

[Portland Public Schools Geocultural Baseline Essay Series](#)

**Hispanic-American
Social-Science Baseline Essay
1996**

**Toward an Understanding
of Hispanic History**

by

Dr. Erasmo Gamboa



**John E. Bierwirth
Superintendent**

**Portland Public Schools
501 N. Dixon Street
Portland, Oregon 97227**

Copyright © 1996 by
Multnomah School District 1J
Portland, Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Hispanic" Defined\.....	1
The Importance of Considering Nationality.....	2
What Hispanics Think.....	3
THE RACIAL BACKGROUND AND CONQUEST.....	3
Native Peoples.....	3
The Spanish.....	8
Conquest.....	10
The African in Latin America.....	11
THE SPANISH COLONIAL SYSTEM.....	12
Race Mixture—La Raza C3smica.....	13
THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LATINOS IN THE U.S.....	18
THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN WAR.....	28
HISPANICS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.....	32
Mexican-Americans.....	32
Puerto Ricans.....	37
Cuban-Americans.....	40
QUEST FOR CIVIL RIGHTS.....	41
CONCLUSION.....	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	51
Chicanos/Latinos in the United States.....	51
Identity.....	52
Chicanos/Latinos in Comparative Perspective.....	53
Border Culture/The Borderlands/U.S.-Hispanic Cultures.....	55
Chicana/Latina Women in the U.S.....	57
Latin American/Central American/Caribbean History.....	58

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the history of the various Latino communities in the United States is no easy matter.¹ In fact, there is no simple way to comprehend the complexity of the "Hispanic" experience. Different historical paths to the U.S., cultural variation, varying rates of acculturation, and diverging demographics argue against making hasty generalizations about the people to whom the term is applied. In any case, the first step toward understanding the Hispanic communities in the U.S. should be an examination of their group identification.

"Hispanic" Defined"

Strictly speaking, Hispanics are people of Latin American or Spanish ancestry residing in the U.S. However, unlike other minority groups they do not constitute an easily identifiable, well-defined ethnic or racial community. They are a true mosaic, composed of many nationalities and different racial and cultural groups. In truth, there is very little real group affinity among Hispanics, outside of their Spanish surnames, a predilection to speak Spanish and practice Catholicism, and an undercurrent of "comunidad" and "familia" that is unparalleled in any region outside of Latin America.²

Prior to the 1970s, Latin Americans and Spaniards in the U.S. based their self-identity on national background. The federal government also used nationality to identify the foreign-born population in the U.S. and language identifiers (Spanish-speaking, Spanish surname, etc.) to define those born in the U.S. Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans were different. Their long history in the U.S., plus their strong cultural and political identity, caused them to be viewed less as distinct nationalities and more as subgroups that could not be assimilated or as hyphenated minority-group Americans.

¹ The terms *Latino*, *Latin American*, and *Hispanic* are used interchangeably in this essay. In light of the variance among Hispanics, the word itself should be examined. The term *Hispanic* was introduced by federal and state governments during the 1970s as a convenient way to identify an otherwise myriad group of people of Latin American and Spanish heritage. Yet another term, *La Raza*, symbolically embraces all Latinos in the United States and elsewhere.

² The words *comunidad* and *familia* have been chosen by the members of the Planning and Advisory Committee for the Hispanic-American Baseline Essays because those words in Spanish more closely describe the affinity between different peoples of the Hispanic world than their English equivalents.

As previously mentioned, the term *Hispanic* imposes a racial and cultural homogeneity where none exists. Racially, many Hispanics are descendants of relatively unmixed African, Asian, European, and American Indian ancestry. Others are also multi-racial—a mixture of American Indian, African, Iberian, and Asian. In terms of cultures and ethnicity, Hispanics truly convey the rainbow of diverse lifestyles representative of all the countries of South, Central, and North America, as well as the Caribbean. For this reason, the word *Latino*, denoting the large interrelated but highly heterogeneous community of Latin Americans, is perhaps a more appropriate means of group identification for U.S. Hispanics.

Beyond its identity, each group of Hispanics has a different history. Mexican-Americans, for example, are members of an "old Hispanic minority" in this country. Their history here was old when British colonization began in the early 1600s. On the other hand, many Hispanic groups, such as Central Americans, constitute more recently arrived immigrant communities.

Finally, Hispanics differ in their manner of politics and their social and economic standing. Many Cuban-Americans tend to be staunch Republicans - perhaps as a reaction to the failed Bay of Pigs invasion, while most Mexican-Americans and many Puerto Ricans are Democrats. The politics of a smaller minority of Hispanics gravitates to the left or right fringes of the political spectrum and is largely shaped by each group's ideological interpretation of its own history.

The Importance of Considering Nationality

For all of these reasons, any attempt to define or identify Hispanics or Latinos in the U.S. should begin with a consideration of their nationality. The country of origin and the national culture of Mexican-Americans, Colombian-Americans, Peruvian-Americans, Cuban-Americans, Nicaraguan-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and others point to their distinguishing attributes. Although unwieldy, this way of identifying and eventually understanding the highly heterogeneous Hispanic population in the U.S. is fundamentally more precise and appropriate than the current term *Hispanic*.

The word *Hispanic* resulted from the interplay of several socio-economic and political factors of the 1970s. For one thing, the surge of Latin American immigration meant that

the federal government needed to find a way to group the various nationalities and racial groups into one category. Yet as immigrant Chilean, Cuban, and Central American communities grew, it became clear that terms such as Puerto Rican or Boriqua, Mexican-American or Chicano did not pertain to them. When the term *Hispanic* was extended to Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and other Latino communities, moreover, the eclipse of the ethnic and cultural nationalism of the 1960s led to the adoption of the more generic term *Hispanic* in the 1970s.

What Hispanics Think

Ultimately, group or individual identity depends on Hispanics themselves. Often, group identity may be grounded in language—do its members speak Spanish or not? Residency, or spatial distribution, may also enter into the definition. For example, many Mexican-Americans born in Texas may wish to be referred to and choose to be identified as *Tejanos*. The same holds true for New York's Puerto Rican Latinos. *Neorricans* or *Nuyoricans* speaks to the vitality of this urban Latino community. An individual's length of residence in the U.S. and probable future status also enter into group consciousness. For this reason many persons of Mexican descent may prefer the socio-political term *Chicano*. The strong concern of Cuban-American Floridians with affairs in Cuba will undoubtedly also define group identity.

THE RACIAL BACKGROUND AND CONQUEST

The people of Latin America, and by extension Hispanics in the U.S., are often the product of extensive racial mixing. In few other places in the world has this occurred in such an abrupt, large scale, and protracted manner as it did in Latin America. To grasp and appreciate the complexity of the Hispanic community, we must take Latin America's Indian, African, European, and Asian background into account.

Native Peoples

Today, although some American Indian people have a different belief, it is generally argued that the first inhabitants in the Americas appeared approximately 45,000 years ago, migrating across a land bridge that linked the Bering Straits to Asia. In the ensuing millennia, they traveled southward at approximately 18 miles per generation, populating

the North and South American continents and ultimately arriving at the tip of Tierra del Fuego in South America. From a common phenotype—black hair, short stature, and light brown skin—these early people adjusted to their immediate environment and separated into a myriad of linguistic and cultural communities with a wide range of social, political, and economic organizations.

Although these communities differed culturally, they were alike in other ways. In all of them religion was central. Religious beliefs, centered on the worship of animate and inanimate forces, were so dominating that ceremony and ritual permeated the lives of the individual and the community.

The importance of the family as a basic social unit was another attribute of the early cultures. For this reason, individual interest was subordinate to family and community concerns. This was particularly true of the ownership of land and other natural resources. All Native American cultures believed that the earth's resources belonged to all people. The ground itself was considered sacred and was revered as the source of all life. Therefore, native people considered themselves as stewards of the earth and practiced strong environmental safeguards to protect the interests of future generations.

Scholars estimate that by the close of the fifteenth century nearly 100 million persons inhabited the Americas. The Aztecs and Mayas of México and Central America; the Carib of the Caribbean zone; the Chibcha of Colombia; the Inca of Perú, Ecuador, and Bolivia; the Aruacanian of Chile; the Guaraní of Paraguay and Argentina; and the Tupi of Brazil were among the most important cultural groups in the area south of the present U.S./Mexican border. By most measures, the Mayan, Incan, and Aztec civilizations serve as useful examples of exceedingly complex and highly developed societies.

The Mayan civilization flourished during the fourth and tenth centuries in Guatemala, and later in the Yucatán area of México. Until the present, the Mayas' remarkable intellectual and social attainments continue to perplex modern scholars. In part, their success was triggered by agriculture. Among the various Mayan cultures, all human activity centered around efficient cultivation of various crops. Maize, or corn, was particularly significant. This crop not only sustained the population but allowed a highly respected group of religious leaders to govern. This elite established the community's social, economic, and political organization. As theocrats, its members also searched for the philosophical meaning of life and its relationship to the cosmos. In an attempt to

understand their world, they also directed important empirical studies. Their scientists conducted astronomical studies of such caliber that they were able to predict eclipses, chart the path of Venus, and prepare a calendar more accurate than the one used by Europeans at the time. Excelling in mathematics, the Mayas unshrouded the concept of zero and devised numeration by position. This was the only cultural group in the Americas to go beyond the use of pictographs and invent a precise system of writing.

Mayan architecture provides further compelling evidence of extraordinary intellectual ability. Its central elements were symmetry with nature and design linked to astrological function. By the time Europeans arrived, many Mayan centers had been mysteriously abandoned. As a result, numerous magnificent Mayan edifices at Uxmal, Chichen Itzá, Palenque, Copán, Tikal, and other sites were spared the ruin of conquest and still stand as silent and magnificent testimony to a past glory.

The decline of the Mayan civilization around 900 A.D. was followed by the rise of the Aztec civilization in central México. The Aztec Indians rose to prominence in the Valley of México after they founded Tenochtitlán, their spectacular capital city, at Lake Texcoco in 1325. In just 175 years, the Aztecs extended their powerful hegemony out from Tenochtitlán to include most of central México. By the year 1500, their cultural influence radiated north from Tenochtitlán to the present southwestern part of the U.S., south into Central America, and east and west touching the Gulf of México and the Pacific Ocean.

Theocracy and secular power were the pillars of the Aztecs' world. According to their religious beliefs, a pantheon of divinities—both benevolent and frightening gods—controlled their prosperity and destiny. Huitzilopochtli, the god of war and the sun, is a case in point. Aztecs believed that Huitzilopochtli traversed the universe as the source of all light. Lest he fail to appear, Huitzilopochtli was kept strong through sustained human sacrifices.

Like the Mayas, and other highly advanced communities, the Aztecs excelled in many areas. They designed an impressive system of government with a clearly defined hierarchical system. An emperor supported by a class of nobility—consisting of high priests and a cadre of distinguished military warriors—stood at the apex of government. Next came a merchant class, followed by artisans, commoners, landless peasants, and slaves.

Although Aztec society was far from democratic, upward mobility from slavery to nobility was possible. Because of a belief in the state's social responsibility, education was free and compulsory for all children. In school they studied religion, community responsibility, and filial duties, as well as the social and natural sciences including politics, astronomy, philosophy, history, writing, oratory and debate, civil engineering, and law.

The Aztec judicial system was predicated on the impartiality, integrity, and virtue of its officials. Lawsuits over adultery, theft, lying, treason, and other crimes were arbitrated in the Aztec courts. Judges who were not impartial faced swift execution if they were convicted. Overall, the Aztec social order rested on strict moral conformity and a responsible citizenry. For this reason, social crimes like theft and drunkenness were not common.

Aztec women were not without rights. They were educated in feminine roles but were considered valued members of society. They could hold property, engage in commerce, and march with the men into battle. Moreover, women could bring suit against Aztec men, including their husbands.

In areas such as medicine, the Aztecs of México were well ahead of Europe of the late 1400s. They had a well-designed ambulance corps, and their medical practitioners performed neurological surgery, set fractured limbs, drilled and filled dental cavities, and drew medicines from a well-catalogued list of more than 1,500 medicinal plants.

Tenochtitlán, the Aztecs' capital, was located in the saltwater marshes of Lake Texcoco. An engineering marvel, it had a population of more than 80,000. The city was impressively clean. Main avenues measuring 25 to 30 feet in width integrated its four main sections. Public markets were interspersed throughout the city and zoological and botanical gardens were common. Two large aqueducts that connected to the mainland supplied fresh water. Outside of Tenochtitlán, engineers constructed roads with an eye to the transportation needs of the empire and its citizens. Four rows of corn were planted along the principal roads so that travelers would not go hungry.

In South America, the Incas also developed as one of the most spectacular and highly organized civilizations of the Americas. Centered at Cuzco, the Inca empire extended in

all directions from Ecuador to Chile and boasted extraordinary achievements in agriculture, engineering, architecture, medicine, public administration, and government.

Like the Aztecs, the Incas conquered their neighbors in order to extend their empire. Then they required all their former enemies to assimilate into the Inca culture. When necessary, the Incan state resettled entire populations in order to quicken the process of integration and maintain firm control. In this way, every Incan subject was compelled to speak Quechua, the official language of the state.

The Incas excelled in many other areas. Their city in the Andes mountains was most impressive in its design and function. Their agronomists were outstanding. They designed extremely efficient irrigation, drainage, and terrace systems and used fertilizers and cross-pollination techniques that allowed expansion of the natural limits of otherwise unarable land. The Incas' agricultural economy was so well developed that farmers met the annual food requirements of the empire with ease. For this reason, hunger was virtually unknown until the agrarian economy was disrupted by the Spanish.

Women's roles in the Incan world also stand out, contradicting a common stereotype of largely male-dominated indigenous societies. In a predominantly agricultural economy, women—not men—had the critical responsibility of managing food production. They determined when and how to plant and harvest crops. Women also oversaw most of the commerce at the various public markets and served in leadership roles in the local political assemblies.

In addition to living in different times and locations, Mayan, Aztec, Incan, and other early American cultures were separated by numerous cultural, political, and economic differences. Still, they constituted the large family of interrelated cultural groups that inhabited the Americas on the eve of European contact.

The Spanish

Spain, like much of Western Europe at the end of the fifteenth century, was on the threshold of a social, political, and commercial revolution. On the Iberian peninsula, Spain and Portugal sought a maritime approach to lucrative Eastern world markets. New technology, including vessels designed to tack against the wind, was required to

accomplish this remarkable feat. Reliable navigation instruments, more accurate chronometers, and parchment paper to note routes and positions of latitude and longitude enabled a more determined and powerful maritime search for the trade centers of the Far East.

In the last decade of the 1400s, other forces shaped Spain as an emerging country. This decade witnessed an end to over 700 years of warfare between Catholicism and Islam in the Iberian Peninsula. Not only did Spanish Catholicism stand victorious when the last stronghold of the Moslems capitulated in 1492, but Spain's military was well honed and now stood poised to conquer new worlds.

At the time, the drive and technology of aggressive commercialism, unshakable religious zeal, a powerful military, and a supportive monarchy put Spain at one of its most important historical crossroads. The individual Spaniard was similarly shaped by many of these same forces—a fixation with religious intolerance, a belief in self-superiority and invincibility, and a penchant for military conquest. To both state and person, the choice was between retrenchment in the tenets of medievalism or an energetic emergence into the modern world.

In a way, the win over Islam was symbolic. While Catholicism prevailed, expelling the Moslems and their religion could not begin to erase nearly seven centuries of African cultural influence. After 1492 many Moslems, called Moors, converted to Catholicism and remained in Spain. Equally important, the Arabic language, culture, and economic institutions were already indelibly stamped on Spain and its people.

However, by this time Spain had a varied cultural background. Due to its geographical position, Spain had been inhabited by many people—Celtic, Phoenician, Greek, Roman, Visigoth, and Iberian³—and its culture was a composite of the contributions of many people. Partly for this reason, when Spain attempted to achieve unity through the institution of the monarchy in 1469, it still remained fragmented by intense regional cultural differences.

Even so, the Spanish monarchy made a determined attempt to create cultural and religious uniformity, developing the infamous Spanish Inquisition to guard against any

³ The original inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula

potential threats to Catholicism. In the end, this type of religious intolerance led to the expulsion of the Sephardic Jewish community, at great loss to Spain. However, religious purity did not necessarily follow from intolerance. Jewish culture was too deeply ingrained in public life and it remained a significant influence in Spain long after the Jews were banished.

In effect, this was the society that sent Columbus west in search of the Indies. It was both technological and mercantilistic, driven by a desire for conquest, an unshakable religious zeal, and a powerful battle-tested military.

Mistaken as Columbus was, his arrival in the Americas altered the course of world history and had an immediate and profound effect on all Indian peoples. At their first encounter, the Indians and the Spanish were perplexed and attempted to rationalize each other's existence through their own religious beliefs. After the initial meeting, however, the Spanish were struck by the reality of immutable racial and cultural differences between themselves and the Indian people. From that point forward, a gulf of misunderstandings between Native American people and Euro-Americans followed.

Even before Columbus' fourth and final voyage, other explorers had followed in his wake searching north and south of the Caribbean for a westward passage to India. By 1513 Juan Ponce de León had landed on the Florida peninsula and Vasco Núñez de Balboa had sighted the vast Pacific Ocean. Three years later Juan Díaz de Solís encountered Argentina's Río de la Plata. In 1518 the first Spanish land falls were made in México by Francisco Hernández de Córdoba and Juan de Grijalva.

Finally, in 1521 the Spanish dream of reaching the Far East via a maritime route was realized. That year, Ferdinand Magellan's expedition demonstrated the feasibility of reaching India by sailing west and in the process circumnavigating the world for the first time.

Conquest

Few sagas of world history compare to the conquest of the Americas. Under the terms of the Treaty of Tordesillas of 1494, Pope Alexander VI arbitrarily divided the "new

world" by drawing an imaginary line 260 leagues west of the Cape Verde Islands. All people and land to the west were entrusted to the Spanish, while Brazil and Africa became Portuguese domain. Backed by this ecclesiastical mandate, the Spanish considered their journey to the Americas a personal opportunity for conquest as well as a signal to embark on a religious mission.

The Spaniards reached the Americas with steel and gunpowder and highly advanced and time-tested military strategies. The use of crossbows, cannons, horses, and mastiffs together with the zealous Spanish attitude of invincibility, placed the Indian people at an immediate handicap. With this advantage, the Spanish set out to conquer and subjugate nearly all of the native people in the Americas.

The conquests of the Aztecs and Incas are the most remarkable examples of Spanish will and Indian defeat. In 1519 Hernán Cortés landed in México to begin his sweep of the powerful Aztecs. Benefiting from sheer luck and shrewd wit, Cortés conquered Tenochtitlán in two years and with little more than a handful of men. Following the conquest in 1521, the debilitating effects of smallpox and other European diseases decimated large numbers of the Indian population. In addition, the psychological trauma of defeat was devastating.

In South America, Francisco Pizarro—inspired by the success of Cortés—reached the Incan empire in 1531. Aided by a military advantage and an unfortunate and bitter dispute between two rival Inca heirs, he sealed the Incas' defeat in 1535.

Ease of conquest, the spoils of war, and the discovery of vast amounts of wealth in México and Perú only served to flame the passions of other conquerors, who quickly subjugated the rest of Latin America. Still, in some areas of the Americas, the Spanish were never completely successful in imposing their will over the Native American communities. In México, for example, the Yaquis remained fiercely independent until the twentieth century. In South America, the conquest of the Aymara of the Titicaca Plateau of the Andes was similarly never complete. To this day, the Aymara remain fiercely loyal to their community leaders, native religion, and other cultural values.

However, soon after their initial victories, the Spanish exerted their influence over most of South America, Central America, the Caribbean, and the present southwestern part

of the U.S. In time, they would extend their domain in the Americas from the tip of Tierra del Fuego north to present-day Alaska.

The African in Latin America

Sailors of African ancestry were aboard the first Spanish ships that landed in the Americas. Later, they accompanied Balboa and Pizarro, marched with Cortés in the conquest of México, and participated in the general exploration of both American continents.⁴

However, the majority of African people came to Latin America as a consequence of the nefarious world slave trade. Within a year after the conquest of Cuba in 1511, the first slaves were shipped directly from Africa to the Caribbean Islands. As the colonial labor economy developed and the Indian population declined, the number of slaves grew proportionately.

The slave trade ripped Africans from their homes in West Africa in the most inhumane fashion. Still, they arrived in the Americas steeped with the practical know-how of the various West African cultures. In Latin America, they adapted those cultural skills, excelling in all segments of the colonial economy and social life.

The Spanish prized the Africans not only for their talents and abilities, but also because they were good workers and had acquired immunities to the infectious diseases that decimated the Indian communities. Most significantly, the slaves were not Christians so their enslavement did not much trouble the conscience of the church and the individual slaveowner.

Under these circumstances and for more than 350 years, slave traders imported and sold their human cargo throughout the Spanish colonies. Although most colonies abolished slavery when they gained their independence in the early 1800s, Spain did not officially terminate the importation of slaves to its remaining colonies until 32 years

⁴ Long before the 1490s, Africa had exerted a tremendous influence on the whole of the Iberian Peninsula. In fact, generations of "Hispanic" Africans or Moorish men and women resided in Spain before and after the age of Columbus.

before the Spanish-American War. All told, approximately 3 million Africans were sold in Spanish America.

The preponderance of enslaved Africans was so great among the labor force that slaves lived throughout the countryside and urban centers. Persons of African descent outnumbered all others in Lima and México City during the 1700s, while slaves in the countryside often became superb farmers, horsemen, and herders.

Slavery itself was not a monolithic institution in the Spanish colonies. The legal and social status of persons of African descent varied across Latin America. In México, for example, their social status was higher than that of Indians. In still another case, Africans could purchase an official certificate declaring them legally white. Africans were not passive as slaves; in México they rebelled against their masters as early as 1537, and elsewhere in Latin America, slave revolts were just as commonplace. At times, freed men and women, known as *cimarrones*, organized their own separate communities in open defiance of the Spanish authorities.

THE SPANISH COLONIAL SYSTEM

While the conquest of the Americas was relatively easy, the process of organizing the colonial system was a different matter. The Spanish were not experienced colonizers, so the colonial system developed through trial and error. The immense cultural differences between the Spanish and Indian people, the distance from Spain to the colonies, and the vastness of the colonial empire also made organizing an efficient colonial system exceedingly difficult.

Furthermore, contention for power between the church, the monarch, and the individual Spaniard worked against effective colonial control. The Catholic Church considered the Americas fertile ground for proselytizing, while to the individual Spaniard the colonies provided an excellent opportunity for resuscitating the diminished privileges and rights of the aristocracy. Too often, personal interests often took precedence over the official dictates of state or church. Finally, the monarchy, embryonic and weak as it was, had its hands full trying to assert its own authority in Latin America. To do this, the king imposed a highly legalistic and regulatory code of checks and balances that were often ignored and, when enforced, had the effect of stifling local initiative. In the end, official colonial policy and everyday practice often went their separate ways. For these

reasons, and in spite of the incredible wealth generated by the Americas, Spain never fully grasped the full potential of colonial Latin America.

The toll of an imperfect colonial system was felt immediately by the native population. The Indians were required to pledge fidelity to a new king and to the Spanish. Under the watchful eye of parish priests, religious orders, and the Inquisition, they were also forced to accept a new God and a foreign set of religious values. In addition, the colonial economy was largely extractive and highly labor intensive. Large estates, mines, and textile industries were entirely predicated on Indian labor.

The daily lives of the Indians and their ability to provide for their common welfare were dramatically altered by two highly exploitive and forced labor systems that resembled slavery. These systems, known in México as the *encomienda* and *repartimiento*, were in use in the colonies until the beginning of the 1700s, when they were replaced by debt peonage and a free-wage system.

One consequence of the colonial system, especially the labor systems, was the shocking decline of the Indian population. Not only did epidemic waves of smallpox, typhus, measles, and influenza decimate entire native communities, the brutal demands made by the Spanish took a heavy toll. Within 100 years, little more than 1 million Indian people remained in México and similar declines took place in Central and South America. In the Caribbean, the Indian population was almost completely obliterated in a matter of 40 to 50 years (in Puerto Rico alone the Indian population declined from more than 200,000 in 1508 to 20,000 in 1511). Many Indians did not wait for death but committed suicide rather than serve as laborers. At other times, women aborted their children as the only means of escaping the heavy yoke of colonial labor systems.

Race Mixture—La Raza Cósmica

Odious as it was, the colonial period provided the stage for the incredible racial and cultural fusion between Indian, African, and Iberian people that is without parallel in the areas of North America colonized by non-Spanish Europeans or the Portuguese.

Racial amalgamation proceeded through Indian women. Although admonished by the church not to do so, the Spanish coveted the native female population. While some

scholars have argued that the Spanish had a propensity for the darker-skinned Indian and African women, a more basic explanation is that there were few Caucasian women in the Americas. Throughout the colonial period, less than 10 percent of all Spanish colonists were female. Among the African slave population, the ratio of men to women was two to one. This preponderance of Spanish and African men in colonial Latin America subjected countless Indian women to forced as well as consensual relations.

Racial mixing among Indians, Europeans, and Africans, and their descendants was so rapid that within two generations the colonial population consisted of a myriad of interracial types. In an attempt to categorize all persons, the Spanish developed a nomenclature of groupings including *mestizo* (union of Spaniard and Indian), *afromestizo* (union of African and Mestizo), *mulatto* (union of African and Spaniard), and others. The common racial stock among the colonial population, however, was Indian.

Even today, almost all Latin American nationalities have some degree of Native American ancestry. Some countries, like Bolivia, Ecuador, and Perú, are predominantly Indian. Others, like Argentina, are markedly more European. In this regard, it is important to consider that many millions of Hispanics in the U.S. are likewise of Indian ancestry. For example, even in Puerto Rico, where Indians disappeared almost entirely, many Puerto Ricans have some degree of Native American ancestry. Racially speaking, Mexican-Americans are also predominantly . . . of Indian descent. One Native American historian has written:

. . .the greatest reservoir of Native American ancestry in the U.S. is not contained within the group usually referred to as "Indians," but among the....Mexican-Americans and so-called Spanish-Americans. A high percentage of the latter are of relatively unmixed native ancestry, and yet it is maintained that they are not "Indians" (although many of them were "Indians in México-Taraumaras, Yaquis, Tepehuanes, etc.). As a matter of fact, many states legally classify Mexican-Americans as "White," and the federal census does not enumerate them as Indians.

No group gave more to Latin America and received less in return than Indian people. Their blood runs through the veins of most Latin Americans and Hispanics and their values strongly influenced Latino psychology. They introduced thousands of words for unknown items and traditions to the Spanish language. Their agricultural skills and technology changed the world. (In food stuffs alone, the Indian contribution more than doubled the world's known food supply in the age of Columbus.) Their greatest loss, on

the other hand, was being deprived of their culture and sacred land without adequate compensation.

Africans likewise contributed greatly to the racial and cultural heritage of Latin America. Even today, the Negroid features of the first Africans in the Americas are clearly discernible among the people of Veracruz, México, Cuba, Panamá, and other parts of South America. African words, proverbs, riddles, and tales further influenced and eventually transformed the Spanish language and folklore of Latinos. Africa, for example, bestowed various percussion instruments as well as the dance forms and rhythms that characterize the merengue, samba, and mambo.

As colonizers, the Spanish provided the matrix for Latin American culture. The Catholic religion, the Spanish language, the centrality of the family as a social unit, and other important facets of Spain's culture provided a uniquely Latin American way of life. Powerful legal and political institutions—together with various systems of taxation, farming, ranching, transportation, and mining—were also brought to the Americas. In short, Spain also bequeathed much to the Americas.

Asians are another group that makes up the cultural and racial diversity of Latinos. For over 300 years, the Philippine Islands were considered part of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, which was centered in México. As early as the 1570s, a flourishing Manila-to-America trade system brought a substantial number of Asian people, mainly Filipinos and Chinese, to the western ports of Latin America and the Caribbean. Arriving aboard China galleons, *naos de la China*, Filipinos and Chinese were especially prevalent in western México, Perú, Cuba, and Puerto Rico.

Chinese laborers, called coolies, were also brought to the Caribbean and other parts of Latin America well ahead of large-scale Asian immigration to the United States. The process that brought these Asian workers to Latin America was simple and direct. First, Chinese men entered into labor contracts in their homeland. Once obligated, the men were sequestered by labor agents operating in Hong Kong and Macao and sent to Latin America.

Labor agents in Macao or Hong Kong developed a lucrative business shipping Chinese laborers to Latin America at between seven and ten dollars for each worker. In the years between 1847 and 1874, Cuba, Chile, and Perú received approximately 250,000

to 500,000 laborers from Amoy, Hong Kong, Canton, and Macao. In 1864 alone, Macao shipped 4,479 contracted laborers to Cuba and 6,243 to Perú. The following year, 5,207 Chinese arrived in Cuba and 8,417 in Perú.

In Cuba the worker's contracts for eight or more years of service were auctioned to employers. Once a laborer's contract was purchased, a Chinese man entered a life of near slavery. In Cuba, employers beat their laborers to extract more work, sometimes killing them. At other times, the Chinese hanged themselves or jumped in wells and boiling sugar cauldrons as the only means of escaping a life of oppression.

Asians, however, did more than supply labor. They added their own ingredient to the culture and racial composition of Latin America. In México, Acapulco became the hub of connections to China and Manila. Here, Chinese silk embroidery inspired the *China poblana* dress, considered part of México's national culture. Ships also brought spices, teak, wax, and porcelains to Latin America. The porcelains, for example, represented the styles produced by skilled Chinese artists of the Ming and Ching dynasties and are still made by Mexican artisans. In this and other ways, the Filipino and Chinese added to the fusion of humanity that is Latin America.

This synergistic mix of peoples and cultures was a fortunate circumstance of the otherwise onerous colonial social system. In the vision of Mexican philosopher José Vasconcelos, this unprecedented racial mixture would produce a superior *raza cósmica*, or a "cosmic race" of Latin Americans. Although the idea was an abstraction, the concept of a cosmic race does reflect the distinctive reality of Latin Americans—a triumvirate family of races and cultures. Vasconcelos was not far from the mark because European visitors to Latin America during the eighteenth century noted the unmistakable mixture of people. Coming from Caucasian societies, they were struck by the people's rich skin tones and the kaleidoscope of color in the dress and lifestyles of the populace. This synergism was reflected in all aspects of public life. By the end of the colonial period, it was difficult to identify any activity in Latin America where all racial groups did not participate or had not made a contribution.

This is not to suggest that the colonial system was idyllic. Except for the Spanish, especially the peninsular born, life was hard in every respect. Everywhere in the colonies, white skin was the color of social, economic, and political privilege. This elitist

entitlement based on pigmentation and nativity was one of the catalysts that ignited Latin America's struggle for independence at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Excluding Haiti, which declared its independence from France in 1804, the Latin American colonies revolted from Spain in the period between 1810 and 1824. In this short time span, Miguel Hidalgo, Simon Bolívar, and José de San Martín initiated the revolution in México, Central America, and South America. The last Spanish garrison surrendered at Callao, Perú, in 1824. Thereafter, Latin America was essentially free from Spanish rule.

In the end, the wars of liberation were also elitist in nature. The masses had gained little in their struggle, and with few exceptions independence meant a mere transfer of power from Spain to a new autocracy. Worse yet, the different independence movements did little to settle questions concerning the new form of government, personal liberty, freedom, and civil rights. Left unresolved, these issues consumed the energies and resources of the new republics for the next 50 years or more. For these reasons and for the greater share of the 1800s, protracted civil wars swept the new republics during their critical years of nation building. At times, different governments simultaneously claimed to be the legitimate representative of the people. At other times, duly elected presidents barely occupied the presidential chair before they were toppled from power. In México, one person - Santa Anna, dominated politics from 1829 to 1855. He headed the nation nine different times, sometimes as a conservative or liberal, and when he pleased as a dictator.

The pattern of political instability that plagued many of the nascent republics took many years to sort out. Some nations like México oscillated between conservative and liberal governments, while other republics such as Argentina experienced civil strife between the politics of the interior and the coast. The inability to resolve these important national issues took its toll on the human condition. It also left an indelible stamp on the style of Latin American politics.

When seen from the perspective of U.S. political history, Latin Americans are too often judged as incapable of self-government, social democracy, and economic self-sufficiency. In truth, Latin Americans themselves were not the only culprits. Colonial Latin America was ill prepared to deal with the complexities of independence. Whether espoused by liberal or conservative governments, democracy and liberty were

abstractions that had meant little to the masses. More often than not, these ideals were little more than pretenses for the exploitation of the many by a few.

Unable to place their houses in order, the various Latin American republics fell victim to a form of neo-colonialism at the hands of the more economically advanced and better organized U.S. and the nations of Europe. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth, world capitalism adapted well with the remaining structural institutions of colonialism to produce a form of neo-colonialism.

As the twentieth century began, Latin America continued to lurch from one political crisis to another and plunged deeper into foreign economic dependency. While economic growth was evident in extractive industries and trade, it was largely a facade that obscured the worsening social and political human condition in Latin America.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LATINOS IN THE U.S.

Due to the proximity of the two areas, Latin America and the U.S. have much in common. Their border does not separate but links them. They share a common historical background—especially, the U.S., México, and some Caribbean nations.

The convergence of today's Latin America and the U.S. began during the Spanish colonial period. As part of its colonial structure, Spain established several viceroyalties in the Americas. The viceroyalty of New Spain is of particular importance because it included much of what is now the U.S. Centered in México, it encompassed the Caribbean Islands, extending south into Panama and north into what is now the southern part of the U.S. Spanish claims to such a vast territory north of present-day México and Cuba resulted from a south-to-north fan of exploration and settlement in the southeastern and southwestern U.S.

In the early years, Spanish explorations were fueled as much by fanciful and romantic tales as by the need to explore, conquer, and understand the "New World." More often than not, a search for utopian civilizations and the pursuit of wealth encouraged expeditions from the Caribbean to Florida and the greater southeastern United States.

Juan Ponce de León, Lucas Vázquez de Ayllón, Pánfilo de Narváez, and Hernando De Soto stand out among the most well-known of these early explorers. Yet while Spanish

officials were in command, the explorations themselves were generally made possible through a combined effort of many unknown Indian, African, and *mestizo* crews.

Ponce de León, who had accompanied Columbus in 1493, was the first Spanish explorer to land in the U.S. He sailed from Puerto Rico in March 1507 and anchored one month later on the coast of Florida. He named the peninsula in observance of *Pascua Florida* (Easter) and the tropical beauty of the area. Although Ponce de León failed to find any signs of tangible wealth, he was the first European who charted the Bahamas Channel, an important route used thereafter by all ships sailing from the Caribbean to Spain.

A few years later, in 1526, Ayllón with six ships and 500 men and women left the Island of Española (Dominican Republic) and ventured as far north as present-day South and North Carolina. Near the Pedee River, Ayllón founded the settlement of San Miguel de Guadalupe, the first recorded non-Indian settlement in the U.S.

In 1528, Narváez, along with nearly 400 men, landed near Tampa Bay, Florida. In a twist of fate, the ships that brought Narváez returned to Cuba, leaving him and his men stranded in Florida. Here began one of the most astounding epics of American history as Narváez and his castaways headed due west in hopes of reaching México.

Twelve years later, De Soto, a veteran of military service in Nicaragua, steered his ships toward Ferriday, Louisiana. For the next three years he engaged in a restless pursuit of the mythical "Cale," a land reputed to have much gold and to be blessed with endless summers. In his search, De Soto's men were the first Europeans to explore the southeastern U.S., including Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

In the Southwest, a similar process of exploration unfolded many years before there was a United States. These excursions were triggered by similar stories about fabulous civilizations, mythical lands, and exotic people. The most persistent of these tales was a legend describing the Seven Golden Cities of Cibola. Located inland from the Pacific, these jeweled cities were rumored to have great stores of the precious metal. Incredible as it seemed, the story was quite logical to the Spanish, especially after they found large amounts of gold and silver among the Aztec people. Once these stories circulated, they became quite real and lured expeditions into the Southwest.

Francisco Vázquez de Coronado was the first person to lead an organized search for the "gilded heaven." Although distant from Florida, Coronado's foray into the Southwest was directly connected to the Narváez expedition of 1528. In 1536 four surviving members of Pánfilo Narváez's expedition had reached México City. They were the last survivors of the men who had disembarked and then been inadvertently left behind in Florida. Not knowing where they were, they attempted to reach México by sailing makeshift rafts and walking along the southeastern Gulf Coast of the U.S. By the time they reached Galveston, Texas, in September of 1528, only 60 members of the crew had survived. By the following spring 15 remained, and in the end only 4 were alive: Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, treasurer to Narváez; Estevan, of African descent; and two others. After spending years among the Indian people in Texas, the four were able to reach Culiacán, Sinaloa, México in 1536.

In México, the survivors never tired of repeating first-hand accounts of survival and incredible perseverance in the lands north of México. When queried about the existence of fabulous kingdoms, the men substantiated the rumors and provided detailed accounts of "The Seven Cities of Cíbola." Confident of their veracity, the viceroy of México selected Francisco Coronado to search for the distant cities.

With determination to succeed in his quest, Coronado dispatched a surveillance party guided by Esteban and directed by Marcos de Niza, a Franciscan friar. In present-day New México, Fray Marcos apparently caught a glimpse of an outlying Zuni Indian village while it was bathed in the golden rays of the setting sun. This sight was sufficient to convince the advance party that they had found the Seven Cities of Cíbola.

Before he left, Coronado had ordered Fray Marcos to send a cross to signal the main party if he should happen upon the mythical cities. If the cities were fair or average in wealth, Fray Marcos was to dispatch a courier with a "small cross." If the discoveries were equal to those found among the Aztecs, he was to forward "a cross the size of two hands." Should the treasure be larger, Fray Marcos was instructed to use his own discretion and return "an appropriate signal."

When several Indians arrived carrying a cross the size of a man, Coronado's main party in México sensed an incredible opportunity. Buoyed with confidence, Francisco Vázquez de Coronado, 336 Spaniards, and several hundred Indians and other enslaved

people left México in 1540 to make good on their dream. Their search for the golden cities took Coronado into New México, Arizona, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas; but after two years of fruitless examination of the Southwest, Coronado returned totally disheartened.

Like Columbus and other explorers before him, Coronado had little to report but the vastness of the land and the existence of enormous herds of "shaggy cows." The only gold and silver they brought back to México was the ornamentation of their swords, knives, and saddles.

In many respects, Coronado and De Soto's movement through the southern belt of the U.S. was alarming to native people. At one point, for example, Coronado approaching from the west and De Soto coming from the east were within two hundred miles of each other in Texas. Under these circumstances, the native people must have experienced a high degree of anxiety from the imposing presence of strangers in their midst.

These Spanish expeditions were no ordinary intrusions, for the church took part in them in order to introduce Catholic beliefs and Spanish values to the Indian communities. When the native population resisted the proselytizing efforts of the church, the troops used force to impose the dictates of Spanish secular and religious authority. At other times, the Spanish used more deliberate measures like enslavement to punish the more recalcitrant individuals.

On the other hand, Indians were very conscious of their own strengths. For example, they soon realized that the authority and power of the men from México was suspect in Indian territory. Over time, the Native Americans also became increasingly resentful of ongoing exploitation and even more doubtful of the benefits of Christianity. When this happened, entire communities, like the Pueblo Indians, rebelled against all forms of Spanish authority.

Examined from still another perspective, these sixteenth-century treks north from México and the Caribbean established the Hispanic presence in the U.S. years ahead of other Europeans. In time, the exploratory probes were followed by more constructive attempts to settle and occupy the land. In the process the Spanish introduced many new elements into the American Southwest, but they also discovered that many aspects of Native American life were well suited to the environment. As had occurred in México,

the combined resources, energies, and creativity of Spaniards, *mestizos*, and Mexican and Southwestern Indians were critical at all levels and stages of the new lands' development.

It was an Hispanic amalgam of Mexican, Indian, Spanish, and African people that introduced and developed the livestock industry of today's U.S. Southwest. Latinos systematically introduced the first breeds of cattle, horses, sheep, swine, and domesticated fowl in the Americas. They brought the customs and practices associated with the various ranching cultures from Africa, Spain, and México into the southwestern U.S. and beyond.

Hundreds of years before the United States took over the region in 1848, sheep and cattle were driven to distant markets outside the Hispanic Southwest. Enroute and upon arrival at their destination, other Euro-Americans borrowed and sometimes modified the technology, organization, and vernacular associated with the various livestock enterprises. In some cases, non-Hispanics adopted entire systems.

By the time of the U.S. Civil War, the "American cowboy—essentially Mexican in dress, equipment, method of operation, and vernacular—appeared throughout most of the western U.S. Even after the U.S. annexed the Southwest, the livestock industries remained Hispanic in design.

The sheep industry is a case in point. At first, Hispanics introduced the churro breed—an animal well suited to the semi-arid environment—to the Southwest. Years later, they brought the merino, a superior wool-producing animal to the region. This breed permitted ranchers to better utilize the vast areas of arid and sandy terrain that characterizes much of the region. The developing sheep ranches led to appropriate range management systems, which remain in use today.

For example, under the Hispanic system, the rights of individual ranchers grazing their animals over large areas of open range were carefully protected. A cooperative assembly of owners, called *ganaderos*, fixed and enforced the grazing rights of each member rancher. They were the cornerstone of the rights system that required each rancher to hire a sufficient number of herders: usually one per 2,000 sheep. In turn, the herders were supervised by a mounted range rider who answered to the range boss. Next came the ranch owner, and finally the cooperative.

When non-Hispanics became sheep ranchers, they adopted the system, personnel included, in its entirety. Even today, Basque and Mexican herders, whose forefathers designed the U.S. system hundreds of years ago, are recruited from abroad for employment in the sheep industry throughout the western United States.

Hispanics also developed the first non-Indian farming economies in this country. They introduced the first modern crops and implements for cultivation—the first hoes, spades, plows, clamps, pliers, files, and wheels used in this part of the nation. The first varieties of wheat cultivated from California to Colorado and as far north as Oregon came from México by way of Spain. México also introduced alfalfa, flax seed, and an open-ball cotton culture that gradually spread throughout the southeastern United States. Likewise, Hispanics brought sugar cane culture to Louisiana and constructed the first sugar refinery in the area. Several varieties of fruit were among the many crops that arrived with the early Hispanic farmers. These included peaches, apples, plums, citrus, cherries, olives, dates, strawberries, and pomegranates. One historian has gone so far as to write, "there was no product contributed to agriculture in the U.S. by the English that the Spanish had not planted earlier."

Hispanics modified the ancient Native American irrigation systems of the Southwest. By the time that Euro-Americans arrived, Mexican people had developed an efficient method of irrigating farm land. To conserve precious water, Mexicans first carefully prepared and leveled the land. Then the fields were blocked into squares and outlined with mounds of dirt. Irrigators carefully flooded each square with water until it ran into the adjacent part of the field, repeating the process until the entire field was thoroughly saturated with water. This system of irrigation is still in use from California to Texas and is regarded as the "Mexican System."

Aware of the need for water in settling the Southwest, Hispanics also developed the first wells to bring water to the surface. Above all, a fair and equitable method of allocating natural water rights to farmers was essential. This was developed through a system of public control of all water resources.

These early Spanish-speaking farmers were keenly aware of the need to regulate farm size and water rights. The basic individual land unit was several times the size of homesteads in the Ohio Valley or the Midwest. The practicality of this larger homestead

was demonstrated when English-speaking farmers adopted it because it was more suitable than smaller farms in the vast arid environment of the Southwest.

Expanded land rights were central to the early Hispanic farming economy. For example, when Texas was still part of México, land laws stipulated that if an honest farmer was unable to pay his debts, no creditor could garnish his land, house, wagon, mules, tools, or anything else that would prevent him from working his homestead. When Texas became independent, these "Mexican" regulations were adopted by the Texas constitution of 1836 and later used in similar Homestead and Preemption laws across the western U.S.

Mexican, Chilean, Peruvian, and other Hispanic people likewise brought over 300 years of mining experience to the western United States. When gold was discovered in California in 1848, Hispanics introduced valuable mining technologies, including the "batea," dry-wash method, and stamp mills, to the mining economies. These techniques had an important bearing on the rapid development of the mining economy and the "frontier" in California and other parts of the West. In addition, mining laws detailing essential mineral rights for a largely transient and volatile mining population can be credited to Hispanic pioneers of the Southwest.

The work of Hispanic pioneers in the labor-intensive silver and copper mines of Arizona, New México, and Colorado must also be acknowledged. When Euro-Americans arrived in southern Arizona, they found a long tradition of mining tied to the Mexican heritage of the population of Tubac and Morenci, Arizona. In addition to their knowledge, the local Latino communities provided much needed labor. One historian of Arizona has noted that Hispanics were critically important, both for their work and their mining expertise:

Even if other labor could have been obtained, the managers would have relied largely on Mexican workers. The Mexican people were adapted to this region and knew many practical applications of the resources of the Arizona-Sonoran environment. There were always some hands who were familiar with silver ores...and could prepare and extract them by simple methods where operators unaccustomed to this zone would have been at a loss without machinery and elaborate equipment.

When Indian trails did not meet the needs of the economic infrastructure, Hispanics broke new avenues of transportation and communication through the rugged, mountainous, and desert-like terrain. Already by the time of the American Revolution,

an overland trail linked what is now Tubac, Arizona, to San Gabriel, California. One hundred years later, the Southern Pacific Railroad Company laid track, following much of the exact route of the former Mexican transportation road. Latinos explored and established similar arteries throughout much of the Southwest. These became the roads for the famous freight wagons called *carros del Rey* or "King's Wagons" that carried supplies from the Southwest to as far north as St Louis, Missouri.

Where roads were lacking, the Mexican men used the mule pack system of transportation to move merchandise and supplies between towns, deliver the mail, and provision isolated military outposts and outlying communities. In fact, Mexicans operated mule pack trains throughout the southwestern and western states extending as far north as British Columbia. They supplied the most remote communities with every kind of merchandise imaginable. For the time, mule trains represented the most efficient system of land transportation.

Hispanic contributions extended beyond the economic infrastructure and set the pattern of life and culture of the Southwest. They copied and improved on the Native American system of puddling adobe by introducing wooden molds to produce uniform bricks. Ovens were also constructed to fire and harden the adobe. With identical-size bricks, masons were able to handle the adobe with ease and construct venerable buildings with walls thirty to forty inches thick. They added stairs, fireplaces, doors with raised sills, and windows set high in the walls to provide security, use passive solar energy, and take into account other ecological factors. Unpretentious in style but practical, these early buildings were a unique blend of Spanish and Indian architectural elements.

From all evidence, well-developed Hispanic municipalities were an early Southwest institution. As the early towns in that region evolved from initial settlements, each contained a plaza surrounded with arcades for commercial use. Four major streets ran at right angles from each side of the plaza area to join other streets laid out in a predictable gridiron or checkerboard fashion throughout the remainder of the town. Knowing of this common municipal design, a stranger was never disoriented in a Mexican town.

Individual building sites were chosen with the same critical eye. The church was always placed on the east side of the plaza, and municipal or government buildings were designated for the west side. Mexican town planners also incorporated environmental

factors in their plans. On navigable rivers, for example, towns were established on the northern bank and all trades and businesses spewing filth or nauseous odors were encouraged to locate on the opposite bank and downriver from the town.

These standards were not always followed, but most municipalities adopted them. Even today, more recent Southwestern communities, and some in the Midwest, reflect the "Mexican pattern" of church on the east and city hall on the west side of town.

Early Hispanic life centered around a practical culture developed according to the needs of the people residing in the Southwest. The most obvious was the Spanish language. Castilian became interlaced with Indian terms borrowed from the native people of México as well as those in the Southwest. This common language, albeit not the King's Spanish, left an indelible and descriptive stamp on virtually thousands of place-names in the region—buildings, churches, missions, streets, towns, cities, counties, states, mountains, valleys, rivers, and bays, from Texas and California to the Pacific Northwest and Alaska.

In New México, for example, rudimentary Spanish is all that is necessary to comprehend the historical and spiritual significance of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains. The same is true of Sucia or Patos Island in the Pacific Northwest.

Language does not tell the whole story about the early Mexican-Hispanic heritage. Troubadours came with Juan Oñate's expedition to the Southwest in 1598. From that year forward, the Spanish ballad and epic poem changed, eventually developing into the *corrido*, which is a genre of Mexican-American and English "Western" music of the West. The Mexican-American musical repertoire, however, goes far beyond ballads.

Songs, the most lyrical and subjective manifestation of the experiences of any people and of central importance in the everyday life of the Mexican population of the Southwest, required instruments. Since woods suitable for making guitars were not available in the region, Mexican-Hispanics brought the guitar and other stringed instruments directly from México. Not surprisingly, instruments and music teachers in the early-day Southwest were abundant. New México, for example, boasted its first musical organ in the 1600s. By contrast, Boston, Massachusetts, known for its cultural eloquence, claims to have had an organ in 1713—a century after the instrument had been in use in New México.

The earliest non-Indian written literature and drama performed in the U.S. also developed in the Southwest. Captain Gaspar de Villagra, a soldier who accompanied the Oñate party, composed epic verses about the expedition's exploits. Religious dramas, and a large number of secular plays were also performed in many towns throughout the region. Once prolific, these compositions were forgotten over time. In the 1930s a manuscript of a play dated in 1619 was discovered in the manuscripts collection at the University of Texas. This and other examples serve as testimony of the centuries-old Hispanic literary tradition in the U.S.

Other cultural evidence suggests that many Western U.S. values and mannerisms were derived from the early Mexican background. "Western hospitality," for one, is rooted in the Mexican custom of opening one's home to weary travelers. In the harsh and often remote environment of the Southwest, counting on one's neighbor was a practical value held dear by Mexican people.

Considering all the contributions Hispanics made, it is clear that they have played no small part in the overall development of the U.S. Seen in this light, the Hispanic/Euro-American dichotomy of communities and cultures that is drawn in some parts of the southwestern U.S. is quite artificial. In reality, Hispanics are no less American and should be considered as equal players in the overall course of U.S. history.

In a society where being "first" counts for much, Hispanics can claim credit for many "firsts." Hispanics developed or introduced the first town and state capital, the earliest non-Indian residence, music, drama, books, and other cultural elements in the U.S. In spite of this and all too often, U.S. history is portrayed as an east-to-west or north-to-south phenomenon that ignores the Hispanic experience and contributions.

THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN WAR

For centuries, Hispanics lived in a practical yet dynamic culture in the American Southwest. Then in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, cataclysmic changes developed as the country expanded westward toward the Mexican borderlands. In less than four decades, the U.S. wrested the Southwest region from México. In this manner, the early Latino inhabitants of the Southwest were incorporated

into the U.S. Against this background, it is well to point out that Hispanics did not come to the U.S.—the U.S. came to them.

In the first decades of the 1800s, the U.S. also gradually began to exert its influence in Latin American affairs. In 1823 the U.S. issued the Monroe Doctrine stating that the American continents were closed to future European colonization. It warned Europe that any disregard of the doctrine would be tantamount to committing an unfriendly act against the U.S. Although the doctrine was largely overlooked by European powers, it does serve to illustrate the rising hegemony of the U.S. over Latin America.

Even as the U.S. began to extend its interests into Latin America, the trials of emerging nationhood proved critical for many countries, particularly México. Between 1836 and 1848, a weak Mexican nation lost approximately 250,000 citizens of Mexican and Indian ancestry and nearly one-half of its national territory to the U.S. This resulted from the clash of México and the U.S. during the Texas War of 1836 and the Mexican-American War of 1846.

In the years between the war of independence and the 1800s, the U.S. developed an unshakable confidence in its political institutions, economy, and civic culture. This faith led many U.S. citizens to develop a feeling of inherent superiority over México and its people. By the 1830s, the doctrine of "manifest destiny" convinced Americans that it was their duty to take the Mexican borderlands and impose U.S. culture and political control.

The pressure to wrest control of México's borderlands intensified in the early 1830s and 1840s. President Polk, for one, made no secret of his desire to expand the western border to the Pacific. He was not alone. Ralph Waldo Emerson was an equally strong proponent of manifest destiny and expansionism. In addition, former President John Quincy Adams and Charles Wilkes were among many others who advocated taking the Mexican lands.

The conflict between the two countries began when U.S. immigrants in the Mexican territory of Texas declared their independence from México in 1836. Within a matter of months, the Texas revolutionary army defeated México's military and Texas became independent.

Inasmuch as Anglo-Texans rationalized their independence as a fundamental right and desire for liberty and democracy, the constitution of the Lone Star Republic left little doubt that these ideals were largely limited to Anglo-Americans. In a short time, Mexican descendants of earlier Texas pioneers found themselves little more than strangers in what was once their own land.

However, the Texas revolt was only a harbinger of things to come. In the years between 1836 and 1846, the U.S. used offers of purchase, provocation, and then intimidation to take the remainder of the Mexican borderlands extending from Texas to California. At one point, the U.S. tendered approximately \$25 million for California alone. Another preliminary maneuver to gain the territories came in the form of claims submitted on behalf of U.S. citizens over the loss of property during the Texas War. As a result of these claims, México was required to pay nearly \$3 million in retribution—this in addition to suffering the loss of Texas.

Even so, by 1845 President Polk and U.S. military commanders urged war with México as the only means to get the remainder of the Southwest. President Polk's exasperation over the failure to goad México into war is evident from his diary. On May 6, 1846, he wrote:

I stated to the Cabinet that up to this time, as we knew, we had heard of no open aggression by the Mexican army, but that the danger was imminent that such acts would be committed. I said that in my opinion we had ample cause of war, and that it was impossible that we could stand in status quo, or that I could remain silent much longer.

Two months later, President Polk ordered General Zachary Taylor to move his troops into a part of southern Texas near the Rio Grande River that was claimed by both countries. In December of that year, the U.S. annexed Texas over the objection of the Mexican government. As 1845 ended, however, the two nations were still at peace.

In May of 1846, President Polk again ordered the U.S. army south to the Rio Grande River. At that point, the Mexican army attacked and war between the two nations began. As soon as the news of the start of hostilities reached the President, the secretary of state addressed Congress to deliver the declaration of war against México.

We go to war with México for the purpose of conquering an honorable and just peace. Whilst we intend to prosecute the war with vigor, both by land

and sea, we shall bear the olive branch in one hand and the sword in the other. Whenever she will accept the former, we shall sheath the latter.

The Mexican-American War of 1846 lasted two years. One year after it began, victory for the U.S. was certain. In May of 1847, negotiations for peace commenced and on February 2, 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo brought an end to the war.

Under the terms of the treaty, and following Senate ratification, México lost nearly one half of its national territory. This included Texas, New México, Arizona, California, and parts of Colorado, for which the U.S. agreed to pay \$15 million. In addition, the U.S. canceled nearly \$3 million in claims that the U.S. alleged México owed from the Texas War of 1836.

Approximately 250,000 Mexican and Indian citizens of México were left in what was now the U.S. Under the terms of the treaty, they were given one year to decide if they wanted to become U.S. citizens or be repatriated to México. If they remained, they were promised full civil, political, and legal rights enjoyed by other citizens under the constitution of the U.S.

Yet, none of the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo were fully upheld. This treaty, intended to protect the former citizens of México, was at best a paper agreement of promises to keep. More importantly, the Mexican community became Mexican-American overnight.

For centuries, they had developed and enjoyed life in a well-defined Mexican-centered economy and social and political system in the "American Southwest." Following the war, "settlers" from the eastern part of the U.S. converged on these territories. For many of them, the Mexican-American War was an affirmation of the truth of Manifest Destiny and the inherent inferiority of Mexican-Americans. For this reason, the years between 1848 and 1900 were critical in shaping the future of Mexican heritage for Hispanics in the U.S.

In places like California or Texas—in fact throughout most of the Southwest—Mexican-Americans were subordinated into a second-class type of U.S. citizenship. The process of social, political, and economic transformation of the former Mexican community happened in a relatively short span of years. Through chicanery, extra-legal means, and

violence, Mexican-Americans were dispossessed of their land and economic power and prevented from effective participation in a new U.S.-centered socio-economic and political order.

Mexican-Americans were also affected by other events beyond their control. The gold rush to California saw a floodtide of non-Hispanics who quickly dominated the state. The Colorado and Nevada areas likewise passed quickly to Anglo control and became states. Of the former Mexican territories, only New México and Arizona remained firmly under Mexican-American control. Here statehood was delayed until the 1900s when Anglos outnumbered Hispanics.

With the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ignored, the former Mexican citizens fared no better under the various state constitutions and legislatures. They were forced to prove titles to their land and were subjected to discriminatory taxes, making it almost certain that their property and other sources of livelihood would be acquired by non-Mexicans. Hispanics, for example, were deprived of their right to mine in many mining districts. As a direct legacy of the Mexican-American War, Anglos often seized Mexican-American mining claims.

Latinos were repressed in other ways. The official use of English and Spanish, a service vital to Hispanic communities, was dropped by state legislatures. Such things as bilingual education, publication of state laws, and official announcements were available to Hispanics until the 1870s. Thereafter, Mexican-Americans were deprived of their constitutional and treaty rights and subjected to discriminatory monolingual state ordinances.

In some communities they were required to carry passes to walk on public streets after certain hours. In other towns, "anti-greaser" ordinances were passed. When Hispanics attempted to assert their own rights, heightened interracial violence and bitterness ensued between them and Euro-Americans.

The decades after the Mexican-American War were significant because they set the stage for relations between Latinos and non-Latinos in the Southwest in the decades to come. Moreover, the pattern of discrimination against Hispanics in the Southwest between 1848 and the turn of the century was important because these practices were transferred to other regions of the U.S. In short, Mexican-Americans, once pioneers in

the Southwest, became a colonized community in their own lands during the last half of the nineteenth century.

HISPANICS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Mexican-Americans

In the last decades of the 1800s, an increasing Anglo-American influx into the American Southwest altered the economic, social, and political structures of the region. By the beginning of the 1900s, the area started to change from an undeveloped and rural area to a region with a complex commercial and industrial economy. In the next two decades, increasing economic development in the Southwest, coupled with events in México, boosted a different interaction between México and the U.S. This expanded relationship had a serious and lasting impact on Mexican-Americans. During this time, millions of Mexicans immigrated to the U.S. in three separate population movements.

The first important emigration to the U.S. developed between 1900 and the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution of 1910. The second occurred from 1910 until the beginning of the Great Depression in 1930. The third wave of immigrants arrived after World War II. These immigrants underscored the earlier Mexican presence in the U.S. and established the matrix for twentieth-century Mexican-American communities.

Between 1900 and the 1920s, an oppressive dictatorship, followed by a protracted, violent, and destructive social revolution, gripped the Mexican Republic. When the civil strife finally ended in 1927, nearly one-tenth of the Mexican population had been forced to flee to the United States.

Even as México was in chaos, the southwestern part of the U.S. grew dramatically through a series of federal initiatives that accelerated railroad, irrigation, and agricultural development. This economic growth was further stimulated by an expanding market demand for western agricultural and mineral products from eastern cities like New York and Chicago. World War I also quickened the pace of commercial agricultural development, changing the Southwest from a minor producer of fresh fruits and vegetables to a supplier of over 40 percent of the nation's consumption. In addition to foodstuffs, the production of fiber and minerals was particularly significant to the

expanding national economy. This large-scale regional economic development produced a labor market that absorbed all of the immigrant workers that México could supply and more.

During this time, the traditional Mexican and Mexican-American lifestyle in the Southwest underwent considerable alteration. Families and whole communities felt the effects of the changing socio-economic structure in México and the U.S. Mexican immigrants had to reorient themselves to life in the U.S., and Mexican-American communities were affected by expanding large-scale economic development and changing government policies regarding the use of public lands.

For example, Mexican-American land owners were unable to hold on to their land due to rising land values and increasing taxation. Through the Forest Reserve Act and the Taylor Grazing Act of 1891, entire villages were also stripped of their customary means of sustaining traditional pastoral life patterns. In consequence, many joined the expanding migratory labor routes out from the Southwest to northern and Midwestern states. Others moved permanently to urban areas or to other states altogether.

Economic development led to a corresponding and critical need for farm workers, railroad laborers, and skilled employees. It came as Congress effectively restricted most southern and eastern European immigrants and all Asian immigrant labor from entering the U.S. during the early 1920s. To compensate for the loss of these traditional sources of labor, employers began to systematically recruit immigrants from the various Mexican provinces.

Well ahead of World War I, labor agents recruited Mexican immigrant families for jobs in the Southwest but also for jobs in Wyoming, Idaho, Illinois, and Ohio. This Mexican work force took a variety of jobs extending from agriculture and railroad construction to work in the copper mines of Arizona, the iron foundries of the upper Midwest, the automobile factories in Detroit, and the coal mines of Appalachia. By the 1920s Mexican labor had become the mainstay of many industries in and out of the Southwest.

Until 1917 there were no laws to regulate entry from México or to protect the rights of these immigrants. Due to the powerful influence of employers who saw immigrants as a cheap and plentiful source of labor, the border between México and the United States remained open to all emigrants. In the U.S, employers blatantly exploited Mexican

immigrants and Mexican-Americans alike. These groups were paid the lowest wages, kept in the lowest and most hazardous jobs, and forced to work and live under the worst of conditions.

In time and in order to develop a permanent labor force, employers began to encourage immigrants and migrants to develop their own communities outside of the Southwest. These early enclaves became the origin of today's large Mexican-American communities, stretching from the San Joaquín Valley in California; north to Mount Vernon, Washington; and Pocatello, Idaho; then east to Silvis, Illinois; and the Great Lakes Region.

Just as the outward ripples of Mexican immigration and Mexican-American migration were arriving to the areas east of the Mississippi and northward near the Canadian border, the flow was stymied by the Great Depression. Mexican immigration, which had expanded Mexican-American communities in the U.S. for nearly two decades, stopped. The severity of the depression hit these communities hard. Like other workers in these years, many Mexican-Americans lost their jobs. Unlike others, however, they experienced great difficulty in obtaining federal assistance because they were regarded as "undeserving foreigners."

Some states turned back Mexicans and Mexican-Americans at border crossings under the guise of "keeping out" public charges. Other states passed laws to prohibit the employment of Mexican and Mexican-American "aliens" on public-works jobs. Widespread anti-Mexican hysteria sometimes gripped entire communities, as employers threw up "Only White Labor Employed" signs. As the Depression worsened and jobs became increasingly scarce, county, state, and federal officials began an aggressive and indiscriminate drive to deport Hispanics of Mexican heritage back to México. Just as quickly, employers dismissed their "Mexican" workers. The Ford Motor Company alone sent back 3,000. All told, over one-half million persons were persuaded or forced to return to México between 1930 and 1939. In the haste of deportation, the constitutional rights of thousands of American citizens of Mexican descent were grossly violated when they too were returned. This unpardonable event, which President Hoover and various state governments condoned, was a replay of deportation proceedings against persons of Mexican heritage that occurred during the recession of 1921.

In contrast, when World War II began, a new and inordinate demand for labor developed in the U.S. Across the country, record-setting agricultural production and general full employment caused Mexican immigration and Mexican-American interstate migration to resume.

One year into the war, labor shortages were so severe that crops were plowed under and industrial production was threatened for lack of workers. One solution to this mounting emergency was to allow Mexican contracted labor to enter the U.S. for temporary work. In 1942 México and the U.S. reached an agreement to do just that. Unlike earlier immigrants, these workers, called *braceros*, were guaranteed specific conditions of employment, transportation to and from the U.S, housing and health care, and protection against discrimination. In practice and in spite of their significant contribution to winning the war, the men were for the most part treated terribly and their contracts became little more than paper promises.

Under the wartime phase of this agreement, over 200,000 braceros were contracted for temporary work in the U.S. Initially, the contracted labor force was restricted to farm employment. However, as the labor shortages worsened, food processors, railroad companies, and the U.S. National Forest Service also employed the men. After the war's end, the U.S. and México agreed to extend their labor agreement. All told, nearly seven million men were contracted to work in the U.S. between 1942 and December 1964.

Mexican immigration, both legal and illegal, was encouraged by the bracero program. Many of the returning braceros, and U.S. employers as well, ardently described the opportunities and comparatively higher wages to hopeful emigrants. Therefore, even though thousands of men were contracted annually, many times that number were not. The latter entered the U.S. outside the bracero program and without authorization. What is more, many former braceros returned to México but then immigrated as free wage earners with their families. Altogether, an unknown number of braceros, undocumented workers, and legal immigrants entered the U.S. between World War II and the 1950s.

As long as there was a need for their labor, Mexicans immigrated to the U.S. At other times, they were discouraged from leaving México and even pressured to leave the U.S. During the recession following the Korean War, Mexicans were again considered culpable for the nation's unemployment. For this reason, the Immigration and

Naturalization Service began a concerted drive in 1954 labeled "Operation Wetback" to deport "illegal wetbacks" to México. When it was over, one million persons had been forced to leave the country, but not before the constitutional rights of hundreds of thousands of Mexican-American citizens had been grossly violated once more.

Between 1910 and the post-World War II period, however, the Mexican-American population grew at unprecedented rates. By the 1960s, Mexican-Americans were the second largest minority group in the U.S.—surpassed only by the African-Americans. This large Spanish-speaking community was no longer rural or exclusive to the southwestern states. Rather, Mexican-American communities were largely urban and could be found in every state of the nation. Natural increases accounted for population growth, but so did immigration. This fact was not lost on Congress.

For the first time, the 1965 Immigration Act placed a limit of 120,000 legal immigrants eligible to enter from all Western hemisphere nations. Under this act, which became effective in 1968, México, and the other Latin American republics, were allotted 20,000 immigrants annually.

In actuality, this legislation did little to stop Mexican immigration. Persistent economic problems and constant population growth resulted in the arrival of thousands of undocumented immigrants to the U.S. Twenty years later, these immigrants, coupled with the continued growth of the Mexican-American communities already in the United States, made Mexican-heritage Latinos the fastest-growing segment of Hispanics.

Puerto Ricans

Puerto Ricans in the U.S. have many parallels with Mexican-Americans. Initially Puerto Ricans, like Mexican-Americans, did not choose to be part of the U.S.; instead, the U.S. came to them. Also, Puerto Rican history in the U.S. was shaped largely by events of the nineteenth century.

The island of Puerto Rico was first colonized by Ponce De León in 1508. For nearly 400 years, Puerto Rico remained under Spanish rule. Then, in 1868, Puerto Ricans began their struggle for independence by seizing the city of Lares. This initial revolt against Spanish colonial rule failed, but 30 years later Spain finally granted autonomy to the

island colony in November 1897. Barely five months later, Spain and the U.S. were at war as a result of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Havana harbor. During the Spanish-American War of 1898, the U.S. dashed all hopes of a free Puerto Rico when Theodore Roosevelt took control of the island. On December 10, 1898, the Treaty of Paris formally ceded Puerto Rico to the U.S.

For the next two years, Puerto Ricans lived under U.S. military rule, but in 1900 the U.S. declared Puerto Rico a "possession." Under this change, the President of the U.S. appointed the island's governor and the executive council of the legislature. Only the members of the lower chamber were chosen by popular vote. What is more, all legislation emanating from Puerto Rico was subject to approval or veto by the U.S. Congress.

Amid continued calls for independence and strong anti-American protests, the Jones Act of 1917 "granted" citizenship to Puerto Ricans, as well as the right to elect members to both houses of the legislature. The status of the island changed dramatically again in 1947, when the U.S. allowed Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor.

In 1948 Luis Muñoz Marín became the first governor elected by popular vote in Puerto Rican history. Four years later, following a popular referendum, Puerto Rico became a commonwealth of the U.S. Under this last arrangement, the island was neither truly independent nor a member state of the U.S. Since then, the island's status and its political ties to the U.S. remain a critical question for all Puerto Ricans living on the island or residing in the mainland.

Puerto Ricans began to settle in the U.S. during the 1800s. Between 1830 and 1889 some upper-class families emigrated to New York and Florida. In the late 1880s labor agents started to recruit Puerto Rican laborers for jobs from as far away as the Hawaiian Islands.

After 1898 U.S. control of Puerto Rico offered expanded opportunities for migration to the mainland. Although some Puerto Ricans left for the U.S. between 1900 and World War I, the first significant migration occurred during the 1920s. Like Mexican immigrants, the majority of Puerto Ricans were laborers. They moved to New York, although some went as far west as Arizona.

In the process, clearly defined communities called "colonias" emerged in the mid-Atlantic states. The principal settlements were located in East Harlem and the Navy section of Brooklyn. Here, *bodegas* (small stores), barbershops, cigar stores, and attorneys' and physicians' offices defined Puerto Rican life. Storefront Pentecostal churches that provided for the spiritual needs of the new migrant community were another early characteristic of the first enclaves. In addition, hometown clubs and other cultural, civic, and worker organizations developed among New York's Puerto Rican community. These community groups encouraged ethnic solidarity and worked to develop the necessary social, political, and cultural networks for survival in an alien land.

Once in the U.S., Puerto Ricans, due to their racial and cultural background, were tagged as being "outsiders," "non-citizens," and "black," and also encountered virulent prejudice and discrimination from other racial and ethnic groups in East Harlem.

In spite of the hostility, migration increased considerably during and after World War II. Between 1944 and 1953, thousands of Puerto Rican migrants arrived in the U.S. annually. By the 1950s, Puerto Ricans in New York identified themselves by time of arrival. First-generation immigrants referred to themselves as *criados*, and second-generation Puerto Ricans were *nacidos*. These terms were used to distinguish between earlier, assimilated immigrants and the more recent arrivals.

Although Puerto Ricans were tagged as "non-citizens," they were subject to the military draft. Many men had served during World War I, but many more were drafted or enlisted during World War II. The 65th U.S. Army Infantry was largely Puerto Rican and saw service in Western Africa and Italy and during the occupation of Germany. After the war, many of these war veterans remained in states like Washington, Illinois, or Kentucky rather than return to the East or to Puerto Rico. While the war distributed Puerto Ricans to other areas of the nation, the war experience did little to change how they were treated by society at large.

In addition to military service, Puerto Rican men were also recruited as contracted laborers during wartime. Like Mexican *braceros*, Puerto Ricans were contracted for temporary wartime employment in agriculture, food processing plants, and Utah's copper mining industry. Railroad companies like the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad also employed Puerto Ricans to work on track maintenance crews.

During the post-war period, migration continued to increase for several reasons. After the war, travel between the island and states such as New York and New Jersey became relatively inexpensive. Migration was also stimulated by poor economic conditions in Puerto Rico and nearly full employment in the U.S. Unlike their Mexican counterparts, many Puerto Rican braceros returned home, boasting and encouraging their friends and relatives to partake of "great opportunities" in New York and elsewhere. Finally, war veterans themselves worked to bring their families and relatives to the mainland.

The third period of migration developed after 1965, when more Puerto Ricans settled on the mainland than at any other time. (As U.S. citizens, Puerto Ricans are not limited by the restrictive quotas of the 1965 Immigration Act.) By being able to take advantage of open migration, Puerto Ricans came to the U.S. and settled in various states. By the end of the 1970s, 60 percent of all Puerto Ricans lived in New York and New Jersey, with significant numbers in Illinois, California, Washington, Florida, and Pennsylvania.

Puerto Ricans also represent the oldest European settlement under the American flag and a unique cultural blend of the Spanish-Caribbean will and the North American drive for political organization; the island now has one of the highest rates of voter participation in the world. Perhaps the best description that can be made of a Puerto Rican and Puerto Ricans in general is that made by Tato Laviera, a Puerto Rican Poet who would describe Puerto Ricans as an "outcry, love, affection, a sentiment, a feeling an attitude... and a song".

Cuban-Americans

Cuban-Americans represent the third largest community of Hispanics. Although their history in the U.S. is brief in comparison to other Spanish speakers of Latin American origin, they share similar experiences.

Like Puerto Ricans, Cuban-Americans began to immigrate to the U.S. during the last half of the nineteenth century. However, there was no significant Cuban emigration until 1959, when Fidel Castro toppled the Fulgencio Batista dictatorship. Following that revolution and until 1962, many political supporters of the old regime fled to Florida.

For the next several years, the Castro government virtually stopped any further emigration of political dissidents. Then in 1965 the Cuban government changed its position, allowing many more Cubans to come to the U.S. This period of immigration, known as the "Freedom Flights" because they were sponsored by the U.S., lasted until 1973. During this time, Cubans represented the second-largest group of Hispanics arriving in the U.S., exceeded only by Mexican immigrants.

As austerity set in, the Cuban economy and political and civil liberties were curtailed and popular dissent in Cuba increased dramatically. In 1980 Castro again lifted the ban on emigration. That year, the "Mariel Boatlift" brought 124,779 Cubans to Florida and other states. At the time, this number was significant because it represented over 1 percent of the island's entire population. More recently, *balseros* or raft people continue to risk their lives in hopes of reaching "freedom" in the U.S. Also, in 1988 the Immigration and Naturalization Service granted permission to the Cuban-American National Foundation to sponsor Cubans living in other nations outside of Cuba for resettlement in the U.S.

For these reasons, nearly 90 percent of all Cubans who have left the island since 1959 have come to the U.S. This is not surprising, given the proximity of Cuba to the Florida peninsula and the historical, cultural, and economic ties between the two nations. In addition, Cubans have received considerable federal aid to help them adjust to the U.S. environment, including financial assistance to obtain jobs, attain education, and resettle outside of Miami.

In the U.S., Cuban-Americans are concentrated in Florida (46%), New York (16.5%), New Jersey (12.5%), California (8.7%), and Illinois (3.8%). Like Puerto Ricans, Cuban-Americans are overwhelmingly urban and have developed near the clusters of families that emigrated to the U.S. prior to the Cuban Revolution. Although the Cuban Refugee Program attempted to settle families away from New York and Florida, many Cuban-Americans eventually returned to Florida.

In Miami, Cuban-Americans have been able to adjust to life in the U.S. in small ethnic communities known as "Little Havana." As is the case with other Hispanics, Cuban-Americans have transposed their culture into a uniquely Cuban-American one.

QUEST FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For as long as Hispanics have been in the U.S., they have struggled to attain equal and full enjoyment of their civil and political rights. All too often, however, nationality, color of skin, culture, language, and social standing have been used as measures of Hispanic inferiority. Against these odds, the quest for equal justice and basic human rights has not always been easy.

Immediately after the Mexican-American War of 1846, Mexican-Americans began to protest their unjust treatment. In California, Joaquín Murrieta, Tiburcio Vázquez, and Juan Flores defied discriminatory treatment. In Texas, Gregorio Cortéz, Juan Cortina, and others also supported the cause of justice for Mexican-Americans. Although termed bandits and often hunted down as such, these men were popular among the masses for helping to resist the tide of anti-Mexican sentiment.

Antipathy of all types against Mexican-Americans continued unabated through the beginning of the twentieth century. When Mexicans and Mexican-Americans were exploited for their labor, workers attempted to form labor organizations for self-protection. At first, Mexican strikers were ignored or hindered by Euro-American worker unions. Eventually, similar class interests convinced the American Federation of Labor (AFL), United Mine Workers (UMW), Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), and other largely Anglo labor organizations to offer assistance. By the 1930s some skilled and semi-skilled Mexican-American workers were also members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO).

Several factors prevented the development of permanent labor organizations or unions of their own among the Mexican-American labor force: (1) until the 1920s, the majority of Mexican-Americans worked in agriculture, where employers have traditionally been most resistant to any type of labor organizing; (2) agricultural workers, especially in migratory communities, are exceedingly difficult to organize; (3) when other workers won the right to form unions in 1935, agriculture was not accorded similar rights; (4) union leaders and the rank and file customarily practiced discrimination against foreign laborers; and (5) until the CIO was organized, unions were developed along craft or trade lines, thereby excluding the bulk of Mexican-American unskilled workers.

Large-scale Mexican immigration, such as that discussed above, did not improve the chances of successful labor organizations. In many states, the legitimate use of violence against Mexican-American labor organizations was equally effective in undermining the workers' efforts. Finally, Mexican-American labor organizations were thwarted by national and world events over which workers had little control. These included both world wars and the Great Depression. Yet, when this labor history is examined in greater detail it does speak to the determination of Mexican-American workers to improve upon their conditions of employment.

Mexican-Americans also were bent on fighting social discrimination. As early as 1928, desegregation cases were filed to challenge the segregation of Mexican students in Texas school districts. Three years later in Lemon Grove, California, Mexican and Mexican-American families organized to stop the separation of their children into inferior facilities. With the assistance of the Mexican consul, Mexican parents sued the Lemon Grove School District and won the right to send their children to the same classes as Caucasians.

In 1929 La Orden de Hijos de América organized in Texas to work for the betterment of U.S. citizens of Mexican descent. It was followed by the League of Latin American Citizens (LULAC), a Mexican-American organization committed to civil rights issues, especially political and educational equality.

Significant social change intensified during the post-World War II years. The war sparked significant change. Labor shortages opened new and better job opportunities for Mexican-Americans. The Fair Employment Practices Committee set up by President Roosevelt also encouraged the hiring of non-white workers in defense industries run by white labor. Post-war voter registration drives and political organization gave Mexican-Americans their first elected representatives. In 1949, Edward Roybal won election to the Los Angeles City Council, the first Mexican-American elected since 1881. In Texas, Henry B. González won election to the state legislature in 1956 and began a long distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. In Southern California, the segregation of Mexican-American children was declared unconstitutional in the case of *Méndez v. Westminster School District*, heard in the U.S. District Court in 1946.

The impetus for social change also came directly from the Mexican-American war veterans. They were among the first to be drafted into the global war to save

democracy. In the military and away from their homes, these young men experienced a different world. Rubbing shoulders with more affluent men and women, Hispanics understood more clearly the meaning of social and economic inequalities. Mexican-Americans were quick to apply the principles of freedom and the pursuit of happiness to their own communities. When a funeral parlor in Three Rivers, Texas, refused to admit the body of Felix Longoria, a Mexican-American and a decorated war veteran, Dr. Hector García founded the G.I. Forum, a group composed of Mexican-American war veterans that promoted social and political opportunity in many states.

The impetus for change also came from the federal government. Immediately following the war, President Truman called for federal investigations of civil rights violations. He also urged the creation of other committees to investigate judicial discrimination. Finally, in 1954 the Supreme Court decided the case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, which prohibited racial segregation. This decision fed a growing hope among Mexican-Americans and other racial and ethnic communities that the nation was embarking on a new era of social change.

Yet the changes listed above were not always applicable to Mexican-Americans. For example, the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court ruling had little impact on "Mexican" schools. Many communities continued to segregate Mexican-Americans for linguistic reasons, although sometimes members of this group were considered "white" and therefore were not covered by prohibitions against discrimination. The constant availability of inexpensive Mexican labor, especially through the bracero program of 1942-1964, made it harder to fight for better working conditions for many Mexican-Americans. Regardless, the post-war years were decisive. Mexican-American communities were determined that no "reconversion" or "putting Mexican-Americans back in their place" would occur, as it had after World War I. This determination was a harbinger of the Chicano Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s.

In the 1960s, Mexican-Americans were able to exert a considerable degree of political influence. The Chicano Civil Rights Movement began with the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, which signaled a new era of social change and led to rising expectations for Hispanics. Under the Office of Economic Opportunity, greater access to education, employment, and economic development was possible. The federal government provided new avenues of opportunity through commissions set up to investigate discriminatory practices. Alternative programs in education and employment

training were also organized and funded. The Executive Office also used its influence and the power of the federal government to persuade recalcitrant agencies and entire communities to accept social change.

For their part, Mexican-Americans developed new strategies for gaining wider socio-economic and political participation. One facet was the Chicano Student Movement. By 1974 this effort had established several important Chicano and other Latino teaching and research centers at various nationally ranked universities and colleges. Students also forced change upon the higher-education faculties by demanding that Hispanics be trained and hired as professors and researchers. In the process, they became role models for other high school graduates to follow.

In labor, Hispanic farm workers made substantial gains. Through the effort and leadership of César Chávez, they organized an effective union that won improvement of sometimes inhuman working conditions in American agriculture. Above all, the farm workers' efforts reminded the world's wealthiest nation that the plight of agricultural laborers and their families had not changed appreciably since Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath*. Farm workers also demonstrated to many others the potential power of organization and cooperation across different ethnicities and racial groups.

The Chicano Movement made significant changes in other areas. The cultural pride and increased self-esteem it engendered overcame earlier, largely unsuccessful, attempts at assimilation. In politics, Mexican-Americans used conventional as well as nontraditional ways to win political recognition. By the 1970s, Hispanics were serving in local and state governing bodies and in the U.S. Congress in unprecedented numbers.

Social change is hard to win, however, and change itself is sometimes fleeting. The Chicano Movement peaked and waned by the end of the 1970s. It was followed by the 1980s, which centered on a more conservative and narcissistic "me" generation that tended to place individual gratification above social responsibility.

Still, Hispanics continue to advocate and promote equal opportunity. Current Mexican-American and Puerto Rican organizations include the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund and the Puerto Rican Legal and Education Fund. These two organizations have been actively engaged in such issues as bilingual education, affirmative action, and worker and housing rights. Other organizations that focus on

political rights include the National Council on La Raza, the Southwest Voter Registration Project, and the National Puerto Rican Forum. The National Coalition of Hispanic Mental Health and Human Service Organizations represents the principal effort at coordinating and improving social services for Hispanics.

CONCLUSION

The first step toward understanding the history of Hispanics in the United States and Latin Americans throughout the American Continent begins with their group identification. Strictly speaking, Hispanics are people of Latin American or Spanish ancestry residing in the United States. Unlike other so-called minority groups however, Hispanics do not constitute one easily identifiable or defined ethnic or racial community. Moreover, outside of their Spanish surnames and a predilection to speak Spanish, there is at times very little real group affinity among Hispanics. At the same time an undercurrent of "comunidad and familia," which is perhaps unparalleled in any other region outside of Latin America prevails. For many, a more fitting term is "Latino," meaning of Latin American ancestry. La Raza is still another term that symbolically embraces all Latinos in the United States and elsewhere.

The term Hispanic was developed in the 1970s by the US Census Bureau as a convenient way to identify an otherwise myriad group of Latin American and Spanish people. The term itself was almost unknown in the United States prior to the 1970s. Before this time, Spaniards and Latin Americans in the United States identified themselves by nationality. The exceptions were Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans. Due to their long history in the United States, and strong cultural and political identity, they were considered inassimilable and, therefore, hyphenated Americans. Aside from its expedient nature, the term Hispanic tends to impose racial and cultural homogeneity where similarity is nonexistent. Racially, Hispanics are often of relatively unmixed African, Asian, European, and Indian ancestry. They can also be multiracial Indo, Afro, Ibero, Asian persons. In terms of cultures and nationalities, Hispanics truly represent the rainbow of diverse lifestyles in all countries of South, Central, and North America, as well as the Caribbean.

The historical trajectory that accounts for each groups' presence in the United States also differs across Hispanics. Some, especially Mexican-Americans, are members of an "old minority" with a history predating the Mayflower. Other Hispanics constitute newly arrived immigrant communities. Hispanics also differ in all manner of politics as well as social and economic standing.

National origin, such as Cuban-American, is a more culturally precise and appropriate way of identifying individual Hispanics and the separate communities. Properly

speaking, only those persons who can trace their ancestry directly to Spain can call themselves Hispanics.

Inapplicable as it may be, the word Hispanic resulted from the interplay of several socio-economic and political factors of the 1970s. For one, the surge of Latin American immigration meant that the federal government needed to assuage the problem of grouping the various nationalities and racial groups into one category. On the other hand, the newly established immigrant Chilean, Cuban, and Central American communities quickly learned that already existing social and political terms such as Puerto Rican or Boricua, Mexican-American or Chicano did not pertain to them. The increasing visibility of Latin American immigrants encouraged the rubric and caused it to be extended to Mexican-Americans and other already Latino existing communities. Finally, the eclipse of ethnic and cultural nationalism worked in favor of adopting the term Hispanic.

As mentioned above, the people of Latin America, and by extension Hispanics in the United States, are the result of tremendous racial mixing. Nowhere else in the world has this process produced a "new" family of people similar to Latinos. In order to understand and appreciate the complexity of the Hispanic community, the Indian, African, European, and Asian background must be examined.

When Columbus came ashore in El Salvador, he set in motion a process of amalgamation and miscegenation in an unprecedented scale. Later, the conquest and colonization of Latin America also proceeded through Indian women. Although admonished by the church, the Spanish began to covet the Indian women from the beginning. While some scholars have argued that the Spanish had a propensity for darker skinned Indian and African women, a more basic explanation is that Caucasian women were almost nonexistent in the Americas. Throughout the colonial period, less than 10 percent of all Spanish colonists were female. Among the African population, the ratio of men to women was two to one. This preponderance of Spanish and African men in colonial Latin America subjected countless Indian women to forced as well as consensual sexual exploitation.

Racial mixing among Indians, Europeans, and Africans, and their descendants, was so rapid that within two generations the colonial population consisted of a myriad of interracially mixed persons. In an attempt to categorize them, the Spanish developed a

nomenclature of groupings including mestizo (union of Spaniard and Indian), afro-mestizo (union of African and Mestizo), mulatto (union of African and Spaniard), and others. The common racial stock among the colonial population, however, was Indian.

Even today, almost all Latin American nationalities have some degree of Native American ancestry. Some countries, such as Bolivia, Ecuador, and Perú are predominately Indian. Other nations such as Argentina are markedly more European. In this regard, it is important to take note that many millions of Hispanics in the United States are likewise of Indian or part Native American ancestry. For example, many Puerto Ricans have some degree of Indian ancestry. Racially speaking, Mexican-Americans are also predominately Indian.

This synergism of humanity and cultures was one of the fortunate circumstance of the otherwise onerous colonial social system. In the vision of the Mexican philosopher, José Vasconcelos, this mixture produced "la raza cósmica," or a "cosmic race"; a multiracial community of people that inherited the best from its antecedents. Although an abstraction, the concept of a cosmic race does reflect the unique reality of Latin Americans as a triumvirate family of races and cultures.

No group gave more to Latin America and received less in return than Indian people. Not only does their blood run through the veins of most Latin Americans and Hispanics, but the psychology of Latinos has also been strongly influenced by Native American values. They also introduced thousands of words to the Spanish language. Their skills and technology in agriculture greatly enhanced the living standards of Europe and also the world. In food stuffs alone, the Indian contribution more than doubled the world's known food supply during the time of Columbus. As in the United States, their greatest loss was being deprived, without adequate compensation, of their sacred land.

Africans, likewise, shaped the racial and cultural heritage of Latin America. Negroid features are clearly discernible among the people of Veracruz, México, Cuba, Panamá, Puerto Rico, Colombia, Brazil and other countries of South America. The language and folklore of Hispanics and Latin Americans abounds with African words, proverbs, riddles, and tales. Africa bestowed various percussion instruments along with the rhythms for merengue, samba, and mambo to Latin American music and dance.

The Spanish brought Catholicism, the Spanish language, their North Africa Moorish and Moslem inheritance, their Sephardic blood and traditions, and other important facets of their culture. The importance of the family and its primacy over the interests of the individual common among Latinos is a direct Spanish cultural trait. Powerful legal and political institutions, systems of taxation, farming and ranching, transportation, and mining were also brought to the Americas.

Asians provide another element to the cultural and racial diversity of Latinos. During much of the colonial period the Philippine Islands were part of the of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, which was centered in México. For over 300 years trade flourished between Asia and western México. This brought a substantial number of Asian people, mainly Filipinos and Chinese, to the western ports of Latin America. Filipinos were especially prevalent in México as a result of the Manila trade route. In their own way, the Chinese and Filipinos contributed to the fusion of people that is Latin America and being Hispanic today.

Foreign visitors to Latin America during the 18th century noted the mixture of people. They remarked about the rich skin tones of the population, and they also commented on the kaleidoscope of color in the dress and daily lives of the populace, as well as its abundance in the public markets and on colonial buildings. By the end of the colonial period it was difficult to identify any activity in Latin America where all racial groups did not participate or make a contribution.

This diversity among Latin Americans and Hispanics in the U.S., when fully acknowledged, may indeed be their most important contribution to a world that is just now beginning to appreciate the value of diversity in all living things.

BIBLIOGRAPHY**Chicanos/Latinos in the United States**

- Abalos, D.T. 1986. *Latinos in the United States: The sacred and the political*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Acosta-Belén, E., and B.R. Sjostrom, eds. 1988. *The Hispanic experience in the United States: contemporary issues and perspectives*. New York: Praeger.
- Acuña, R. 1988. *Occupied America: a history of Chicanos*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Bean, F.D., and M. Tienda. 1987. *The Hispanic population of the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Borjas, G.J., and M. Tienda, eds. 1987. *Hispanics in the U.S. economy*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Cafferty, P.S.J., and W.C. McReady, eds. 1985. *Hispanics in the United States*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transactions, Inc.
- Chávez, L.R. 1988. "Settlers and sojourners: the case of Mexicans in the United States." *Human Organization*. 47(2):95-108.
- De La Garza, R.O. 1985. *The Mexican American experience*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ford Foundation. 1984. *Hispanics: challenges and opportunities*. New York: Ford Foundation working paper #435.
- Gann, L.H., and P.J. Duignan. 1986. *The Hispanics in the United States: a history*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- García, F.C. 1988. *Latinos and the political system*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- García, J.A. 1984. *The Chicano struggle: analyses of past and present efforts*. Binghamton: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingue.
- Jaffe, A.J., R.M. Cullen, and T.D. Boswell. 1980. *The changing demography of the Spanish Americans*. New York: Academic Press.
- Keefe, S.E., and A. Padilla. 1987. *Chicano ethnicity*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- McWilliams, C. 1968. *North from Mexico: the Spanish speaking people of the United States*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Meléndez, E. 1991. *Hispanics in the labor force: issues and policies*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Mirande, A. 1985. *The Chicano Experience: an alternative perspective*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Moore, J., and H. Panchon. 1985. *Hispanics in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Raigoza, J. 1988. U.S. Hispanics: a demographic and issue profile. *Population and Environment*, 10(2):95-106.
- Sandoval, M. 1990. *On the move: a history of the Hispanic church in the United States*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Schick, F.L. 1991. *Statistical handbook on U.S. Hispanics*. Phoenix:Oryx Press.
- Vigil, M.E. 1987. *Hispanics in American politics*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Weyr, T. 1988. *Hispanic U.S.A.: Breaking the melting pot*. New York: Harper and Row.

Identity

- Giménez, M.E. 1989. The political construction of "Hispanics," Statistical politics in the 1980s." In *Estudios Chicanos and the Politics of Community*, ed. Mary Romero and Cordelia Candelaria. Colorado Springs: National Association for Chicano Studies.
- Hayes-Bautista, D.E., and J. Chapa. 1987. Latino terminology: conceptual bases for standardized terminology." *American Journal of Public Health*, 77(1):61-72.
- Keefe, S.E., and A.M. Padilla. 1987. *Chicano ethnicity*. Albuquerque. University of New Mexico Press.
- Klor de Alva, J.J. 1988. "Telling Hispanics apart: Latino sociocultural diversity." In *The Hispanic experience in the United States*, ed. Edna Acosta-Belen and Barbara J. Sjoström. New York: Praeger.
- Melville, M.B. 1988. Hispanics: race, class, or ethnicity? *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. 16(1):67-83.
- Nelson, C., and M. Tienda. 1985. "The Structuring of Hispanic Ethnicity: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 8(1): 49-74.

- Padilla, F.M. 1989. "Salsa music as a cultural expression of Latino consciousness and unity." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 11(1):28-45.
- Portes, A., and C. Truelove. 1987. Making sense of diversity: recent research on Hispanic minorities in the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 13:359-85.
- Santos, G. 1992. Somos RUNAFRIBES? The future of Latino ethnicity in the Americas. In *Community Empowerment and Chicano Scholarship*, ed. Mary Romero and Cordelia Candelaria. Selected Proceedings, National Association for Chicanos Studies.
- Treviño, F.M. 1987. Standardized terminology for Hispanic populations. *American Journal of Public Health*. 77(1):69-72.

Chicanos/Latinos in Comparative Perspective

- Arreola, D.D. 1985. Mexican Americans. In *Ethnicity in contemporary America: a geographical appraisal*, ed. Jesse O. McKee. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Bean, F.D., J. Schmandt, and S. Winetraub, eds. 1989. *Mexican and Central American population and U.S. immigration policy*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas Press.
- Boswell, T.D. 1985. Puerto Ricans living in the United States. In *Ethnicity in contemporary america: a geographical appraisal.*, ed. Jesse O. McKee. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- _____. 1985. The Cuban-Americans. In *Ethnicity in contemporary America: a geographical appraisal*, ed. Jesse O. McKee. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Browning, H.L., and R.O. De La Garza, eds. 1986. *Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans: an evolving relation*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas Press.
- Briody, E.K. 1989. *Household labor patterns among Mexican Americans in South Texas*. New York: AMS Press.
- Connor, W. 1985. *Mexican-Americans in comparative perspective*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.
- Dunleavy, J.A. 1991. On the settlement of recent Caribbean and Latin immigrants to the United States. *Growth and Change*. 22(1):54-67.

- Garver, S. 1981. *Coming to North America: from Mexico, Cuba, and Puerto Rico*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Hayes-Bautista, D.E., and J. Chapa. 1987. Latino terminology: conceptual bases for standardized terminology. *American Journal of Public Health*, 77(1):61-72.
- Heer, D.M. 1990. *Undocumented Mexicans in the United States*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Jankowski, M.S. 1986. *City bound: urban life and political attitudes among Chicano youth*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Levine, B. , ed. 1987. *The Caribbean exodus*. New York: Praeger.
- McHugh, K.E. 1989. Hispanic migration and population redistribution in the United States. *Professional Geographer*. 41(4):429-39.
- Melville, M.B. 1988. Hispanics: race, class, or ethnicity? *Journal of Ethnic Studies*. 16(1):67-83.
- Padilla, F.M. 1989. Salsa music as a cultural expression of Latino consciousness and unity. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*. 11(1):28-45.
- Pedraza-Bailey, S. 1985. *Political and economic migrants in America: Cubans and Mexicans*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Portes, A., and R.L. Bach. 1985. *Latin journey: Cuban and Mexican immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Portes, A., and C. Truelove. 1987. Making sense of diversity: recent research on Hispanic minorities in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 13:359-385.
- Sáenz, R. 1991. Interregional migration patterns of Chicanos: the core, periphery, and frontier. *Social Science Quarterly*. 72(1):135-148.
- Trevino, F.M. 1987. Standardized terminology for Hispanic populations. *American Journal of Public Health*. 77(1):69-72.
- Vernez, G., and D. Ronfeldt. 1991. The current situation in Mexican immigration. *Science*. 251:1189-1193.
- Wallace, S.P. 1989. The new urban Latinos: Central Americans in a Mexican immigrant environment. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*. 25(2):239-64.

Border Culture/The Borderlands/U.S.-Hispanic Cultures

- Anaya, R.A. 1989. *Aztlán: essays on the Chicano homeland*. Albuquerque: Academia/El Norte Publications.
- Barrera, M. 1988. *Beyond Aztlán: ethnic autonomy in comparative perspective*. New York: Praeger.
- Briggs, V.M. 1974. *The Mexico-United States border*. Austin: Center for the Study of Human Resources, University of Texas Press.
- Cross, H.E., and J.A. Sandos. 1981. *Across the border: rural development in Mexico and recent migration to the United States*. Berkeley: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California.
- De León, A. 1983. *They called them greasers: Anglo attitudes toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Deutsh, S. 1987. *No separate refuge: culture, class, and gender on an Anglo-Hispanic frontier in the American Southwest, 1880-1940*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fernández, R.A. 1989. *The Mexican-American border region: issues and trends*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- García, M.T. 1981. *Desert immigrants: the Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gibson, L.J. 1985. *The U.S. and Mexico: borderland development and the national economies*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Hansen, N.M. 1981. *The border economy: regional development in the Southwest*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Herzog, L.A. 1990. *Where north meets south: cities, space, and politics on the U.S.-Mexico border*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas Press.
- Langley, L.D. 1991. *Mexico and the United States: the fragile relationship*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- _____. 1988. *Mexamerica: two countries, one future*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Martínez, O.J. 1978. *Border boom town: Ciudad Juarez since 1848*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- _____. 1988. *Troublesome border*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- Massey, D. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The social progress of international migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McCombs, V.M. 1970. *From over the border: a study of Mexicans in the United States*. San Francisco: R and E Research Associates.
- McNally, M.J. 1984. *Catholicism in South Florida, 1869-1968*. Gainesville: University Presses of Florida.
- Meyer, M.C. 1986. The borderlands: a historical survey for the non-historian. *Journal of Borderland Studies*. Spring:133-41.
- Miller, T. 1981. *On the border: portraits of America's Southwestern frontier*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Monroy, D. 1990. *Thrown among strangers: the making of Mexican culture in frontier California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Montejano, D. 1987. *Anglos and Mexicans in the making of Texas, 1836-1886*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Officer, J.E. 1987. *Hispanic Arizona, 1536-1856*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Peach, J.T. 1984. *Demographic and economic change in Mexico's northern frontier*. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University, Center for Latin American Studies.
- Reich, P.L. 1984. *Statistical abstract of the United States-Mexico borderlands*. Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Rosenthal-Urey, Ina. 1986. *Regional impacts of U.S.-Mexican relations*. La Jolla: Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego.
- Reunión de Universidades de México y Estados Unidos. 1983. *Reglas del juego y juego de reglas en la vida fronteriza*. Mexico: ANUIES.
- Sandoval, M. 1983. *Fronteras: a history of the Latin American church in the USA*. San Antonio: Mexican American Cultural Center.
- Seligson, M.A. 1981. *Maquiladoras and migration: workers in the Mexico-United States border industrialization program*. Austin: Mexico-U.S. Border Research Program, University of Texas.
- Stoddard, E.R. 1987. *Trends and patterns of poverty along the U.S.-Mexico border*. Las Cruces: Joint Border Research Institute, New Mexico State University.

- Vásquez, C. 1983. *Mexican-U.S. relations: conflict and convergence*. Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Publications and Latin American Center Publications.
- Weber, D.J. 1988. *Myth and the history of the Hispanic southwest*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Weisman, A. 1986. *La Frontera: the United States border with Mexico*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Chicana/Latina Women in the U.S.

- Alcalay, R. 1984. Hispanic women in the United States: family and work relations (differences due to country of origin, time of migration, occupation, and socioeconomic status). *Migration Today*. 12(3): 13-20.
- Cárdenas, G., and E.T. Flores. 1986. *The migration and settlement of undocumented women*. Austin: Center for Mexican American Studies, University of Texas at Austin.
- Cotera, M. 1976. *Diosa y hembra: the history and heritage of Chicanas in the U.S.* Austin: Information Systems Development.
- Cotera, M.P. 1976. *Profiles of the Mexican American woman*. Austin: National Educational Laboratory Publishers.
- Del Castillo, A.R. 1990. *Between borders: essays on Mexicana/Chicana history*. Encino: Floricanto Press.
- Horno Delgado, A. 1989. *Breaking boundaries: Latina writing and critical readings*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Melville, M.B. 1988. *Mexicanas at work in the United States*. Houston: Mexican American Studies Program, University of Houston.
- Melville, M.B. 1980. *Twice a minority: Mexican American women*. St. Louis: Mosby.
- Mirande, A. 1981. *La Chicana: the Mexican-American woman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mora, M. 1980. *Mexican women in the United States: struggles past and present*. Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Research Center Publications, University of California.
- Nathan, D. 1991. *Women and other aliens: essays from the U.S.-Mexico Border*. El Paso: Cinco Puntos Press.

- Ruiz, V. 1987. *Women on the U.S.-Mexico Border: responses to change*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Sánchez, R. 1978. *Essays on la mujer*. Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Center Publications, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Tienda, M., and P. Guhleman. 1985. The occupational position of employed Hispanic women. In Gorge J. Borjas and Marta Tienda, eds. *Hispanics in the U.S. economy*. Orlando: Academic Press.

Latin American/Central American/Caribbean History

- Bakewell, P.J. 1985. *Readings in Latin American history*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Biles, R.E. 1988. *Inter-American relations: the Latin American perspective*. Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers.
- Burns, E.B. 1990. *Latin America: a concise history*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Calvert, P. 1990. *Latin America in the twentieth century*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Camacho, G. 1973. *Latin America: a short history*. London: Allen Lane.
- Cockcroft, J.D. 1989. *Neighbors in turmoil: Latin America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Crow, J.A. 1980. *The epic of Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- González Casanova, P. 1985. *America Latina: historia de medio siglo*. Mexico, D.F.: Siglos Veintiuno Editores.
- Humphreys, R.A. 1981. *Latin America and the Second World War*. London: Published for the Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London by Athlone.
- Jonas, S. 1990. *Democracy in Latin America: visions and realities*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
- Langley, L.O. 1989. *America and the Americas: the United States in the western hemisphere*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Langley, L. 1985. *Central America: the real stakes*. New York: Crown.
- Langley, L.D. 1985. *The United States and the Caribbean in the twentieth century*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

- Maguire, A. 1986. *Bordering on trouble: resources and politics in Latin America*. Bethesda: Adler and Adler.
- Mires F. 1989. *La rebelion permanente; las revoluciones en America Latina*. Mexico, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- Morales Padron, F. 1990. *Historia del descubrimiento y conquista de America*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Preston, D. 1987. *Latin American development: geographical perspectives*. England: Longham Scientific and Technical; New York: Wiley.
- Preston, D.A. 1981. *Emigration and rural development in tropical America*. Leeds: School of Geography, University of Leeds.
- Sejourne, L. 1987. *America Latina*. Mexico, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.
- West, R.C, and J.J. Parsons. 1980. *Historical geography of Latin America*. Baton Rouge: School of Geoscience, Louisiana State University.
- Zofp, P.E. 1980. *Cultural Accumulation in Latin America*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.