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Archaeology of the Borderlands: A View from Naco, Arizona

William H. Doelle, Center for Desert Archaeology

Although a mammoth was found near Naco, Arizona, and the town was a flashpoint during the Mexican Revolution, I suspect that few readers of Archaeology Southwest have visited Naco. Actually, there are two Nacos: one in Arizona and one in Sonora. The paired border towns are separated by an imposing fence, and due to a recent law passed by the U.S. Congress, the fence will likely be reinforced and expanded in the near future. Given the intense focus on the United States–Mexico border these days, we decided that Naco, Arizona, would be a good place to gain some perspective on the rich prehistory and history of the borderlands and to see some of the difficult challenges presented by the border for conducting community-based archaeology. The results of our exploration are presented in this issue of Archaeology Southwest.

The current border was not established until 1852–1853, when a joint Boundary Commission from both countries worked out the details of the border’s placement between the Rio Grande and the Pacific Ocean. Following the major ceding of territory to the United States by Mexico at the end of the Mexican War of 1848, the adjustment of the Gadsden Purchase in 1854 was relatively small. Nevertheless, it was a time of significant tension between the two countries. That territorial expansion was envisioned by many Americans as part of this country’s manifest destiny to settle and tame the western half of the continent, although at the same time, the country was torn politically by the north-south divisions that the issue of slavery presented. Thus, border issues were not just local; they were much larger in scope.

Today, too, daily life in the borderland region is deeply affected by international issues. From drug smuggling to illegal immigration to threats of global terrorism, a myriad of complex issues comes into play along the border. These are not the focus here, but we must give some consideration to the effect they have on the study and interpretation of the rich heritage of the borderland area. Our goal is to provide a deeper historical context for the region.

It is interesting to note the role of environmental factors in the current border and how some of those seem to extend into the distant past. The Rio Grande marks the southern edge of Texas and comprises a tangible natural feature that marks the border in a general linear fashion. But from El Paso westward, there is no simple correspondence between the border line and nature. Between the Rio Grande and the lower Colorado River, the border follows a zone of watershed boundaries. Rivers or seasonal arroyos drain either northward or southward from the border region. This means...
that, in this area, the border is located in a slightly more upland setting. For prehistoric farmers, that would have meant shorter growing seasons but more rainfall, as temperatures dropped with higher elevation and rainfall increased. During historic times, the grasslands of this upland area were especially favorable for ranching. The border also crosses the “grain” of the land in this basin and range province—meaning that an elevational cross-section along the border is “jagged” as it crosses valley bottoms, then high mountains, and back into the next valley repeatedly as one moves from east to west. This physical structure is a bit more favorable to northsouth human movement than east-west.

Our understanding of deep prehistoric times is not sufficiently detailed for us to project boundary zones for either Paleoindian or Archaic times, when hunting and gathering provided sustenance for the relatively small human populations of those times. And for the first two millennia after the arrival of cultigens, boundaries are not discernible. With the development of the larger populations and the greater complexity of the Hohokam irrigation farmers, however, there was at least a broad cultural boundary in the vicinity of the current border between Arizona and Sonora. The so-called Trincheras culture from south of the border had material culture that was distinctive from that of the Hohokam. But the boundary between these groups was not a sharp one. There was clearly a great deal of interaction, and the transition from one cultural focus to the other was gradual across the landscape.

The southern Southwest underwent a dramatic population decline in late prehistoric times that is still not well understood. Large population centers both north and south of the current border had been abandoned roughly a century or more before Francisco Vásquez de Coronado and his men traversed the area in 1540. The current border region was very lightly settled, and as the Coronado expedition ventured north of the Gila River, they entered a vast area with little settled human population, an area that the chroniclers referred to as a despooblado.

During Spanish times, the missionaries’ northward expansion stalled in the area of San Xavier del Bac and territory at the far margins of northeastern New Spain, they experienced increasing resistance from mobile Apache groups and others who joined them. This led the Spaniards to establish presidios—fortified settlements containing troops—across the northern margin of the territory. It is ironic to note the directional reversal between initial and current efforts to establish a defensible border. The central government based in Mexico sought to discourage incursions from the north into its territory to the south. Today, the power centers and the directions of concern are reversed, and the United States seeks to exclude incursions from the south.

Borders are lines or zones of transition with varying degrees of permeability. There is a consistent need to develop special institutions to deal with the issues that borders invariably create, and many of those institutions involve a military element. That theme is very strong when the archaeology of the borderland is considered. Camps, forts, battle sites, and a variety of attempts to control the movement of people or goods across the border are a recurrent element of the archaeological record of the past 250 years.

Today, Naco sits in a zone that has long been contested by, or has at least been transitional between, groups to its north and south. The authors in this issue have considered many places of this borderland’s past, from the ancient, extinct mammoths hunted by humans more than 10,000 years ago, to the Spanish presidios that were ultimately ineffective in containing the mobile and hostile Apaches, to the recent, increasingly intensive, efforts to mark and even seal the border between the United States and Mexico.
ORDER COMMUNITIES were established for many reasons in Arizona. The area east of the Santa Cruz River, running to the New Mexico boundary, saw small towns developing around mines and smelters (Bisbee, Washington Camp, Douglas, and Duquesne), military forts (Sierra Vista), and near a spring (Lochiel). In contrast, Naco was established in 1898 at the spot where the Arizona & South Eastern Railroad crossed into Mexico, heading south about 100 miles to Nacozari. Naco began as a service center for those moving across the border. A customs house was soon erected, with customs and immigration inspectors tasked with examining goods and people traveling from Mexico. Another Naco, on the Sonoran side of the border, also began to attract residents. Within a few years, Naco grew into a small town of about 500 people. By 1904, the Copper Queen store opened to the east of the U.S. Customs house. To the north, D Street was lined with small businesses patronized by travelers and nearby ranchers—a drug store, barbershop, bank, and telegraph office, as well as saloons and general stores.

Hopes for growth were dashed as a result of the Mexican Revolution. Insurgents, unhappy about governmental policies, fought soldiers on the streets of Naco, Sonora, at various times from 1911 through 1915 (see page 6). American soldiers were stationed in Naco, Arizona, in November 1910, with some of the men living in tents next to the Copper Queen Store. During the height of the fighting, infantrymen hid in trenches as stray bullets smashed into walls and struck innocent bystanders. Four residents of Naco, Arizona, were killed and 37 more injured during the course of the conflict. Other political disturbances in Naco, Sonora, in 1929, saw the accidental dropping of bombs from an airplane onto the American side of the border. These conflicts, along with the decline of the nearby mines and smelters in Bisbee, slowed development of the community.

The passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994 opened the border to increased movement of goods and resulted in the need to expand the U.S. Customs house. Archaeological testing conducted by Desert Archaeology, Inc., personnel in 1993 found clear evidence of both conflict and cooperation. Archaeologists, scraping the ground north of the ruins of the Copper Queen Store, discovered tent stakes pounded in by American soldiers in the 1910s. Nearby, metal detecting revealed spent ammunition from guns fired on the Mexican side of the border. In contrast, the trench containing the shared water system of the two early Nacos was also located, revealing the coordinated effort by civic leaders to bring drinking water to their residents.

The archaeological and historical research for the project led to a series of decorative tiles mounted along the new pedestrian walkway at the international border. These tiles bring the history of Naco, Arizona, to modern-day residents and visitors.
IN THE SECOND HALF of the nineteenth century, the U.S. government sent troops to its border with Mexico to protect citizens from Apache attacks, leading to the establishment of Fort Huachuca in 1877. The Apache Wars ended with Geronimo’s surrender in 1886, and the borderlands were relatively calm until around 1910, when the Mexican Revolution began.

Mexican General Porfirio Díaz had seized the presidency in 1876. To ensure he held onto that office when he ran for re-election in 1910, Díaz jailed his opponent, Francisco Madero. Escaping from jail on the day after Díaz’s election, Madero crossed the border into the United States, and called for an armed insurrection against Díaz. Madero’s followers, called *insurrectos*, began to clash with the Mexican *federales*.

Fearing that Mexican rebel activity would spill over onto the American side of the border, the U.S. government moved quickly, and the first troops were sent to the border within a month of Díaz’s inauguration. Soldiers were deployed to Texas, as well as to several places in Arizona: Douglas, the nearby Slaughter Ranch, Naco (see page 6), Nogales, and Duquesne.

Historian John P. Wilson notes that, “The numerous rebel factions all recognized the international boundary as a focal point, for it was from the north that they sought contraband arms and ammunition as well as recruits, and they hoped to take refuge there if things went badly.”

A major battle between the *insurrectos* and *federales* took place just south of Douglas, in Agua Prieta, in April 1911. The first battle of Naco, Sonora, occurred in late May, and although it occurred in Mexico, it showed the United States that conflict along the border was inevitable and vigilance would be necessary to protect American interests.

At this time, Díaz resigned from office, but murder and intrigue at the national level led to a rapid succession of Mexican presidents, further destabilizing the country. In October 1914, *federales* and *insurrectos* again met at Naco, Sonora. In response, four troops of the Tenth Cavalry (the Buffalo Soldiers; see page 5) were sent to Naco, along with six troops and the machine-gun platoon from the Ninth Cavalry to protect the border and enforce neutrality. To complicate matters, these soldiers also had to act as crowd control for the many American spectators who came to Naco to witness the conflict firsthand.

Following rebel leader Pancho Villa’s raid on Columbus, New Mexico, in March 1916, the troops of the Tenth Cavalry departed from Naco, Arizona, to participate in the 1916–1917 Punitive Expedition, led by General John J. Pershing, in search of Villa and his army. Wilson writes that “By May [1916] the entire U.S. Regular Army stationed in the United States, except for one cavalry regiment and some Coast Artillery, was either distributed along the border or accompanying Pershing’s expedition.” Despite this impressive mobilization of men, the Punitive Expedition was a failure, neither finding Villa nor stopping cross-border skirmishes.

In January 1917, a document known as the Zimmermann telegram was dispatched by the German Foreign Secretary to the German Ambassador in Mexico in an attempt to form a military alliance between Germany and Mexico against the United States. It began, “We intend to begin on the first of February unrestricted submarine warfare. We shall endeavor in spite of this to keep the United States of America neutral.” Instead of keeping the United States neutral, the telegram had the opposite effect: Congress declared war on Germany in April 1917.

Although the bulk of the troops that participated in the Punitive Expedition had been deployed elsewhere in February 1917, some soldiers remained at the border—in light of the contents of the Zimmermann telegram, rumors of German agents operating along the border, and continued Mexican rebel activity. However, with the armistice in 1918, there were further troop reductions in the border area. The 1919 “fence along the border” (see page 9) was short-lived, and in 1923, soldiers were pulled out of Naco. The last border posts, at Nogales and Douglas, were abandoned in 1933.

In 1866, the U.S. Congress created two cavalry units (the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry regiments) and four infantries (later consolidated into the Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth regiments) that were African-American units, with white officers during the units’ early years. Members of these volunteer units served on the Western frontier during the late 1860s and 1870s. Their courage and tenacity earned them the nickname Buffalo Soldiers, bestowed on them by the admiring Native American warriors against whom they fought. For much of their early history, the Buffalo Soldiers served in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma. Although the term originally was used only for those soldiers from the Tenth Cavalry who had actually served on the Plains, it became the common nickname for soldiers from all four of the regiments.

Fort Huachuca was established in 1877 to protect the United States–Mexico border, and specifically, to prevent Apache raiders from crossing the border from Mexico to target settlers in the southeastern Arizona Territory. Initially, 135 soldiers from Company B of Camp Lowell, near Tucson, were dispatched to the area under Captain Samuel M. Whitside. The soldiers were successful at limiting raids. Soon, cattle ranches were established and miners explored the area for gold, silver, and copper. The economy of this part of the territory began to boom.

African-American soldiers from the Twenty-fourth Infantry arrived at Fort Huachuca in 1892 and remained until 1896. Because of continued conflicts with the Apaches and concerns with cross-border bandits, the soldiers built permanent structures to replace the flimsy camp quarters previously used to house troops, mounts, and equipment. Other Buffalo Soldiers were present from 1898 to 1900, and returned in 1912 for a brief tour of duty. Meanwhile, internal political problems in Mexico, including battles between insurgent rebels and the government, spilled across the border. The U.S. Army responded by adding soldiers to the region.

The Tenth Cavalry arrived at Fort Huachuca in 1913, and served with General Pershing in the 1916–1917 Punitive Expedition (see page 4). Others were stationed at nearby posts, including Naco. During the First World War, these soldiers guarded the border. Segregated African-American units remained at the fort until after the Second World War. Many soldiers said that they joined the army because it was difficult for African-American men to find work at the time. While army pay was low, beginning at $13 a month in the late nineteenth century, most of these men joined not for financial reasons, but to have an adventure or as a way out of their current circumstances. They found themselves at a fort that was isolated from population centers and uncomfortable during the summer monsoon season; still, with its slightly higher elevation and mountain setting, it was cooler than other forts in the southern part of the territory. In addition, the availability of fresh water meant that soldiers at Fort Huachuca had the lowest incidence of illness among those stationed in the territory.

The African-American soldiers experienced racism not only from the communities in which they served but also, at times, from some of their own officers. Despite this, all of the surviving Buffalo Soldiers interviewed for the multivolume history of the fort entitled Huachuca Illustrated said that, given the opportunity, they would enlist again.
Camp Naco
Debby Swartzwelder, University of Arizona South

In the border town of Naco sit 23 buildings, on 17 acres, that comprise Camp Naco, also known as Camp Newell. This military defense compound was built between 1919 and 1923 as part of the U.S. War Department’s Mexican Border Defense construction project—a plan to build a 1,200-mile “fence” of soldiers along the United States–Mexico border that was slated to cost $7 million (see pages 8 and 9). As a 1919 Bisbee Daily Review article put it, “Uncle Sam is building a giant fence along the Mexican border…while its posts are of wood and other building materials, its rails will be American soldiers.” The project was aimed at establishing or upgrading border military posts in order to safeguard American citizens and economic interests.

In 1919, the plan for the camp in Naco, part of the Tenth Cavalry Division Patrol District, was for the construction of 35 adobe buildings. Camp Naco was the only one of nine Western camps to be constructed of adobe. Today, it is the only camp site in Arizona that remains largely intact, despite a 2006 fire that claimed four buildings.

Prior to the construction of the camp, Naco had been just another border town whose residents had come to the area for mining opportunities or to raise cattle. The town was established in 1898, and the next year it had about 50 residents. With the establishment of a customs house and increasing international mining operations, Naco became a thriving border town (see page 3). One of the original owners of the Naco townsite, as well as the land on which Camp Naco was located, was John J. Newell. He and his partners leased the land on which Camp Naco stands to the U.S. War Department from about 1915 to 1923, when the troops left the camp. Newell, his partners, and/or Newell family members owned the land until 1990.

The Mexican Revolution, which began in 1910, inaugurated a time of political and social unrest that lasted until the late 1920s (see page 4). In response to this turmoil, the U.S. government sent soldiers to shore up the United States–Mexico border at selected sites, including Naco. Troops—ranging from 50 to 5,000—were stationed at Naco from 1911 through 1923. The primary military presence consisted of the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry Regiments, and later the Twenty-fifth Infantry Regiment, all of which were Buffalo Soldier units (see page 5). The camp at Naco was closed in December 1923.

From 1935 to 1937, the site was occupied by Civilian Conservation Corps Camp 3839, SCS-18, which occupied the adobe compound and upgraded the facilities. Most of the CCC’s work appears to have been conducted off-site, near Bisbee, where workers planted trees to stop soil erosion. In the 1950s, the Newell family opened the buildings of the camp quarters to renters; former residents speak fondly of living at the camp. In the 1980s, the camp was advertised for sale.

In 1990, VisionQuest of Tucson purchased the property with the intention of establishing a rehabilitation camp for troubled youth and a heritage park. However, the application to rezone from residential to commercial was denied, and the camp has stood empty for many years.

In August 2006, the town of Huachuca City (about 40 miles from Naco) approved, by a 5–1 vote, acceptance of Camp Naco as a donation from VisionQuest to pursue the camp’s preservation. More recently, representatives of the
Just as we were preparing this issue of *Archaeology Southwest*, it was announced that Huachuca City would take ownership of Camp Naco (Camp Newell) and lead a drive to rehabilitate and preserve this endangered facility. There is still much to be accomplished, but here is a very encouraging statement from Huachuca City’s mayor, George Nerhan.

Huachuca City owes its very existence to the military presence at Fort Huachuca. In appreciation of those close ties and with a strong commitment to saving a valuable piece of area history, we are excited by the opportunity to step forward and take on the preservation of Camp Newell. The camp represents an important period in our history and that of Fort Huachuca—the role of the Buffalo Soldiers and the larger influence of the Mexican Revolution. It is the only remnant of that period in our area and the best preserved of any of the outposts from that period. We are proud to be involved in this effort, which will preserve a piece of our past and create a community resource that will be of value to all.
In the eighteenth century, most of western North America was controlled by Spain. There was no border separating Mexico from the rest of continental North America until the Gadsden Purchase in 1854. Although Spain was concerned that other European powers—especially England and Russia—might seek to expand their influence in this region, it was dominated by mounting problems with local Native Americans, many of whom resented the Spanish presence and were willing to attack soldiers and settlers.

Spanish missions, ranches, and mines became increasingly vulnerable to attacks by Native Americans. The Spaniards responded by running from Texas westward to California. The Presidio of San Phelipe de Gracía Real de Terrenate was established in 1742, a few miles north of Nogales, Arizona, and Nogales, Sonora. This presidio consisted of two clusters of structures, one on a gently sloping ridge and the other on a low bank along Pequeño Río de Terrenate. The Captain’s house and the guardhouse were on the ridge. The fort had no surrounding wall. An inspection by a British naval officer in 1769 noted that the fort was built of adobe walls, that it had no parapet, and that the Mexican soldiers were poorly equipped.

The move to the new presidio took place in December 1775. Nothing seemed to go well there. Temporary structures were first built, then the adobe walls of the permanent fort took place, soldiers, Opata (Mexican Indian) scouts, and civilians struggled to grow enough food with Apaches swooping down and battling soldiers. In a series of attacks between 1776 and 1780, dozens of soldiers were killed. In one attack, soldiers were fighting Apaches on the south shore of the San Pedro River and 25 men perished. With problems mounting, the fort was abandoned in 1780. The soldiers headed south to Las Palmas de Los Lagos.

In the years since, the two forts have met different fates. San Phelipe de Terrenate lies on a Sonoran ranch, the low rubble mounds of the fort having long been incorporated into the landscape. Santa Cruz de Terrenate, near the modern-day town of Nogales, Arizona, has been excavated by several archaeologists in the early 1950s. Afterward, portions of the site were transferred into the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in the 1980s. The BLM has designed a 1.2-mile Presidio Trail that keeps visitors to a minimum.
Modern-day Arizona and Sonora; that did not come about — might encroach upon the region, more pressing were and settlers in an attempt to drive them away. ed by setting up military forts, called presidios, in a line miles southeast of the two modern border communities the other on the adjacent floodplain to the south of the section conducted in 1771 by Captain Hugo O’Conor, an River. built in the plaza. As construction of the stone foundations wood for 300 people. Work outside the fort was dangerous, ambush in July 1776, Apaches lured soldiers across the Nutrias, about five miles from the original Terrenate. of its structures, first depicted on a 1766 map, still visible. of Fairbank, was on private land until the 1980s. Charles of the presidio were looted by treasure hunters. It passed allows visitors to view the site but keeps further damage

The map on the top shows the arrangement of the presidios in about 1780. As Don Bufkin writes, "With few modifications this chain of forts was to remain unaltered until the 1830's . . . even in the face of changing frontier conditions, no major re-alignment was made by the following Spanish or Mexican military officials. Of the presidios abandoned at one time or another, only Tubac in Southern Arizona was reopened. It was garrisoned a second time in the 1790's, but instead of by Spanish lancers, its defenders were Indian auxiliaries."

The map on the bottom shows a line of patrol stations slated to be erected along the United States–Mexico border in 1919. An article in the Bisbee Daily Review of June 7, 1919, is titled “U.S. To Build $7,000,000 'Fence' On Mexican Border.” The author, A. E. Geldhof, writes that, “Uncle Sam is building a giant fence along the Mexican border! It’s 1200 miles long, and while its posts are of wood and other building materials, its rails will be American soldiers . . . It’s a double row of cavalry patrol stations, barracks buildings and miscellaneous structures, stretching from Brownsville, Texas on the Gulf of Mexico, to Arivaga [sic], Ariz., on the edge of the great desert . . . In exploring this project, Assistant Secretary of War [Benedict] Crowell declared it is primarily for defense against the elements, and not against the Mexicans. It is admitted, however, that the patrol stations are for the purpose of guarding the border against invasions by bandits and cattle thieves.”

The walls of the adobe chapel still stand over four feet high.
GREENBUSH DRAW, in southern Arizona, occupies a prominent place in the history of Paleoindian research. In 1951, a few years after finding a Clovis point upstream of the locality, landowner Marc Navarrete found two more Clovis points and mammoth bones eroding from Greenbush Draw. He reported these finds to archaeologist Emil Haury at the University of Arizona. Haury assembled a research team, including geologist Ernst Antevs and paleontologist John Lance, to excavate the site in 1952. The Naco mammoth, buried slightly more than two meters below the modern surface and resting atop a pebbly sand deposit, eventually yielded seven Clovis points in direct association as well as one projectile point from a disturbed matrix. Naco was the first Clovis mammoth site to be so identified after the Clovis type was recognized as typologically and stratigraphically distinct from the younger Folsom type.

Two other Clovis or likely Clovis mammoth sites were found along Greenbush Draw, the highest reported concentration of such sites in North America. Less than one kilometer upstream from the Naco site, the Leikem site (Naco II) was tested by C. Vance Haynes (then a University of Arizona graduate student) and Al Johnson (now retired from the University of Kansas) in 1963 and 1964. The site contained the remains of two mammoths. Subsequent mechanical excavation unearthed a single large Clovis point probably associated with the fauna. A third mammoth locality, approximately 30 meters from the original Naco site, was discovered in 1973. The Navarrete site, excavated by Haury and then-graduate student Bruce Huckell (now on the archaeology faculty at the University of New Mexico), yielded the partial remains of two mammoths in association with a Clovis point fragment as well as a possible bone tool.

After the 1973 excavations, Greenbush Draw was surveyed by Haynes, but until recently the drainage received little additional attention from archaeologists. In 2001, the University of Arizona Anthropology Department received a research endowment from Joe and Ruth Cramer of Denver. The Argonaut Archaeological Research Fund (AARF) was established to support fieldwork focusing on the early peopling of the southwestern United States and northwestern Mexico. (All of the early investigations in the Upper San Pedro were on the American side of the border.)

In 2002, I was hired as the executive director of AARF. The Upper San Pedro Valley, owing to its remarkable Paleoindian record, became the focus of our research beginning in 2003. Two of our graduate students, Ned Gaines (see page 11) and Jesse Ballenger, decided to examine the archaeological and related geologic record of the area, working on both sides of the border. Gaines worked mostly on the Mexican side of the valley, while Ballenger (recently returned from serving in Iraq with the National Guard) took the area north of the border for his Ph.D. research. Because Greenbush is so near the border and has such an important geoarchaeological record, however, they pooled their resources for that area.

The work by Gaines and Ballenger suggests that the Greenbush area is an important transition zone for the preservation of Paleoindian sites and Paleoindian-age strata. Although sites are or were preserved along Greenbush Draw, the stratigraphy is only broadly comparable to the better-known and better-documented spring-related stratigraphy downstream, at the Lehner and Murray Springs Clovis mammoth sites.

Ballenger, covering more than 500 miles as he surveyed the Greenbush area, has found evidence for additional buried Paleoindian sites, suggesting that we may be seeing a snapshot of the last remnants of a once much more extensive record of Ice Age landscapes and people.
Reflections on Surveying the Borderlands Region of Northern Sonora

Ned Gaines, Northern Land Use Research, Inc.

Like other archaeologists who work in southern Arizona, I have had firsthand experience with the flood of illegal and undocumented traffic moving north across the desert. For my master’s thesis research, I conducted an archaeological survey on the Mexican side of the border, in the San Pedro Valley between Naco and Cananea. It was a challenging, at times hair-raising, yet extremely rewarding opportunity to get to know the people, both past and present, who inhabit this region.

My research consisted of a survey of the gullies and arroyos of the San Pedro Valley in Mexico in order to identify Ice Age geologic deposits and associated fossils and Paleoindian remains. Herein lay one of the greatest risks of the endeavor. In addition to providing a window into the past, these deeply incised gullies are also the preferred covert routes of undocumented immigrants and drug smugglers. Nevertheless, I felt that the high likelihood of identifying Paleoindian deposits—similar to those known from the Arizona portions of the valley at sites such as Lehner Ranch and Murray Springs—warranted the risks.

A large portion of my time in the field was devoted to meeting the locals, because I felt that the more people who knew who I was and what I was doing, the safer I would be. I also hoped that I might meet ranchers who had found Pleistocene fossils on their land, or people who had collected fluted points and would show me where they had found them. I spoke with residents of both Naco and Cananea, ranchers living in the valley, cowboys, and government officials, as well as the federales who patrol the valley’s roads.

The suspicion that greeted my initial forays into the valley soon turned to hospitality when word spread that I was an archaeologist. It seemed that almost everyone I met was interested in the history and the prehistory of the valley. Many families in the area have been there for generations, and they told me stories of Pancho Villa and the revolution (see page 4), bootlegging during prohibition, and Apache raids. The artifact collectors I met were eager to show me their favorite sites. I was invited to spend the evening at several ranches, and I enjoyed delicious meals of javelina chorizo and many a glass of fine bacanora. A large portion of the data that I reported in my thesis came as a result of these meetings, and I am proud to now call many of these people my friends.

This is not to say that my preliminary fears were unfounded. At times I was forced to turn a blind eye to that which did not concern me or my research. On several occasions I surprised large groups of undocumented immigrants. Many times I was cautioned not to work in certain areas. Once when I was working alone in an arroyo, I was accosted by several stern-looking men who warned me in no uncertain terms that I was not to be taking pictures of anything in the vicinity. While they permitted me to proceed upon my way, they followed me for several hours. At the end of that day, I headed north across the border, feeling fortunate that they let me go without conveying a more serious lesson.

I am happy to say that I have now successfully completed both the survey and my master’s thesis. It was my privilege to report several new Pleistocene fossil locales as well as additional evidence of the Paleoindian occupation of the valley. However, the most satisfying aspect of the project was exploring a place rarely seen by those of us who live north of the border and getting to know the local people. I would, however, urge extreme caution for those who would like to follow suit.
Near the border town of Naco are two abandoned cemeteries. One cemetery, which appears to contain only a few individuals, is on land owned by Cochise County. The other cemetery, on private land and known as the Naco Cemetery, contains many more individuals, including veterans of the Civil War and Mexican War and Naco’s Justice of the Peace. Together, the cemeteries may contain 70 individuals.

The Naco Cemetery made headlines in 2004, when a 12-acre parcel that includes the cemetery was sold to a husband and wife who intended to build a home and an RV park on it. (Such construction is legal in Cochise County, because the cemetery is on private land.) Local residents opposed the project, however, and as an Arizona Daily Star article pointed out, “Because of local historians’ concerns about the old Naco cemetery, Cochise County has formed a committee to protect the county’s several hundred burial sites dating to the mid-19th century.” In my capacity as repatriation coordinator for the Arizona State Museum, I received many letters from local residents, descendants of those buried at the cemetery, and other concerned citizens (including archaeologists and historians) urging that the cemetery be preserved.

Prior to purchasing the land, the couple believed there were only a few individuals interred on their property. But when they learned that the number of burials was considerably higher, and when it was clear that a growing number of people, both in-state and out of state, opposed their project, the landowners decided not to proceed with developing the site.

As a result of this incident, Cochise County’s planning and zoning commission recently adopted stricter regulations regarding human remains on private lands. These laws would require the landowner to create a development plan for the land and also, if applicable, enter into a burial agreement with the Arizona State Museum repatriation coordinator.

Conflicts over development and cemetery sites are becoming more common as the population expands to traditionally rural areas and people find new uses for land. Cochise County’s new zoning regulations attempt to strike a balance between preservation and growth.

The Working Group for the Inventory of Arizona’s Historic Cemeteries is a consortium of individuals and organizations that includes the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Pioneer Cemetery Association, genealogists, and the Arizona Funeral Directors Association, among others.

The goal of the consortium is to have a reasonably complete inventory of all historic cemeteries in the state by 2012. Inventoried cemeteries can range from one individual gravesite to large cemeteries, and can be located on private or public lands. The working group’s position is that the first step in protecting historic cemeteries is to identify them.

Statewide information on the locations of historic cemeteries is gathered by volunteers, like the Arizona Site Stewards. SHPO is developing a database of all the historic cemeteries and gravesites in the state. For further information about this working group and its activities, please call Reba Grandrud at 602.992.0339 or Mary Robinson at SHPO, 602.542.4009.
TWO YEARS AGO, when the situation at the Naco Cemetery was being reported on the Internet and in southern Arizona newspapers (see page 12), I happened upon a list of the people interred at Naco’s two cemeteries that had been compiled by historian Robert Silas Griffin. To my surprise, one of the names matched that of my maternal great-great-grandmother, Trinidad Lopez, about whom little is known.

Family lore has it that, as a young woman in Tucson, Trinidad bore three children by John Rhodes, a cattleman from Texas who fell in with the brothers Ed and John Tewksbury, two of the major players in Arizona’s Pleasant Valley War. This feud, also known as the Graham–Tewksbury War, lasted about a decade and was responsible for the deaths of between 30 and 50 men.

In 1888, a year after members of the Graham faction killed John Tewksbury, Rhodes married Tewksbury’s widow and within a short time relocated his and Trinidad’s children from Tucson to Pleasant Valley. In 1892, Rhodes and Ed Tewksbury ambushed Tom Graham (the last of the Graham men) in Tempe. Rhodes was quickly arrested and put on trial. While in the courtroom, Rhodes was nearly killed when his victim’s widow attempted to shoot him. Rhodes was acquitted, and after that he seems to have become a more-or-less model citizen: he signed up, at age 56, to be an Arizona Ranger, and in 1907, he became the Pinal County Livestock inspector.

There is little direct evidence for the course of Trinidad’s life after Rhodes took their children to Pleasant Valley. But when I discovered her name among those at the Naco Cemetery, and then was able to obtain a copy of her death certificate, various pieces of the puzzle began to fall into place. I had already placed her year of birth sometime around 1854–1856, and she appears to have grown up with a younger brother or cousin named Rafael Lopez. (Interestingly, years later, when Rhodes was on trial, a Rafael Lopez corroborated Rhodes’s claim that he was nowhere near Graham’s property at the time the latter was killed.)

The Trinidad Lopez buried at Naco died in 1920, at age 65, indicating she was born in 1855. On her death certificate, she is listed as a “widow,” but her parents’ last name is the same as hers. Although it is conceivable that she had married a man with the same surname, it is also possible that the use of the term “widow” was a way of getting around the fact that she had three children out of wedlock. Family tradition suggests that Trinidad was not born in Tucson, but, instead, somewhere in Sonora. Both the census data and her death certificate bear this out.

Although it is unclear what Trinidad was doing in Naco around the time of her death, we know that she had various relatives in southern Arizona, including a cousin or uncle, José Lopez, who homesteaded a ranch in the San Pedro Valley, her brother or cousin Rafael Lopez, a sister or cousin Josefa Lopez, as well as Trinidad’s children—Clara, who lived on the Acton Ranch near Mammoth, Juan Francisco (Frank), who was killed during construction of the copper mill at Hayden in 1911, and William (Billy) Rhodes, who worked on the Carlink Ranch, near Redington.

It’s ironic that it took the potential destruction of the Naco Cemetery to bring so much attention to the individuals who have been interred at Naco’s cemeteries for so many years. Thanks to the residents of Cochise County and other interested parties, Trinidad Lopez and the other people at the Naco cemeteries can continue to rest in peace—que en paz descanse.
Connecting to Community History: A Personal View

Rebecca Orozco, Center for Southwest Studies, Cochise College

I am a third-generation resident of Cochise County and have always had an interest in the history of the area. I studied archaeology and history, and today I am the director of the Center for Southwest Studies at Cochise College. I also teach the history of Mexico. My grandfather was born in Tombstone in 1881. I remember him talking about watching the battle of Agua Prieta from the roof of the Gadsden Hotel in 1915. So I always had an interest in the Mexican Revolution along the border.

In 1997, I moved to Bisbee to direct Elderhostel programs in the region. I remembered Camp Naco and began including it as a stop on some of my programs. The wonderful old buildings and the incredible history fascinated me. When I started at the college three years ago, my new position in community outreach seemed a perfect avenue to work for its preservation. An article in the Tucson Citizen at that same time indicated VisionQuest was willing to donate the site to a nonprofit organization able to preserve and restore the Camp. We convened a meeting of community members, interested parties, and possible partners to try to find a solution. No one stepped forward.

Over the next two years I searched for an organization willing to take it on. In partnership with the University of Arizona South, a history student, Debby Swartzwelder, began the research to complete Camp Naco’s National Register of Historic Places nomination (see pages 6 and 7).

Then, on May 21, 2006, arsonists struck the camp, burning five of the noncommissioned officers’ quarters. In previous meetings, Cochise County Planning and Zoning had stated that the site needed to be fenced. Now the fence was mandated, and because of the presence of asbestos in the shingles on the burned buildings, an asbestos survey and cleanup had to be done. The estimated cost for these requirements approached $100,000. It became apparent that faced with that liability, destruction of the site might be the only alternative. The search for someone willing to take on the project became desperate. Hundreds of phone calls, emails, and letters went out looking for a savior.

One of my duties at the college is to serve on the Southeastern Arizona Governments Organization. Other members of the board are the mayors of local communities. At the June board meeting I made a presentation about the camp and the terrible loss to the region if the site was lost. One of the people who heard my presentation was Mayor George Nerhan of Huachuca City. He took the idea back to his council and, after much discussion, they decided to take it on. Their decision came with less than a week left for VisionQuest to respond to the county’s mandate.

This site has a great deal of importance; it represents the best preserved of all the camps constructed to protect the border during the Mexican Revolution. The soldiers stationed there were from the Ninth and Tenth Cavalry and the Twenty-fifth Infantry. All were Buffalo Soldiers (see page 5), and their role in our history needs more recognition. That we might be able to save this treasure—Camp Naco—is truly wonderful.

Rediscovering Camp Naco

Debby Swartzwelder, University of Arizona South

I’m originally from Reading, Pennsylvania, and served 20 years in the U.S. Army, spending 11 of those in Germany. While overseas, I used every opportunity to travel and experience European culture. My last active duty was at Fort Huachuca, and in 2001, I retired, remaining in Sierra Vista for my family. After enrolling at the University of Arizona South, a history professor’s class assignment changed my life. When I began to research Camp Naco, I quickly became intrigued with the unique military history of this border compound (see pages 6 and 7). Because I’d conducted many investigations as an army counterintelligence agent, I brought those skills to the Naco project; my research experience has proven particularly useful in locating and documenting vital construction information. Long after the history assignment was completed, I’ve continued to search for primary sources to document the rich history of this site, with the ultimate goal of nominating the camp to the National Register of Historic Places. I am one of many people who are interested in saving this monument to Arizona’s history; Huachuca City recently acquired the camp, giving this historic property its only hope for a future (see page 7). Preservation efforts have also been spearheaded by Rebecca Orozco (see above), the Center for Southwest Studies, Cochise College, and J. C. Mutchler, University of Arizona South, the history professor who inspired my interest in the camp, by coordinating with other concerned members in the local and academic communities to raise awareness about this project.
Naco’s Historical Diversity
William H. Doelle, Center for Desert Archaeology

Remains of some of the oldest human occupation in North America, an intensely militarized zone, and the oldest golf course in continual use in the state of Arizona are all elements of Naco’s history. To say that this is a diverse history is an understatement.

The Naco golf course dominates the landscape of the aerial photographs in this issue. Green stands out in the desert. But when the course was first constructed six miles to the northeast in Bisbee in the early 1900s, the “greens” were oiled sand. In the mid-1930s, the golf course was moved to Naco, benefiting from donated land and Civilian Conservation Corps labor.

This aerial view shows the tight clustering of this diversity. The golf course needs no pointing out, but a close look shows that it now spans both sides of Greenbush Draw. The erosion of ancient geologic layers along that draw has revealed mammoths in association with Clovis spear points. And in the lower left of this photo is Camp Naco, the most obvious element of the military past.

Not far away, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehends thousands of illegal entrants, and multiple layers of border fence are planned. Amid all of this, the local residents attempt to be a community. They raise families, they work, they live and die. Community life is a central human thread, and maintaining a viable community in a contested borderland is an unrelenting challenge. Celebrating its diverse history can be part of building community identity, a process that is part of preserving Camp Naco.

Correction: On page 9 of the Spring 2006 issue of Archaeology Southwest (Vol. 20, No. 2), the article entitled “Historic Canals of the Safford Basin,” by Verna Rae Colvin and Patricia A. Cook, please note that the junior author should read Patricia Cook.

Camp Naco, in the foreground, is just a short distance from Greenbush Draw (upper mid-ground), which is flanked by a historic golf course.
THE END IS VERY, VERY NEAR. I do not like to prophesy doom, but for Camp Naco time is not on the side of those who seek to save it. My first visit was only two years ago. I was amazed to discover this incredible complex of buildings on the edge of Naco, Arizona. Even then, I was appalled at the pace of decline in these buildings. And when Becky Orozco (see page 14) called in May 2006 to tell me that four of the six buildings at the southern end of the complex had been consumed by arson-caused fires, I gave up any hope that preservation was possible. Fortunately, Orozco did not. But time is so short for Camp Naco that only a broad-based, high-intensity response holds any hope of a positive outcome.

I took this photo of one of the unburned buildings at Camp Naco just a month ago. It takes no imagination whatsoever to see that this building is about to make an irreversible transition from standing architecture to a ruin. That is the case with all of the structures at Camp Naco. And the best-preserved building is the one that the illegal immigrants find is the best place for a brief respite on their way north. The magnitude of what they leave behind—from water bottles to clothing to graffiti—is hard to comprehend.

Despite the dark picture that I have painted, there is a ray of hope. The community of Huachuca City has stepped into the center of this dire situation. It has come with a vision of transformation. It foresees a community-based collaboration that is an extreme challenge. These six acres and 23 buildings are not really Huachuca City’s problem. Yet Huachuca City sees its community’s heritage as tied to the military history of the borderlands. This is an expansive vision.

The Center for Desert Archaeology is committed to a community-based preservation archaeology. The only path to success with Camp Naco will be through a collaboration that includes the communities of Naco and Huachuca City and a very broad historic preservation community. The heritage resources are there, as this issue of Archaeology Southwest documents. The challenge is to see if the human and financial resources can be brought together in an effective manner with sufficient rapidity to turn the tide of decline.

The jury is still out. While they deliberate, please contact us if you want to help.

William H. Doelle, President & CEO
Center for Desert Archaeology