

Mexican Elites and Language Policy in Tucson's First Schools

Elise M. DuBord
The University of Arizona

Abstract

Educational institutions developed in Tucson, Arizona in the last quarter of the 19th Century during a critical time in cultural and political shifts of power between Anglo and Mexican elites in Southern Arizona. This paper examines unofficial language policies in both public and parochial schools in Tucson that reflect the accommodation of power between the two groups. The data used to reconstruct these *de facto* language policies comes from school documents, newspaper articles and advertisements, memoirs of teachers, politicians and others as well as historical accounts of the formation of Tucson's first schools. Tollefson (1991) suggests that "language policy is used to sustain existing power relationships" (11) and in the example of Tucson, parallel language policies in the schools reflect the interests of both Anglo elites in governmental positions and Mexican elites with historical ties to the region. U.S. funded territorial schools favored a language policy of assimilation that promoted the English language and Anglo cultural values and generally used Spanish as a transitional tool to facilitate the acquisition of English. Parochial schools funded by the local elite Mexican community maintained Spanish as the language of instruction. In an attempt to promote unity by creating a level linguistic playing field, language policy reproduces social inequalities by attempting to erase minority culture and language; which in turn causes an oppositional reaction in said minority group that diminishes the original goal of creating a shared identity (Schmidt 2000). Language policy in the parochial schools was an attempt by Mexican elites to maintain their privileged status and reject assimilation, while policy in public schools threatened the Mexican community's local authority by imposing English as a requisite for access to public education. I conclude that language policy in both school systems

demonstrates that both Anglos and Mexicans had dominant roles in the social and economic hierarchy of Tucson although this shared status was actively being contested.

1. Introduction

Tucson is not unique in the Southwest in its continued debate over language policy in public schools. In 2000, Proposition 203 disabled bilingual education programs across the state of Arizona by mandating that instruction be conducted in English and using transitional language programs to teach students English as quickly as possible (Arizona Voters 2000). This represented a shift from bilingual programs that stressed the maintenance of both Spanish and English to the use of Spanish as a transitional tool to reach the primary goal of English proficiency. The current situation reflects the language ideology of the dominant Anglo population of Arizona that often sees English as a prerequisite for academic, social, and economic success. At the end of the 19th Century when the Arizona territorial government founded public schools, a similar ideology led to the creation of a public school system that educated an almost exclusively Mexican population¹, yet teachers were Anglo and English was the language of classroom instruction, with few exceptions.

In both cases, the Anglo population adopted what Ronald Schmidt (2000) refers to as a language policy of assimilation where subordinate groups are pushed to adopt the dominant group's culture and language in an attempt to create a more unified society (Schmidt 2000: 59). Assimilation policies reflect the continual construction of what Benedict Anderson (1991) calls an "imagined community," the imagined ideal of a cohesive nation where all members are bound together through a common identity. But, as a result of assimilation policies, the status of the subordinate group's language and culture diminishes due to its loss of legitimacy. In an attempt to promote unity by creating a level linguistic playing field, language policy in fact reproduces social inequalities by attempting to erase minority culture and language; which in turn causes an oppositional reaction in said minority group that diminishes the original goal of creating a shared identity (Schmidt 2000: 60). Hernández-Chávez (1995) explains that the eradication of subordinate cultures and languages has been essential in maintaining Anglo hegemony throughout U.S. history.

The public school system in Tucson adopted a cultural and linguistic assimilation policy toward Mexican students. Although the Mexican elites in Tucson were active and supportive of the development of public schools, they preferred that their own children attend other learning institutions that allowed them to maintain greater cultural and linguistic autonomy. This is exactly the "defensive reaction" Schmidt (2000) describes by minority groups faced with assimilation policies in an attempt to resist cultural absorption by the dominant group. This paper will outline the initial formation of formal educational

institutions in Tucson at the last quarter of the 19th Century, paying particular attention to the participation of Mexican leadership in its establishment and how the issue of language was addressed in the first schools. The fact that Mexican elites were very influential in creating public education for the masses (for both Mexicans and Anglos) where English was the primary language of instruction, demonstrates a partial acceptance of a language policy of assimilation of Mexican students. Yet Mexicans of economic means preferred parochial schools for their own children as a personal protest against assimilation policy and as a means of maintaining cultural and linguistic separation and privilege. Their dual participation in Anglo and Mexican sponsored schools reflects that the balance of power was in the process of being redefined between the two groups.

2. Tucson's Origins

At the time of the Gadsden Purchase of 1854, that determined the final drawing of the border between Sonora and Arizona, the majority of Tucson's citizens were of Mexican descent. In 1860, Hispanics represented 70.6% of Tucson's population; they maintained a numerical majority of the local population until the beginning of the 20th Century (Sheridan 1986). The diversification of the population included U.S. citizens from other parts of the country and foreign immigrants from Europe and China. The African American population was very limited until the beginning of the 20th Century (Gil 1980: 417). Most of the original Anglo settlers to southern Arizona were single men working at mining facilities, without children, who did not establish themselves permanently nor were initially preoccupied with the formation of schools.

In contrast, the Mexican population had lasting roots in the community. Fr. Eusebio Francisco Kino established the San Xavier de Bac Mission on the uppermost frontier of New Spain's territory in 1700 (Cosulich 1953). In 1775, the presidio of San Agustín was founded ten miles to the north of the San Xavier, which eventually led to the establishment of the city of Tucson, a Mexican frontier town until the Gadsden Purchase. After the U.S. annexation of Southern Arizona, the Mexican elite and middle class of Tucson enjoyed favorable conditions, less ethnic conflict, and maintained closer ties to Mexico (especially with the state of Sonora) than Mexican populations in other parts of the Southwest (Sheridan 1986). Of course, not all Mexicans benefited from these conditions, and indeed the Mexican working-class was systematically subordinated by their lack of economic mobility and opportunities to ameliorate their life conditions.

3. The Establishment of Public Schools in Tucson

Arizona was declared a separate territory in 1863 and in September of that year the

governor urged the legislative assembly to establish a public school system. Instead of agreeing to institute a territorial tax to support public schools, the legislature allocated \$250 to the existing mission school at San Xavier del Bac (the first school in Arizona) (Weeks 1918) and \$500 for the establishment of public schools in Tucson, with the stipulation that English must be integrated into daily instruction (Carter 1937). It would be six years before the first public school opened in Tucson, but the English language stipulation tied to education funding indicates the legislature's recognition of the possible results of establishing schools in Tucson (then the largest population center) where the majority of school-aged children was Mexican and did not speak English. The territorial government dictated that a publicly funded educational institution needed to conform to the Anglo linguistic ideology that promoted English as a necessary element of education in a U.S. territory. They feared that if* they supported a system that could potentially sustain the use of Spanish they would delay the "Americanization" process.

3.1 The First Schools

The first public school teacher in Tucson, Augustus Brichta, taught a group of fifty-five Mexican boys for six months in 1869 (Tully 1894). Funding was scarce and class was conducted in a room with a dirt roof and floor and furnished with rough benches. Textbooks were difficult to come by "and the pupils relied solely on the teacher for a knowledge of the earth beyond what they could see of it" (McCrea quoted in Carter 1937: 5). Due to lack of funding (Brichta was never paid in full), the school closed and it was nearly two years later before the next school opened. There is no indication what language was used as the medium of instruction nor if Brichta could speak Spanish.

In 1872, John A. Spring, reopened the public school to 138 boys, 95% of whom were Mexican (Tully 1894). Spring evaluates his pupils' English ability in the following way in his memoir:

[N]ot one could express himself intelligently in the English language, although many of them possessed quite a variegated vocabulary of bad English words; about five or six understood sufficient English to know what to do when asked to perform a common household duty [...] and could, perhaps in "a sort of way" make themselves understood in that language, when speaking of the most common things of everyday life. About twenty boys, ranging in age from thirteen to sixteen years, were in attendance who had been to school in Mexico or had received private lessons in Spanish [...] To attempt to speak English to them all at once, and English only, as proposed and urged by a member of the school trustees, and to teach them arithmetic and geography in English before they could understand a single word of that language, would have been a futile undertaking involving an

absolute loss of much valuable time. I therefore explained everything in Spanish, the boys' mother tongue, so that every sentence that was translated or read or spoken in English was immediately conveyed to their intellect in a comprehensible manner. (Spring 1996: 241-2)

Spring's account of his teaching strategies reveals not only the language ability of the students, but also how he personally dealt with the difficulty of trying to educate a Spanish-speaking population in English, who in some cases had previous educational experience in Spanish. This is the first hint of an official school language policy as dictated by the school trustee who saw English as a prerequisite to other forms of knowledge. Spring's refusal to adopt an English-only policy in the classroom allowed the teaching of subjects other than English while respecting the students' existing academic knowledge and language abilities.

Spring provides the following description of bilingual education materials that were used in the school:

Governor Safford had kindly presented to the school two dozen of Ollendorf's Spanish English systems for the use of the boys who could read Spanish fluently and write without difficulty. To these boys I would, after they had written a page in their copy books, read and thoroughly explain a lesson in Ollendorf and show them how to translate the Spanish exercises properly into English [...] I found it absolutely necessary to translate and explain to them everything they read, as otherwise they would take no interest in a story. (Spring 1996: 242)

It appears that the general objective of Spring's teaching style was to facilitate his students' English acquisition, yet his account demonstrates acceptance of the use of Spanish and English side-by-side in the classroom. The use of Spanish and bilingual educational materials, despite the school trustees' request for an English-only learning environment, mirrors a shift in power that was occurring in the community at large. Mexicans represented a numerical majority and maintained many powerful positions in Tucson, but Anglos were increasing in number and in status. However official policy still did not reflect the local reality.

The board of trustees replaced Spring with two female teachers (known as "school mams") that could be hired for the same cost as one male teacher. Spring's memoir states that the female teachers discovered that "the first requisite toward successful teaching of these Mexican boys was a knowledge of their pupil's language" (Spring 1966: 262). Spring proceeded to tutor the new teachers in Spanish. This suggests that teachers continued to use Spanish in the classroom to some extent, although it is difficult to determine the balance between English and Spanish as a medium of instruction.

3.2 Curriculum and Classroom communication

Principal George C. Hall's 1881 annual report discusses the challenges he encountered in his first year at the Tucson Public School. He indicates that among the school's large Mexican population many could not speak English. Defining grade levels was problematic because many students were "quite proficient in arithmetic [but] could scarcely read English at all" (Hall 1881: 11), suggesting that, to some extent, Spanish was used as a medium of instruction to teach subjects such as mathematics. He further explains that his own inability to communicate in Spanish was advantageous because it forced students "to employ all their knowledge of the language [English], and to seek a better acquaintance with it, in order to make themselves understood" (Hall 1881: 10). Hall's statement demonstrates a shift in attitude from education professionals regarding communication with students in their first language. Previous to Hall's report, teachers favored being able to communicate in Spanish with their students, as demonstrated by John Spring and his immediate successors. Spring recognized the importance of building on his students' existing knowledge of the Spanish language and determined that teaching only in English would retard the learning process in other academic subjects. Likewise, in 1897, Samuel McCrea's principal report recommended that first grade teachers acquire basic Spanish vocabulary in order to facilitate the learning of English and that all primary teachers in general would benefit from learning conversational Spanish (McCrea 1897: 10). Thus, we see a vacillation in tolerance of the use of Spanish by individual principals.

In Hall's 1881 report, there is no evidence that Spanish was taught in the primary or grammar school divisions as a separate subject, although it does appear in the curriculum for high school courses, where Spanish was mandatory in the "Scientific Course" of study and optional in the "Literary Course" where students had the choice of either German or Spanish. The school employed a special teacher in Spanish but it appears that Spanish was only formally taught at the secondary level (Fowler 1961: 26). The lack of Spanish curriculum in the primary and grammar divisions and its presence in the high school division indicates that official policy treated Spanish as a foreign language and did not recognize it as a primary language for Mexican students. This is reflected in the principal's report of 1894 that lists textbooks used in the public school, all of which are in English (Tully 1894). The absence of Spanish in the curriculum continued despite that fact that in 1890, only 19% of students were Anglo (Fowler 1961: 31) and that majority of students in the public schools were Mexican, a trend that continued well into the 20th Century.

4. The Mexican Community's Role in Establishing Tucson's Schools

The first Arizona territorial legislative assembly met in 1863, and from this date

until 1877, Mexican representatives were active in the assembly during these first years of governmental support for public education. Samuel McCrea's 1902 history of the founding of public schools in Tucson addressed the contribution of Mexicans to public education in the territorial legislative assembly:

Probably nothing so emphasized the change resulting from the large American immigration as the fact that 1877 practically marked the end of Mexican representatives in the Assembly[...] Up to this time Pima and Yuma counties had sent one Mexican to the Council and another to the House, except in 1866 and 1867. As if to make this loss good, in 1864, 1871 and 1877 two Mexicans had seats in the Council, while another had the usual seat in the House. Except for a single Representative in 1881 who was re-elected in 1891, a Mexican was never again elected to a seat in the Arizona Assembly [...] One or more of this race always found places on the Committees on Education, and notwithstanding their devotion to the Church, proved to be good friends of the public school. (McCrea 1902: 54)

Elite members of the Mexicans community in Southern Arizona that participated in the first years of the territorial government were supportive of creating a public school system throughout the state, even if their own children did not attend these schools. But the public schools did benefit the Mexican community in general, where most school-aged children could be found.

Several local Mexican leaders were influential in the establishment of public schools and in lending their own financial support. Esteven Ochoa is known as one of Tucson's most prominent early businessmen and the founding father of the city's public school system. Ochoa was born in Chihuahua, Mexico, traveling first to Missouri where he learned English and began working in the freighting business. He arrived in Tucson around 1860, where he established a successful business and was a prominent local citizen whose home became the center of high society events (Lockwood 1968).

Ochoa, together with Governor Anson Safford, introduced a bill to the territorial legislature in 1870 in support of public education. Sheridan (1986) explains that Ochoa and other Mexican elites endorsed public education as a payback for Safford's support of bilingual court proceedings and Spanish translation of territorial laws. Safford hoped that Ochoa's introduction of a public school bill would convince legislators to support the bill when they saw a prominent Mexican Catholic (usually associated with support for parochial schools) who championed the public school system. Thus, Mexican support for public education was part of the negotiation that gave the Spanish language legitimacy within the territorial government. The bill passed, but little funding was allocated to schools.

In 1875, Ochoa was elected mayor of Tucson (the city's only Mexican mayor after the Gadsden Purchase) and also served as president of the school board (Lockwood 1968). When construction of a local school was threatened due to lack of funding, Ochoa donated land to the city and paid for construction costs out of his own pocket (Albrecht 1963: 38), an action that has elevated him to an almost mythical status in the pioneer and Mexican history of Arizona. Sheridan (1986) explains that although Mexican elites embraced learning English to compete with the ever-growing Anglo population, they did not accept assimilation into the Anglo culture. Mexican elites advocated public education for the poorer members of their community, but founded private schools for their own children; therefore the development of parochial and public education occurred simultaneously in Tucson, each with a different socioeconomic clientele. Sheridan contends that Ochoa is representative of Mexican elites of the era that supported public education; they spoke English and worked with Anglo businessmen, yet also supported the Catholic Church and schools, spoke Spanish, and maintained their Mexican cultural identity (Sheridan 1986). An apt description of Mexicans' bicultural identity appears in an 1875 report of the 4th of July in Tucson where Ochoa served as master of ceremonies where speeches and the reciting of the Declaration of Independence were performed in both English and Spanish (*Arizona Citizen* July 10, 1875). The following description of Ochoa's home is another hint of the dual cultural role of Mexican elites in Tucson: "[T]he walls were hung with flags, and works of art, in profusion. At the head of the hall were large portraits of Gen. Hidalgo, of Mexican fame, and on his right was the face of Washington, representing America" (*Arizona Weekly Star*, May 9, 1878).

Another example of Mexican support for education, and for public schools in particular, is demonstrated in the following editorial from a Spanish language newspaper *Las dos repúblicas*:

Schools will open tomorrow and we exhort parents to send their children to them reminding them [parents] of their imperious obligation to provide them [their children] an education that can be acquired without any expense, classes being open to everyone that understands the need to educate the masses, and wants to take advantage of the opportunity. (*Las dos repúblicas* 2/septiembre/1887, my translation)²

Support of public education in Spanish language print media demonstrates that the Mexican elites were advocates for educational opportunities for the entire population as is also demonstrated by their economic and legislative support of public education. The fact that their own children rarely attended public schools indicates that they rejected the assimilation of Anglo culture through official institutions.

5. Parochial Schools

In 1870, the St. Joseph sisters established a Catholic school for girls (Weeks 1918). In 1974, the boy's school of St. Augustine was established (Sheridan 1986) and also the co-educational institution called the Modern School taught by J.M. Silva, most of whose 39 students were Mexican (Fowler 1961: 23). Although Mexican elites supported the founding of public schools, they also supported the parallel development of these parochial schools for the education of their own children. The fact that the Mexican community did not entrust their children to the public schools indicates that they thought that the parochial schools were more effective. The following section will demonstrate why language could have been an influential factor in maintaining separate schools systems.

Weeks notes in his history of Arizona education that some of the Catholic learning institutions that taught Mexican and American Indian students did not teach in English (1918: 13). It is not clear to what extent Spanish was the language of instruction in the Catholic schools in Tucson, but based on almost exclusive attendance by Mexican students, together with Week's report, we can assume that Spanish was, to some extent, the language of instruction. Extensive advertising for Spanish language educational materials in Tucson's Spanish language newspapers (in subjects such as literature, history, grammar, arithmetic, and reading) also suggests that formal Spanish language education in Tucson was effectively taking place (*Las dos repúblicas* 25/mayo/1878). In addition, advertisements appeared during the same time period for private instruction in Spanish as well as in English and in French (*El fronterizo* 21/julio/1882).

Mexican families generally preferred Catholic schools; the reason most often cited being their religious affiliation and the segregation of the sexes. For many years after the establishment of public schools, numerous Mexican families preferred to send their children to these schools. Although it is impossible to determine to what extent school language policy influenced their preference for the parochial schools, I speculate that both English and Spanish instruction were important for elite families to maintain their privileged economic and social situation because it allowed them to maintain alliances in Mexico and forge new alliances in the United States. Domination of both languages would allow them the unique position of cultural and economic go-betweens for the Anglo and Mexican populations.

5.1 Conflict between Public and Parochial Schools

The Arizona territorial government allocated funds to existing parochial schools on several occasions, which ignited a debate about public funding supporting religious institutions. McCrea's account of the establishment of Arizona public schools critiques

the “foreign” (Mexican and other) resistance to public education in favor of parochial schools by stating:

With more than three-fifths of the people of Arizona born in Mexico and other foreign countries, with most of the Mexicans and many other foreigners ignorant and bigoted, with none of this foreign element attached to American institutions, it is hardly wondered at that ambitious ecclesiastics should seek to gain control of the public schools of the new Territory and to divert the bulk of the limited, yet increasing, school revenue into the coffers of the Roman Church. (McCrea 1902: 45)

This commentary demonstrates a protest against territory moneys being given to Catholic schools; especially in areas where public schools were in existence and where there was a lack of acceptance of Catholic schools and the Church itself by the Anglo population that was predominantly Protestant. In 1875, the conflict between public and parochial schools increased as the Legislative Assembly agreed to aid the St. Joseph Sister’s girl’s school with \$300. This was perhaps due to the fact that, of the 312 students attending school in Tucson, 187 attended Catholic schools (Nilson 1985). Parents who sent their children to Catholic schools did not want to pay both taxes that supported public education and private school tuition. The controversy caused by allocation of territorial funds to Catholic schools ultimately led to the resignation of the Chief Justice of the Territorial Supreme Court and the passage of laws that kept public funds out of private schools.

An editorial, two years later, in the Spanish language newspaper *Las dos repúblicas* reflects the persistence of this debate by criticizing a traveling circus that supported public schools through benefit performances, but did not support Catholic schools:

We accuse of great ignorance or anger those who forget that Tucson has three public schools that complete the noble task of educating the youth [...] The actual Public School, that receives funds from the Territory and the County and the city, for which it does not require the charity of circus people, etc, has less than 130 youth of both sexes: it was founded in 1872. The Parochial School of St. Augustine for boys and the St. Joseph Academy for girls have 246 youth of both sexes, in both of which young people are educated without cost and were founded in 1870. The city’s principle families and from other parts send their children to the latter schools, although they find themselves obligated by law, to contribute to the support of the other. Thus, the other [parochial schools] are preferred by the principle families, we can assure you that they study the same branches as in the actual Public School, and that their preceptors persist and achieve as many advances as they are able to do in the other [...] Not so much partiality, dear philanthropists. (*Las dos repúblicas* 18/mayo/1878, my translation)³

Support of parochial schools in the above citation alludes to Catholic schools being considered a sort of public school that served a greater number of students than the officially publicly funded schools. In 1881, 280 students attended the public schools, while 450 attended Catholic schools (Hall 1881: 11). The figures from 1878 and 1881 show almost double the number of students attending Catholic schools than the number attending public schools, the majority of whom were Mexican. In these first years of formal educational institutions in Tucson, the majority of the population favored parochial schools that allowed greater expression of Mexican cultural, religious, and linguistic traditions.

It is notable that Mexican elites were much more willing to send their boys to public schools than their girls. School teacher Mamie Bernard de Aguirre notes, “The better class of Mexican families would not send their girls [to public school], although they sent the boys. And the girls whose parents were broadminded enough to send them were sort of ostracized” (quoted in Sheridan 1986: 45). Mrs. L.C. Hughes, wife of a prominent Tucson newspaper owner, who opened the first public school for girls in 1873, stated that “[t]he natives [Mexicans] were so strongly opposed to co-education that it was necessary to have separate schools for the boys and girls” (quoted in Carter 1937: 12). The division of standards of education appears to reflect the different educational objectives for boys and girls. These young Mexican men would grow up to be the future businessmen of their community and their exposure to the English language and the Anglo culture in public schools would be beneficial for their socioeconomic success. Women, seen as the traditional bearers of culture and language, were instructed in Spanish in parochial schools because Mexican elites “considered themselves the heirs to a Catholic, European intellectual tradition” and they felt Catholic schools would inculcate their privileged cultural tradition on their daughters (Sheridan 1986: 47).

6. Conclusion

Mexican elites were largely responsible for founding educational institutions in both public and parochial settings in the last quarter of the 19th Century, in Tucson, Arizona. They financially supported public schools, but demanded a different education for their own children in an attempt to maintain their privileged status at the local level through their ability to participate in various social structures. By creating privately funded local schools, Mexican elites had greater control over curriculum, religious affiliation, segregation by sex, and the language of instruction. They also maintained a social distance between themselves and Mexicans from lower socio-economic classes and from the Anglo population in general. Their role in establishing public schools demonstrates Mexicans’

partial participation in the social order the Anglo society was constructing, but a rejection of some aspects of assimilation.

Bourdieu (1991) links economic power and language use in education when he says, “The educational market is strictly dominated by the linguistic products of the dominant class and tends to sanction the pre-existing differences in capital” (Bourdieu 1991: 64). Bourdieu’s conception of language as a representation of economic hierarchy is useful in examining language policy in Tucson’s first schools. Because both Spanish and English persisted in classroom settings, albeit in different school systems, it demonstrates that economic power was shared by Mexicans and Anglos in this historical period of transition. Mexican elites were able to maintain their language within the parochial schools because they had the economic and political power to do so.

Tollefson (1991) states that “language policy is used to sustain existing power relationships” (Tollefson 1991:11) and in the example of Tucson, both Anglo elites in governmental positions and Mexican elites with historical ties to the region had power within the community. Parallel language policies developed in the schools that reflect the interests of each group. Mexican elites maintained the Spanish language through private schools that represented their privileged status in the Mexican community. Their limited access to official governmental offices pushed them to create local institutions that supported their own cultural needs and covertly rejected the dominant ideology that sought to impose English in the territory through educational institutions. Tollefson (1991) sees language policy as a powerful exclusionary tool that the state uses to reproduce inequalities; while minorities that are the most affected by language policies are excluded from the decision making process. In Tucson, Mexicans from lower socioeconomic classes were most affected by language policy in the schools and had no channel through which they could contest language policy. Mexican elites opted to create a *de facto* policy within their own community that rejected the dominant Anglo ideology of assimilation that was beginning to push Mexicans out of their traditional roles of authority in the Southwest. By financially supporting public schools, Mexican elites participated in the shifting power structure that privileged the English language and Anglo cultural values. School language policy at the end of the 19th Century demonstrates that schools developed in a critical point in cultural and political shifts in power in Southern Arizona.

Notes

¹ I will use to the term Mexican to refer to persons of Mexican heritage born both in Mexico and the Southwest that resided in southern Arizona.

² “Mañana se abrirán las escuelas, y exortamos á los padres de familia manden á sus hijos á ellas recordándoles la imperiosa obligación que tienen de proporcionarles la educación que sin ningun gasto pueden adquirirles, estando las aulas abiertas para todos los que comprenden la necesidad de la educación de las masas, y deseen aprovechar las oportunidad.” (Orthography from original document)

³ [A]cusamos de mucha ignorancia ó despecho á los que se olvidan que en el Tucson hay tres escuelas públicas que cumplen con la noble tarea de educar á la juventud [...] La Escuela Pública neta, que se sostiene con los fondos del Territorio y del Condado y de la ciudad, y que por consiguiente no debe necesitar de la caridad de cirqueros etc, cuenta con ménos de 130 jóvenes de ambos sexos: se fundó en 1872. La Escuela Parroquial de San Agustín, para niños y la Academia de San José, para niñas cuentan ambas con 246 jóvenes de ambos sexos; en las dos se educa á la juventud gratuitamente, y se fundaron en 1870. Las principales familias de esta ciudad y de otras partes envían sus hijos á estas últimas escuelas, aunque se vean obligados por la ley, á contribuir al sostén de aquella. Mas aun, siendo preferibles á otra [las escuelas parroquiales] por las principales familias, podemos asegurar que en ellas se cursan los mismos ramos que en la Escuela Pública neta, y que los preceptores de ellas se empeñan tanto y logran conseguir tantos adelantos como puedan hacerlos en la otra [...] No tanta parcialidad amados filantropos.

Works Cited

Albrecht, E. 1963. “Estevan Ochoa: Mexican-American Businessman”. *Arizoniana: The Journal of Arizona History* 4(2): 35-40.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Arizona Citizen, “The Forth in Tucson”. 3:3, 7/10/1875.

Arizona Voters. 2000. “Proposition 203: English Language Education for Children in Public Schools.”

Arizona Weekly Star, “The ceremony and Festivities connected with the Marriage of C.H. Tully and Miss. Adela Baron,” 3:3, 5/9/1875.

Bonillas, I. 1926. “Reminiscences”. *Biographical file of Ignacio Bonillas*. Arizona Historical Society.

Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language & Symbolic Power*. Thompson, J.B., ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Carter, I. 1937. *Rise of the Public Schools of Tucson: 1867-1936*. Unpublished thesis: University of Arizona.

Cosulich, B. 1953. *Tucson*. Tucson: Arizona Silhouettes.

El fronterizo, 21/julio/1882.

Fowler, S. 1961. *A History of Education in Tucson until 1912*. Unpublished manuscript: Arizona Historical Society.

Gill, M.E., and J.S. Goff. 1980. “Joseph H. Kibbey and School Segregation in Arizona”. *The Journal of Arizona History* 21(4): 411-422.

Hall, G.C. 1882. *Annual Report of the Principal of the Public Schools*. Tucson: Arizona

Publishing Co.'s Steam Print.

Hernández-Chávez, E. 1995 "Language Policy in the United States: A History of Cultural Genocide". In Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and R. Phillipson, eds. *Linguistic Human Rights*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 141-158.

Las dos repúblicas "Las escuelas del Tucson". 18/mayo/1878.

Las dos repúblicas, 25/mayo/1878.

Lockwood, F.C. 1968. *Pioneer Portraits: Selected Vignettes*. Tucson: University of Arizona.

McCrea, S.P. 1902. *The Establishment of the Arizona School System*. Unpublished thesis: Stanford University.

_____. 1897. *Report of Principal*. Tucson: Star Publishing Co.

Nilsen, A.P., ed. 1985. *Dust in our Desks: Territory Days to the Present in Arizona Schools*. Tempe: ASU Centennial Commission.

Schmidt, Sr., R., 2000. "Making Sense of Language Policy Conflict". *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States*. Philadelphia: Temple U.P.

Sheridan, T.E. 1986. *Los Tucsoneneses: The Mexican Community in Tucson, 1854-1941*. Tucson: University of Arizona.

Spring, J.A. 1966. *John Spring's Arizona*. Gustafson, A.M., ed. Tucson: University of Arizona.

Tollefson, J.W. 1991. *Planning Language, Planning Inequality: Language Policy in the Community*. New York: Longman.

Tretschek, D.T. 1965. *Pinckney Randolph Tully and Charles Heppin Tully: Arizona Pioneers*. Unpublished Manuscript: Arizona Historical Society.

Tully, C. 1894. *Report of the Principal of the Tucson Public Schools*. Tucson: Enterprise Job Printing House.

Weeks, S.B. 1918. *History of Public School Education in Arizona*. Washington DC: Department of the Interior.

Works Consulted

Butchart, R.E. 1977. "The Frontier Teacher: Arizona, 1875-1925". *Journal of the West*. 16(3): 54-66.

Chanin, A. and M. Chanin. 1977. *This Land These Voices: A Different View of Arizona History in the Words of Those Who Lived It*. Flagstaff: Northland Press.

Cooper, J.F. 1967. *The First Hundred Years: The History of Tucson School District 1, Tucson, Arizona 1867-1967*. (No publishing information).

McQuown, K.A. 1964. "Tucson Public Schools, 1867-1874". *Arizoniana: The Journal*

of Arizona History. 5(2): 38-43.

Manuel, H.T. 1965. *Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and the Public Welfare*. Austin: University of Texas.

Tinker Salas, M. 1996. "Sonora: The Making of a Border Society, 1880-1910". *U.S.- Mexican Borderlands: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. In Martínez, O.J., ed. Wilmington: Scholarly Resources Inc.