminder of the arrival of railroading at Laguna and the constant need for abundant water.[114] To the left is the local market and, just beyond that, a small reservation library. Behind the library, the stone, adobe, and plaster houses of Laguna Pueblo dot the slow rise to the mesa top. A fork in the semi-improved road lies just beyond the library. To the right, it winds up a slope past the modern tribal offices to the whitewashed Catholic church, dedicated to St. Joseph, patron saint of the Laguna people. The left fork, to the south, follows the now-abandoned Route 66, built over the roadbed of the original Atlantic & Pacific Railroad tracks. The Atlantic & Pacific's plan for expansion to the Pacific brought it to Laguna in the late nineteenth century. The arrival of the railroad's construction crew and the lasting effect of subsequent events on Laguna culture is the subject of a sit-down dinner held at the tribal recreation hall today. Nearly one hundred retirees and descendants of laborers for the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad and its successor, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, are attending.

The crowd assembles on the evening of 14 November 1992 to celebrate the relationship of the Laguna people with the Atlantic & Pacific and Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroads, spanning more than one hundred years. As at any function, some people cluster together, apparently arranged according to familial ties. Others sit in twos and threes, glancing about shyly and now and

then acknowledging a friendly face. Several are clearly comfortable at such events and are making the most of the dinner party to play "catch up" on foreign and domestic gossip with their acquaintances. Whether anyone has more than a dim knowledge of all the others at the reunion is not immediately obvious. Nearly everyone present is one of the 7,103 enrolled members of the Laguna tribe of New Mexico and lives on, or within a fifty-mile radius of, the reservation.[115] These people attend the proliferation of tribal-based Laguna and Catholic religious events that occur throughout the year, but those events are not enough to occasion a sit-down affair. The group has a common denominator apart from relationships of either a casual, a familial, or a pious nature. The symbolism of this night is uniquely Laguna by experience: There is a representation evident that remains forever just at the edge of the participants' reality.

This year is the eve of the 125th anniversary of the founding of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, inheritor of the Atlantic & Pacific Railroad in New Mexico.[116] A connection at the periphery of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe affects everyone in attendance. However, it is the first time in the 112 years since the predecessor Atlantic & Pacific originally contracted to employ Laguna workers that a gathering of this kind has taken place. Retirees, wives, children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and widows and orphans of deceased Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe workers are sitting down together. Many express their pleasure, commenting repeatedly, "We thought the company had forgotten us." The surprised dinner guests are happy that their former employer has sponsored this reunion, even though there are no Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe representatives present. Most of the participants eagerly awaited the reunion, and a few tried previously to organize such an event. Fading photographs and news clippings only partially recall the many alliances, experiences, and memories brought by working for the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe: the Santa Fe All Indian Band, powwows in Golden Gate Park, children playing at night under the dim security lights of the train yards, a first communion dinner in a boxcar meeting hall at the Richmond terminal. The reunion is a chance—which many hope will be the first of many—for grasping at threads of experiences woven into that seamless cloth of awareness: the persistent sense of being Laguna.

A catering staff shifts quietly and efficiently between tables and guests. Neat, white tablecloths with china plates and silverware

slightly startle the dinner guests. One woman whispers, "I was sure it would be the usual Indian fry bread and a piece of chicken thrown in a paper basket. Wait until my sister hears what she missed." The caterer is from nearby Grants. Called the "Uranium Capitol of the World" during the 1950s energy boom, Grants is now little more than host to a massive penal colony and weekend shoppers, both native and nonnative. Laguna who want to "go to town" to eat visit this caterer's place of business. The menu, the decor of the restaurant, and even the staff uniforms reflect a continuous theme in Laguna life: railroading. The owner is particularly fond of collecting bits of trivia from the heyday of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe. His popularity among the people who built and maintained that empire is understandable. The Laguna people picked this caterer for tonight's railroad event, and he adds an unanticipated texture to the proceedings.

The building's interior, earlier scrubbed clean by a few of the party guests, reflects the importance of the event. Festive dinner settings, pictures along the walls, and handmade banners attesting to the continuance of the Laguna-Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe relationship provide color in an otherwise stark room. Outside, a weathered sign reading "Recreation Hall" is the only decoration on this gray, cement block structure. A chain link fence enclosing the hall testifies to the proclamations of some that "things aren't the same like when we were kids. Now everything has to be locked up." Rolled barbed wire tops the fence to discourage the more insistent intruder.

Beliefs in an enduring Laguna-Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe relationship are not pervasive throughout the Laguna population. A thirty-nine-year veteran of railroad life points up the slope of the nearby mesa toward the ever-present Catholic church. A site near the church, where the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe wanted to place railroad cars as mementos of the persistence of loyalty between the Indians and the railroad, is bare to this day. The tribal council voted against accepting the offer; whether this was an act of resistance to further industrial intrusion on tribal lands is unclear. However, the storyteller is obviously skeptical about the wisdom shown by the council: "Those guys are crazy.... If we had let the railroad do that, then we could have worked with them on other things, and maybe they would have said, 'Well, those Indians don't have a baseball field or a good recreation hall, so let's put one up for them.'" The narrator appraises the hard, lifeless exterior of the recreation building

as he returns to the dinner, then exclaims with a laugh, "Them guys don't know nothing. . . . They're crazy." Many other retired workers, however, cling to the symbolic remnants of their railroad employment.

A 102-year-old retiree attending tonight's function lives alone in two rooms on the far side of Laguna Pueblo. A single window faces the west side, directly above the buried Atlantic & Pacific track bed. Round cedar beams support the seven-foot-high ceiling of his sparsely furnished pueblo apartment. Fading black-and-white photographs from his long tenure with the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe line the walls of both rooms just below the beams. The 1880 agreement was barely thirty years old when this man began service nearby as a laborer, working on a section gang from the now-vanished railroad junction called Suanee. The photographs recall daily his Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe employment; they are experiential threads in the tapestry that is Laguna existence.

At the reunion dinner, the old man is resplendent in a scarlet baseball jacket, a remnant of days when the company, using advertising almost totally dependent on themes of southwestern Native America, called on native railroad workers to display their tribal culture for corporate profit. The jacket is one of three specially designed by a fellow Laguna for the workers to wear as they toured on company business. On the back is a large, embroidered profile of a stereotypical, war-bonneted Indian. The round, blue-and-white Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe logo flashes on the front of the jacket, over the old man's heart, when he turns to have his photo taken.

None of the Laguna Tribal Council are in attendance at the dinner, save for one latecomer, the tribal interpreter. He is a college-educated World War II veteran who chose to return to the reservation rather than succumb to the lures of urban life, the materialistic lifestyle that came with spending the years away. The interpreter rises and asks, through a family member, for the opportunity to make some remarks. A few opening words are in English; none are in Spanish. The rest of the address is in Laguna. As he speaks, everyone is silent, even though many members of the younger generations might not fully comprehend his words. Assurance and dignity mark the speech that concludes the evening.

Later, when asked to summarize the interpreter's remarks, an older Laguna explains, "He says that this dinner is a good thing,

that we need to remember our past and our responsibility to the agreement we made in the early days with the Santa Fe, when it first come through here. Our women have been reminding us for a long time now, he says, that we should do what we used to, that we should go to the Santa Fe and renew our verbal agreement.... It is the way our people have survived and it is the way we can provide for our children, and for the tribe to continue."[117] This dinner gathering is a ritual for renewal, a celebration of the continuity of the tribe. Recognizing the event of 1880 as a symbolic marker of Laguna essence, the dinner reminds participants that they must again affirm its existence by annually Watering the Flower.

Michael McGerr observed in 1994 that, while structurally relevant to the economy, corporations exerted limited influence on Americans' attitudes and behavior as individuals. A paradox resulted, in that, "[f]or all their scope, corporations and other bureaucracies have failed to remake their own workers, let alone American culture." To explain this phenomenon, McGerr said, "We need to go beyond our faith in the power of organizations to transform people and culture." He concluded, "Our nation may well be exceptional not for the power of organization, but for the persisting sense of human agency."[118] One reason for this apparent inconsistency lies in the fact that, as creations of the state, corporations are also agencies thereof. For Native American societies such as that at Laguna Pueblo and the Richmond village, the unity of state and community structures is historically and, to a lesser degree, contemporarily an amalgam. However structured, these combinations always remain just slightly at the margins of the larger, state-bound, social and economic systems. That marginality is at least partially self-imposed and maintained, wittingly or unwittingly, as an act of resistance. The present reality of such struggles against real and imagined hardships is continually filtered through the lens of hindsight. This phenomenon in turn creates perceptions effecting change among dynamic strategies for tribal survival and maintenance of identity. Edward Spicer wrote, "An identity system . . . develops independently of those processes by which a total culture pattern, a set of particular customs and beliefs constituting a way of life, is maintained." He proposed that "[t]he continuity of a people is a phenomenon distinct from the persistence of a particular set of culture traits."[119] The Indian village at Richmond provided excellent documentable and corroborative

testimony to such persistence in the face of the dynamics of cultural change.

Scores of migrant Laguna laborers, augmented with members of the neighboring Acoma Pueblo, left New Mexico, passing in and out of the terminal at Richmond from 1945 until 1982, when the Indian village disbanded. They adapted themselves selectively to surrounding nonnative functions but clung to tradition, returning often to their pueblos for nurturing celebrations and rituals. During the Laguna workers' employment at Richmond, their village functioned as a de facto satellite of the distant Laguna Pueblo. Sociologically and psychologically, the village boxcars, such as House 21, remained inextricably a part of the home pueblo, as if situated along the railroad right-of-way, west of the Rio Grande in New Mexico. The shared experience of the laborers who intermittently occupied the Indian village speaks as a tribute to the cultural persistence of those who Watered the Flower of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe contract. In the process, the participants extended the vitality of their Native American communities and altered significantly the people's rich cultural tradition.

The effect of the Laguna-Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe relationship on the lives of the laborers is notable even now. The relevance of the railroad experience in contemporary life intensifies when gauged against the role it played in the Laguna's persistence as a people. A time-honored employment contract between the Laguna and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe, with its origins in the Flower of 1880, increased in vitality through absorption into the traditional Laguna cultural continuum. This vigorous process redefined a core of being Laguna that was different from all the other infinite possibilities for tribal identity. The annual affirmation ritual of the Watering of the Flower of Friendship originated after the 1880 event in recognition of a mutual accommodation between Laguna Pueblo and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe. Intervening years added experiential depth and texture to the ritual design. The annual remembrance of the event served to intertwine the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe experience within the warp and weft of Laguna life, with the railroad employment experience becoming indistinguishable from any of the other singular threads constituting the fabric of Laguna culture. The absence of that thread would unquestionably alter the tapestry of contemporary Laguna life and the persistent sense of being Laguna.

NOTES

1. Michael McGerr, "The Persistence of Individualism" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 10 February 1993.

2. The elements of the contractual agreement made in 1880 are highly stylized in Laguna traditions and are repeated whenever a discussion of the Laguna-Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe relationship arises. At the reunions in 1992, 1993, and 1995, a tribal official recited the "Watering the Flower of Friendship" story following the evening meal.

3. *File No. 490 Contract Between United States of America and Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Co. Dated June 29th 1897. Subject. Approval by Secretary of Interior of Issue of Capital Stock. Original Certificate*, Ref. RR 258, Santa Fe Collection (Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society).

4. James Quigel, *Labor Conflict in the United States: An Encyclopedia*, Ronald L. Filippelli, ed. (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990), 435–36.

5. Santiago B. and Nellie A. Sarracino, taped and personal interviews, University of California, Berkeley, and Laguna Pueblo, New Mexico, September 1991–May 1993; Ruth Hopper, personal interviews, University of California, Berkeley, September 1991–May 1993. Interviews with Ethel Rogoff, Teresita Garcia, Timothy Anallah, Gerald West, Paul Thomas, Santiago Thomas, Ruby Antonio, Ella Kie, Charles Romero, and others recorded at Vallejo and Richmond, California, and at Laguna Pueblo between June 1992 and March 1995. Hereinafter referred to as personal interviews.

6. The historic settlements on the reservation comprised Laguna, Seama, Paguate, Encinal, Paraje, and Mesita, with Gallup, Winslow, Barstow, and Richmond as the major Laguna railroad labor camps. Although other labor communities existed along the railroad lines, these four, the largest and most well organized, applied for "colony" status. None of the railroad camps exists today. Personal interviews.

7. Anthropologist Edward H. Spicer analyzed the hybridity of evolving cultural systems as resistance mechanisms under government- and corporate-controlled situations. See Edward H. Spicer, "Persistent Cultural Systems: A Comparative Study of Identity Systems That Can Adapt to Contrasting Environments," *Science* 174 (November 1971), 798.

8. H.A. Burroughs, "Richmond–City That Mushroomed," *The Santa Fe Magazine* (May 1951), 8.

9. Donald Duke and Stan Kistler, *Santa Fe . . . Steel Rails Through California* (San Marino, CA: Pacific Railroad Publications, Inc., 1963), 9.

10. Keith L. Bryant, Jr., *History of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 179.

11. Burroughs, "Richmond–City That Mushroomed," 9.

12. Duke and Kistler, *Santa Fe ... Steel Rails Through California*, 161.

13. *Point Richmond Record*, vol. 1, no. 1, 7 July 1900.

14. Burroughs, "Richmond–City That Mushroomed," 9.

15. *The Santa Fe Trail*, by the editors of *Look* magazine(New York: Random House, 1946), 107.

16. Bryant, Jr., *History of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway*, 179.
17. Burroughs, "Richmond–City That Mushroomed," 12.
18. Ibid.
19. Quigel, *Labor Conflict*, 435–36.
20. Personal interviews.
21. Quigel, *Labor Conflict*, 435–36.
22. Personal interviews.
23. Lewis Meriam et al., *The Problem of Indian Administration: Report of a Survey Made at the Request of the Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and Submitted to Him, February 21, 1928* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), 737. Herein referred to as the Meriam report.
24. Lucille Hamner, *Survey of the Social and Educational Needs of the Laguna Indians*, RG75, Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Central Classified File, 1907–1939, Laguna-25-700, File 26331 Laguna F800, Part 1-3 (Washington, DC: National Archives, 1933), 7.
25. L. L. Waters, *Steel Trails To Santa Fe* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1950), 328.
26. Ibid.
27. Eleanor M. Ramsey, "Richmond, California: 1850–1940," in *Investigation of Cultural Resources within the Richmond Harbor Development Project 11-A, Richmond, Contra Costa County, California* (Courtesy of Robert Orlins, California Archaeological Consultants, Inc., Banks and Orlins, 1981), 5.24.
28. Lipps's reply explained that "[f]ew of these [Native Americans in Alameda County] are ward Indians. To be a federal ward an Indian must live on a reservation, or have an allotment of land held in trust by the government." Letter from Mary Roberts Coolidge to Superintendent Oscar Lipps and reply, Record Group 75: CCF - 1907-39, Laguna 922: RG 75 stack 11 E 3, row 25, compartment 10, shelf 4 (San Bruno, CA: Pacific-Sierra Region, National Archives, 1933).
29. James N. Gregory, *American Exodus: The Dust Bowl Migration and Okie Culture in California* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 176.
30. Shirley Ann Moore, "The Black Community in Richmond, California, 1910–1963" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1989), 9.
31. *The Santa Fe Magazine* (June 1943), 13; Burroughs, "Richmond–City That Mushroomed," 12.
32. Hubert Owen Brown, "The Impact of War Worker Migration on the Public School System of Richmond, California, from 1940–1945" (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1973), 180.
33. Personal interviews.
34. Steve Talbott, *Roots of Oppression: The American Indian Question* (New York: International Publishers, 1985), 23.
35. Edward P. Dozier, "Rio Grande Pueblos," in *Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change*, ed. Edward H. Spicer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 165.
36. "Parker Appointed System Employment Supervisor," *The Santa Fe Magazine* (September 1952), 26.

37. Personal interviews.

38. Edward H. Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest: The Impact of Spain, Mexico, and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533–1960* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1962), 554.

39. F.G. Gurley, "Indians and the Southwest," *The Santa Fe Magazine* (October 1952), 18.

40. Constance L. Menninger, *Oral History of Margaret Irwin Hauke, Council Grove, Kansas: Employee, Santa Fe Railway, 1924–1946* (Topeka: Kansas State Historical Society, 1984), 77.

41. Gurley, "Indians and the Southwest," 19.

42. Personal interviews.

43. Personal interviews.

44. Dozier, "Rio Grande Pueblos," 176.

45. Michelene Fixico, "The Road to Middle Class America," in *American Indian Identity: Today's Changing Perspectives*, ed. Clifford E. Trafzer (Sacramento, CA: Sierra Oaks Publishing Company, 1989), 74.

46. Ramsey, "Richmond, California: 1850–1940," 5.24.

47. Ibid., 5.26.

48. Judith K. Dunning, *Harry and Marguerite Williams: Reflections of a Longtime Black Family in Richmond*, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library (Berkeley: University of California, 1985); see introduction.

49. Ibid., 112.

50. Ibid., 113.

5. Ibid.

52. Ibid., 115.

53. Ibid., 114.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid., 116.

56. Ibid.

57. Personal interviews.

58. "FACT SHEET" regarding Intertribal Friendship House [not dated], Community History Project (Oakland, CA: Intertribal Friendship House). Non-Native Americans, including local politicians, dominated the original founding group. However, several Laguna people took part in the Intertribal Friendship House formation and served on various committees. One Laguna still retained some of the original organizational documents in 1994.

59. Personal interviews.

60. "The Spirit of Giving," *Standard Oiler* (December 1955), 3.

61. Personal interviews.

62. "The Spirit of Giving," 3.

63. Ibid.

64. Personal interviews.

65. The word *American* often appeared in Laguna language during interviews in 1990–94 as a holdover from the earliest contact with Anglo-Americans coming to the pueblo. Those interviewed said it generally denotes all nonnative, non-Laguna people.

66. Dozier, "Rio Grande Pueblos," 174.

67. This referred to the Voluntary Relocation Program, established by Congress in 1952, which brought thousands of Native Americans to the Bay Area. See Carl Waldman, *Atlas of the North American Indian* (New York: Facts on File Publications, 1985), 194.

68. Personal interviews.

69. Doris Duke Collection, tape no. 213, Laguna Pueblo, 18 November 1969; Zimmerman Library Special Collections, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Hereinafter referred to as Doris Duke Collection.

70. Menninger, *Oral History of Margaret Irwin Hauke*, 7.

71. Personal interviews.

72. Clint C. Wilson II and Felix Gutierrez, *Minorities and Media: Diversity and the End of Communication* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1985), 91.

73. Personal interviews. The year of the film was given as 1946 but was considered "a guess" by the interviewee. This man expressed no particular interest in discovering the exact date and title of the film. When asked to give his Social Security number to a Screen Actor's Guild archivist for identification of his appearances, he changed the subject and ignored the request.

74. "How an Oakland Chinese Became One of the Country's Leading Indians," *Alameda Times-Star*, 15 January 1966. Author's collection.

75. Author's collection.

76. Personal interviews.

77. Personal interviews.

78. Personal interviews.

79. "Railroad Police," *The Santa Fe Magazine* (January 1952), 14.

80. Personal interviews.

81. Personal interviews.

82. Raymond J. DeMallie, "Narrative and the Ethnohistorical Method," *Ethnohistory* 40 (Fall 1993), 525.

83. Personal interviews.

84. Personal interviews.

85. Alan L. Sorkin, *The Urban American Indian* (Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Company, 1978), 73.

86. Written testimonial in author's collection.

87. California governor Ronald Reagan signed the bill [SB572, Dynally (D-LA)] requiring schools to teach early California history and the role of "Negroes, American Indians, Mexican-Americans and other ethnic groups in the development of California and the United States." See the *San Francisco Chronicle*, 14 August 1968.

88. Personal interviews.

89. The Meriam report, 737.

90. Doris Duke Collection.

91. Ibid.

92. Talbott, *Roots of Oppression*, 179.

93. Information courtesy of Mike Martin, Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Public Relations Department, Los Angeles, California, by telephone during March 1993.

94. "The End of Indian Village," *Contra Costa Independent*, 6 August 1982.

95. Personal interviews. A photocopy of the map attached to the lease agreements is in the author's collection. Former residents were reluctant to allow copying of the actual lease provisions, however.

96. Personal interviews.

97. "The End of Indian Village," 4.

98. Ibid., 1.

99. T.C. McLuhan, *Dream Tracks: The Railroad and the American Indian, 1890–1930* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1985), 19.

100. Wilson and Gutierrez, *Minorities and Media*, 27. However, they also said that "the caricatures that once stereotyped Native Americans in advertising" passed from the American scene. This notion is hardly borne out by the current proliferation of sports team logos and tribal names for consumer goods.

101. Ramsey, "Richmond, California: 1850–1940," 5.24.

102. Today this particular railroad track crossing carries the name "Indian Crossing," given it by the railroad employees during the active years of the village.

103. Dunning, *Harry and Marguerite Williams*, 117.

104. Ramsey, "Richmond, California: 1850–1940," 5.26.

105. In her report, Ramsey referred to 1888 as the original contract year but did not specify the source of her information. This conflicted with the accepted year of the original Laguna-Atlantic & Pacific agreement.

106. Ramsey, "Richmond, California: 1850–1940," 5.27.

107. Personal interviews.

108. "The End of Indian Village," 1.

109. Information courtesy of Mike Martin, Atchison, Topeka and Santa Public Relations Department, March 1993.

110. "The End of Indian Village," 1.

111. Personal interviews.

112. Dunning, *Harry and Marguerite Williams*, 117.

113. Personal interviews.

114. In 1933, the San Jose River was described as an "intermittent stream." The water once necessary to railroading declined due to drainage by "Acomas" and "white settlers" for irrigation, according to a report by Lucille Hamner. See Hamner, *Survey of the Social and Educational Needs of the Laguna Indians*, 7.

115. Information provided by the Laguna Tribal Office, Laguna, New Mexico, 23 June 1993.

116. For one account of early railroad expansion, see Stuart Daggett, *Railroad Consolidation West of the Mississippi River* (New York, Arno Press, 1981), 127.

117. Personal interviews.

118. Michael McGerr, "The Persistence of Individualism."

119. Edward H. Spicer, "Persistent Cultural Systems," 798.