
TOPICAL REVIEW

MEXICAN EMIGRATION HISTORY, 1900–1970: LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

*Arthur F. Corwin, University of Connecticut**

A. STUDIES BY U.S. HISTORIANS AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS.

HAD MASSIVE MIGRATION OF MEXICAN LABOR TO THE SOUTHWEST NOT TAKEN place in the twentieth century, it is probable, as Ruth Tuck observed in *Not with the Fist: Mexican-Americans in a Southwest City* (N.Y., 1946; 29–30), that “side-eddies” of native Spanish-speaking would have been gradually swept into the mainstream of American life, as they almost were in California by 1900. Or perhaps these Spanish-speakers would have remained a picturesque folk in such isolated areas as northern New Mexico and South Texas.* But massive migration from Mexico did occur at the opening of this century, adding a new chapter to Southwestern settlement and development, a chapter that differs from the old romanticized Southwest as much as a Chicano barrio or migrant camp differs from a restored Spanish mission or a New Mexico adobe. And yet this chapter—now so important to the ethnic study movement—has been almost totally neglected by Latin Americanists both in the United States and Mexico.

This neglect is surprising if one considers the number of historians who have

* This article, originally submitted by the author to the *Latin American Research Review*, exclusively, and accepted for publication in this issue (after certain revisions and updating by the author at the request of the Editor of LARR) was, through a misunderstanding on the part of the journal, *Historia Mexicana*, published in unrevised form in the issue of that journal for Oct.–Dec. 1972.

It is not the policy of the *Latin American Research Review* to publish articles which have appeared elsewhere in print. However, the Editor has decided to publish this article because of LARR's prior right to it, and because by its publication in LARR, in English, it will not only reach all of LARR's subscribers and other readers but will presumably also be read by persons who may not see the Spanish-language version or who do not read Spanish. (Ed.)

* The Spanish-speaking population in the territory ceded by Mexico in 1848 was approximately 80,000. Nearly three-fourths of this number were concentrated in northern New Mexico.

dedicated themselves to the study of Spanish, Mexican, and Anglo-American settlement in the Borderlands, and the struggle for territorial control. Some of these leading historians are: Hubert H. Bancroft (with his monumental *Works*); Herbert E. Bolton and the "Berkeley School" of Borderland historians; Charles W. Hackett and the "Texas School" of Southwestern history; and noted writers like Frank W. Blackmar, Walter Prescott Webb, Paul Horgan, Carlos E. Castañeda, and Mexico's Vito Alessio Robles. One might also mention such specialized studies as Florence J. Scott's *Historical Heritage of the Lower Rio Grande. A Historical Record of Spanish Exploration, Subjugation and Colonization . . . together with the Development of Towns and Ranches under Spanish, Mexican and Texas Sovereignties, 1747–1848* (rev. ed., Waco, 1966); and interpretations of Southwestern colonization and pacification by such anthropologists as Edward H. Spicer, *Cycles of Conquest. The Impact of Spain, Mexico and the United States on the Indians of the Southwest, 1533–1960* (Tucson, 1962), and Jack D. Forbes, *Apache, Navajo and Spaniard* (Norman, 1960).

A convenient summary of the literature of Spanish expansion in the Borderlands can be found in John F. Bannon, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier, 1513–1821* (N.Y., 1970; 257–287), and for the troubled colonizing efforts of the Mexican period, see C. Alan Hutchinson, *Frontier Settlement in Mexican California. The Hajar-Padrés Colony, and Its Origins, 1769–1835* (New Haven, 1969; 423–440). The vast literature on American westward settlement is suggested by Ray A. Billington, *Westward Expansion: A History of the American Frontier* (3rd ed. N.Y., 1967; 765–893).

Neglect by history scholars of modern Mexican migration may seem even more remarkable when one takes into account the many general histories devoted to other immigrant groups in American development. The explanation appears to be that professional historians have been primarily interested in formative or institutional forces. Certain groups who contributed more largely, especially in the colonial era, to shape dominant national institutions and national culture, have naturally received more attention, as in the studies of Spanish missionaries by the Bolton school, or in studies of predominantly Anglo-Saxon migrations which, as it turned out, constituted the mainstream of national development. Understandably, many of the most noted works on the cultural mainstream scarcely mention late-coming Mexicans; for example, Oscar Handlin's *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of Great Migrations that Made the American People* (N.Y., 1959), or Marcus Hanson's *The Atlantic Migration, 1607–1860* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940). In other general works the Mexicans are given a passing acknowledgment, or they are lumped together with Filipinos, Puerto Ricans, Portuguese, Asians, Greeks, and other latecomers in a marginal chapter, as in Carl Wittke's outstanding survey, *We Who Built America: The Saga of the Immigrant* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1940).

If professional historians have overlooked or doubted the formative role of Mexican migration in the development of the modern Southwest, Carey McWilliams, a master storyteller, did not. It is significant that the first attempt at a full historical interpretation of Mexican settlement, old and new, in the United States was written

by this brilliant, crusading journalist who later became editor of *The Nation*, a magazine standing staunchly for liberal reforms. In *North from Mexico; the Spanish-Speaking People of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1948), McWilliams traced the full sweep of Spanish and Mexican migration north, from colonial times to the middle of the twentieth century. This movement is presented as a natural gravitation northward, a thesis that has considerable appeal for those who seek to defend a prior territorial claim on the Southwest, and who would have labor recruitment and “wetback migration transformed into something more heroic, like the natural and inevitable migration of La Raza back to the original homeland of Aztlán. A second influential thesis is that agribusiness capitalists and Anglo landgrabbers practically ensnared migrant labor on the old Spanish land grants. *North from Mexico* is also admired as one of the first debunkings of the “fantasy heritage” promoted by chambers of commerce, western novelists, and Hollywood script writers who make much of fictional Spanish Dons and fiestas but look disdainfully at Mexican settlers and peons. For these reasons McWilliams’ work has become not only a classic of ethnic history but of American social protest literature as well.

Because of the demand for Chicano textbooks, McWilliams’ work has been reprinted by Greenwood Press (N.Y., 1968). The new introduction fails to mention many civil-rights, educational, and economic gains made by Mexican-Americans since World War II. The McWilliams’ version of how Anglo invaders abused the innocent natives and incoming migrant workers in “their own native land” can be savoured also by the Mexican public in a Spanish edition that bears a more juicy subtitle: *Al Norte de México: el conflicto entre “Anglos” e “Hispanos”* (Siglo XX Editores, México, D.F., 1968). Equally important from the viewpoint of massive diffusion of *McWilliamismo* among ethnic groups and others is the fact that the Educational Film Division of Greenwood Press has released a 16 mm., twenty-minute, sound and color film entitled *North from Mexico: Exploration and Heritage*, which pictures the unfolding of Mexican-American history since Spanish exploration and settlement. According to its producers this visual teaching-aid for all levels of education “reveals the racism, misunderstanding, and distortions of reality that long have victimized this second largest of America’s minority groups,” and gives a clear meaning “to the necessity” of today’s Mexican-American political activism.

McWilliams has written other vanguard articles and books of social protest that attack American prejudices, and union-busting agribusiness for exploiting migrant labor, especially in Texas and California. The most valuable of these works is *Factories in the Fields* (Boston, 1939). It now seems fitting that McWilliams’ life-long interest in Mexican-Americans should find expression in a *padrino* relationship. He was a spiritual founder and editorial adviser to the *Journal of Mexican American History*, established by a group of Mexican-American graduate students at the University of California, Santa Barbara, to rectify the neglect of Mexican-American history. The first issue of this journal appeared in September 1970.

In sum, *McWilliamismo* stands like a monolith overshadowing the whole subject of Mexican-American history, including Mexican migration. If we leave aside

Latin American Research Review

his writings, and recent ethnic-study publications reflecting standard McWilliam's themes, then we can say that there is not yet in print a body of historical literature concerned with modern Mexican migration to the United States.

The few historical studies of note specifically concerned with twentieth-century emigration from Mexico are still unpublished: for example, John R. Martínez, "Mexican Emigration to the United States, 1910–1930." This doctoral thesis (History, University of California, Berkeley, 1957; 176 pp.) is the only general historical account thus far of the first Mexican exodus. It is a pre-ethnic, objective study based on primary and secondary sources. Other important studies are: George O. Coalson, "The Development of the Migratory Farm Labor System in Texas, 1900–1954" (History, University of Oklahoma, 1956; 242 pp.); and Abraham Hoffman's "The Repatriation of Mexican Nationals from the United States during the Great Depression" (History, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970; 281 pp.). The latter study, which made extensive use of materials in the U.S. National Archives, will soon be published by the University of Arizona Press.

Examples of master's dissertations which present in historical perspective a string of selections from congressional hearings and reports on Mexican labor migration are: Joe W. Neal, "The Policy of the United States toward Immigration from Mexico" (University of Texas, 1941; 260 pp.); and Robert J. Lipshultz, "American Attitudes toward Mexican Immigration, 1924–1952" (University of Chicago, 1962, 119 pp.).

To date, Mexican-American ethnic scholars like political scientist Ralph Gúzman, or anthropologist Octavio Romano, one of the founders of *El Grito; A Journal of Contemporary Mexican-American Thought*, a quarterly started in 1968 (Quinto Sol Publications, Berkeley), have been absorbed with the Chicano social and political experience in American society and the refutation of "Mexican stereotypes" rather than with the history of Mexican migration and its cultural roots in Mexico. As for Chicano historians, so few of them are as yet trained in history and engaged in research that it is hardly surprising that the history of La Raza migration by La Raza has yet to be done. Nevertheless, certain historians, social scientists, and professional writers have given considerable attention to the migration of La Raza in the twentieth century and to migrant-labor conditions, in recently-published surveys for the ethnic textbook market. These surveys owe much to McWilliams' pioneer works but in some cases move beyond his earlier resources. One of the more objective, scholarly accounts that builds on McWilliams' interpretations is Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Riviera, *Chicanos, a History of Mexican Americans* (N.Y., 1972). Also useful for earlier patterns of exploration and settlement is a *Documentary History of the Mexican-Americans* (N.Y., 1971), edited by professional editors Wayne Moquin and Charles Van Doren, with collaboration of historian Feliciano Rivera. However, this syllabus tells very little about La Raza and too much about the well-known episodes in the history of the Old Southwest under Spain and Mexico. Where the editors touch on Mexican labor migration it is to point out, a la McWilliams, Anglo exploitation. A more passionate work of Chicano scholarship which emphasizes migration, territorial conflict, and exploitation of La Raza is Rodolfo Acuña's *Occupied America: The*

Chicano's Struggle toward Liberation (San Francisco, 1972). Other survey texts that give a brief but generally objective account of modern Mexican migration are: Ruth S. Lamb, *Mexican Americans: Sons of the Southwest* (Claremont, Cal., 1970); Joan Moore, with Alfredo Cuellar, *Mexican Americans* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971); and Leo Grebler, *et al.*, *The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority* (N.Y., 1970). Moreover, forthcoming textbooks on Mexican-American history and social evolution by George O. Coalson and Ward S. Albro of Texas A and I University, Ellwyn Stoddard of the University of Texas at El Paso, and Carlos Cortés of the University of California at Riverside will devote chapters to migration and migratory labor.

It seems clear that until the recent ethnic-studies movement, professional historians had generally neglected Mexican emigration studies. However, this subject early in the twentieth century attracted the attention of social scientists, who seemed naturally more interested in contemporary social and economic phenomena. Mexican emigration appears to have coincided fortuitously with the rise of the social sciences in Southwestern universities in the 1920s and 1930s. Mexicans moving into the margins of the Southwestern community seemed to present a handy and docile social laboratory for the dissertation adviser and his graduate students in the social sciences. Like early border missionaries, social workers, and educators, the social scientists were soon producing a flood of observations about the "poor Mexicans" from Old Mexico, squatting on the "wrong side of the track." Such phenomena as the Mexican migrant and the assimilation question soon became a matter of compassionate concern to sociologist Emory S. Bogardus of the University of Southern California, and to the Mexican anthropologist, Manuel Gamio. Social scientists have produced during the past fifty years the most notable studies of Mexican migrants and their Chicano descendants in the United States. Here we have space to mention only a few of the works that would be useful to historians of Mexican emigration.

A point of departure for any serious review of Mexican emigration literature is Victor S. Clark, "Mexican Labor in the United States," U.S. Bureau of Labor *Bulletin*, 78: 466–522 (Sept., 1908). This report, the first of its kind, called attention to the rapid spread of Mexican peon labor in the Southwestern states and far beyond. Economist Clark, who had traveled widely in Mexico and the Southwest, attributed the beginnings of this labor migration to railroads and mines (many of them American-owned) that recruited cheap campesino labor from the populous Central Plateau for work in northern Mexico, whence the workers moved across the border for even higher wages in U.S. mines, railroads, and agriculture, crossing through such labor-recruiting centers as El Paso, Eagle Pass, and Laredo. This process, according to Clark (p. 470) had "carried the central Mexican villager a thousand miles from his home to within a few miles of the border, and Mexican employers, with a gold wage, have had little difficulty in attracting him across that not very formidable dividing line." Clark's study is also significant because it verifies the fact that large-scale use of Mexican migrant labor preceded the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution and the adoption of U.S. quota laws (1917, 1924) excluding other sources of "cheap alien labor."

Latin American Research Review

After Clark's study the use of peon labor from south of the border continued its spreading course along the railway arteries of the United States, but no important reports or studies of this phenomenon of back-door immigration appeared for a number of years. During the 1920s, however, several social scientists took a special interest in the rapidly increasing presence of Mexican laborers and their families pulled over the border by the labor demands of World War I, or pushed over by revolutionary turmoil and misery in rural Mexico. For example, Max S. Handman, an economist with the University of Texas, classified Mexican immigrants and casual laborers in distinct social groups and explained the causes of wage-labor emigration in two important articles: "The Mexican Immigrant in Texas," *Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly*, 8: 33–41 (June 1926); and "Economic Reasons for the Coming of the Mexican Immigrant," *American Journal of Sociology*, 35: 601–605 (January, 1930).

Studies by social scientists including Clark, Handman, and Paul S. Taylor, served as the basis for Charles P. Howland's excellent summary account of "Mexican Immigration" for the period 1900–1930 in *Survey of American Foreign Relations* (Council of Foreign Relations, New Haven, 1931; 4: 202–233). This volume, which is mostly devoted to United States-Mexico relations, suggests how important the Mexican restriction question had become for the United States during the 1920s.

Before the end of the 1920s, Mexican labor migration found its chronicler in Paul S. Taylor, an economist with the University of California. His multi-volume series entitled *Mexican Labor in the United States* (consisting of ten parts, published by the University of California Press, Berkeley, 1928–34), was written and documented with objectivity and sound method, both empirical and historical (economist Taylor had also studied history under Professor Bolton), that were lacking in the literature of pastoral concern and social work. Using interviews, field trips, and primary and secondary sources, Dr. Taylor gathered a rich harvest of information on Mexican labor conditions and migrant patterns in regions as diverse as California, Texas, Colorado, Pennsylvania, and Chicago. Today these works have acquired a unique stature, in part because no other compilation provides such valuable source materials and statistics for the researcher interested in the first generation of Mexican migration labor. Taylor's series terminated in 1934 when the Great Depression was rolling back the high tide of Mexican migration.

As part of his series of studies Taylor produced what is virtually an historical synthesis of Mexican labor and social conditions in South Texas during the late nineteenth century and up to 1930. *A Mexican-American Frontier: Nueces County, Texas* (Durham, N.C., 1934) is perhaps his most cohesive work, and certainly one of the most useful for Mexican-American studies. Another significant work by this author, *A Spanish-American Peasant Community: Arandas in Jalisco, Mexico* (Ibero-Americana: 4, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1933), describes a relatively progressive village with creole and mestizo social types that sent many *jornaleros* to the United States, and included interview statements illustrating the migrant workers' impressions of the United States. Another article, co-authored by Taylor and Tom

Vasey, "Historical Background of California Farm Labor," *Rural Sociology*, 1:3: 281–295 (September 1936), suggested the role of successive waves of low-cost migrant labor, Orientals, poor whites, and Mexicans, in the rise of a unique big-scale agribusiness in California. This perspective is more fully developed by Varden Fuller in a significant but little known thesis in economic development published by the LaFollette Committee hearings as "The Supply of Agricultural Labor as a Factor in the Evolution of Farm Organization in California," in U.S. Congress, Senate. *Violations of Free Speech and Rights of Labor. Hearings Pursuant to Senate Resolution 266 . . . Subcommittee on Education and Labor . . . 74th Congress, Part 54* (Washington, D.C., 1940, pp. 19777–19898).

Besides Taylor's works, several other landmark studies were carried out by social scientists; for example, *Mexicans in California; Report of Governor C. C. Young's Mexican Fact-Finding Committee* (San Francisco: Departments of Industrial Relations, Agriculture, and Social Welfare, 1930). This is the first general survey sponsored by the State of California of Mexican labor, settlement, living conditions, and demographic distribution. It reflected official concern with social problems arising from a rapidly-growing migrant population. Another important survey by Constantine Panunzio and the Heller Committee is, *How Mexicans Earn and Live: A Study of the Incomes and Expenditures of One Hundred Mexican Families in San Diego, California* (Berkeley, 1933).

Manuel Gamio, a noted Mexican cultural anthropologist, published two fundamental accounts of Mexican emigration to the United States. The data for his principal study, *Mexican Immigration to the United States; A Study of Human Migration and Adjustment* (Chicago, 1930), were gathered in the years 1926–27. The book is an effort to determine the geographic origins, causes, and numbers of Mexican emigration, principally laborers, and their social and economic condition in the United States. A complementary study, *The Mexican Immigrant, His Life Story* (Chicago, 1931), covered the same period of migration, approximately 1917–27. It is a collection of interviews and life stories from 57 emigrants employed in diverse jobs and areas, illustrating the emigrants' reasons for leaving Mexico, their impressions of American life, and their feelings of social rejection or discrimination. Significantly, both Taylor and Gamio received support from The Social Science Research Council, with recommendations from such pioneer students of immigration and social welfare as Edith Abbott of the University of Chicago.

Emory S. Bogardus, emeritus professor of sociology, the University of Southern California, was also among the first social scientists to recognize the importance of Mexican migration and settlement, and to pioneer this field of research. Professor Bogardus published several sympathetic but not profound studies of Mexican acculturation and naturalization problems. His most important general survey is *The Mexican in the United States* (Los Angeles, 1934). The study contains one of the first annotated bibliographies concerned with Mexican emigration, settlement, and adjustment problems. Among several articles by Bogardus on the Mexican perhaps the most significant are those that have attempted to measure the degree of social accept-

Latin American Research Review

ance and assimilation in national society. See, for example, his "Second Generation Mexicans," in *Sociology and Social Research*, 13: 276–283 (1929); or his "Racial Distance Changes in the United States during the Past Thirty Years," *Sociology and Social Research*, 44: 127–135 (1959), in which the author compares research data from the years 1926, 1946, and 1956, and finds that after World War II the status of Mexican-Americans rose markedly.

The depression, which terminated the first exodus of Mexicans to the United States, also caused a sudden lapse of interest in Mexican migration studies by the American academy community. (Here we except a few studies touching on repatriation, by Taylor and Bogardus, and on Mexican labor conditions during the depression years by Selden Menefee and others.) When interest in Mexican emigration was revived after World War II, it was almost completely absorbed or distracted by heated questions generated by the bi-national bracero program (1942–64). Almost unnoticed by the general American public, more Mexicans settled permanently in the United States by legal or illegal means in the period 1945–65 (more than 1.5 million) than in all previous periods combined. And yet after Taylor's works there was no important study published by American scholars on Mexican emigration *per se* until Leo Grebler's monograph: *Mexican Immigration to the United States: The Record and its Implications* (Graduate School of Business Administration, UCLA, 1966; 105 pp.). This statistical study, partly incorporated into the final publication of the Ford-funded Mexican-American Study Project (*The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority* (N.Y., 1970), is loaded with tables and interpolations that cover the period 1890 to 1965. It also contains some information on U.S. immigration laws and procedures.

On the other hand, a relatively large number of excellent monographs of an historical or social-science nature have been written about bracero labor in the period 1942–64. Most of these studies emphasize the organizational aspects of the international agreements to import trans-border labor, and the wetback threat to that program. For example, Wayne D. Rasmussen in *A History of the Emergency Farm Labor Supply Program, 1943–1947* (Agricultural Monograph No. 13. Mimeographed. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 1951; 298 pp.), covered the war-time origins of contract-labor accords; Richard Hancock, a former employee in a bracero-contracting center, described the Mexican side of the program in *The Role of the Bracero in the Economic and Cultural Dynamics of Mexico: A Case Study of Chihuahua* (Stanford, 1959; 150 pp.); Henry P. Anderson provided a valuable first-hand account of bracero recruiting in "The Bracero in California, with Particular Reference to Health, Attitudes, and Practices" (Mimeographed. University of California School of Public Health, Berkeley, 1961; 328 pp.). The most important publications to date are Ernesto Galarza's outstanding *Merchants of Labor. The Mexican Bracero Story. An Account of the Managed Migration of Mexican Farm Workers in California, 1942–1960* (Santa Barbara, 1965); and Richard B. Craig's *The Bracero Program: Interest Groups and Foreign Policy* (Austin, 1971), which traces the rise and demise of the bi-national program, and the interplay of special interests as manifested in a wide survey of published sources.

Some examples of notable doctoral dissertations concerned with diplomacy, braceros, and wetback control are John P. Carney, "Postwar Mexican Migration: 1945–1955, with Particular Reference to the Policies and Practices of the United States Concerning its Control" (University of Southern California, 1957; 268 pp.); Robert D. Tomasck, "Political and Economic Implications of Mexican Labor in the United States under the Non-Quota System, Contract Labor Program and Wetback Employment" (University of Michigan, 1958: 318 pp.); and Johnny M. McCain, "Contract Labor as a Factor in United States–Mexican Relations, 1942–1947" (University of Texas at Austin, 1970; 383 pp.).

The longstanding need for a readily-available work on illegal immigration problems has been partly met by sociologist Julian Samora's publication, *Los Mojados: The Wetback Story* (Notre Dame, 1971). The most complete account to date, the book is a factual survey of the phenomenon, emphasizing the period since World War II. Also of historical value are the reminiscences of the 1940s and 1950s by a Texas wetback employer, Carrol Norquest, author of *Rio Grande Wetbacks: Mexican Migrant Workers* (Albuquerque, 1972).

One could mention many more studies covering aspects of the bracero program and wetback-control difficulties, such as Otey Scruggs, "The United States, Mexico and the Wetbacks, 1942–1947." *Pacific Historical Review*, 30: 149–164 (May 1961), an analysis based on archival sources; or government publications prepared with the collaboration of social scientists, for example, *Report of the President's [Truman] Commission on Migratory Labor in American Agriculture* (Washington, D.C., 1968), which contains (pp. 99–130), among other matter, an historical sketch of the immigrant-commuter phenomenon along U.S. land borders. However, like the bracero studies previously mentioned, government publications rarely have concentrated on permanent immigration and settlement generated by labor recruitment, legal and illegal. This lacuna is but partially filled by the recent exhaustive hearings on Mexican and other illegals, *Illegal Aliens. Hearings before the Subcommittee No. 1 (Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Chairman), House Committee on the Judiciary . . . 92nd Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions . . .* (Five parts. Washington, D.C., 1971–1972; 1528 pp.).

Other U.S. studies, source materials, and bibliographical aids bearing on Mexican emigration will be briefly indicated in later sections of this paper.

B. THE MEXICAN SIDE OF EMIGRATION LITERATURE.

It is estimated that by 1928, more than one-tenth of Mexico's population had moved, temporarily or permanently, to the United States. Mexico then had a population of approximately seventeen million. As early as 1917, the revolutionary government attempted to stop Mexican laborers from migrating north by establishing check-points on the railroads to detain workers without bonafide contracts, and by circulating reports about unfair treatment of Mexican labor in the United States, but to little avail. At the same time, the government attempted to protect those workers already in the United States and to repatriate them when possible through consular agencies and patriotic societies established in the United States.

As one might expect, many scattered notices on Mexican migration and repatriation can be found in Mexican newspapers, yet, strange to say, this subject of vital national concern has been generally ignored by Mexican writers, past and present. Excluding a few persons who had some official concern with government emigration or immigration services or statistical control, and with some exceptions such as Manuel Gamio, no Mexican writer published a major work on emigration or repatriation during the 1920s or 1930s. The nature of the few early publications dealing with these topics is therefore that of "official concern" with depopulation and loss of labor. The literature of official concern reflected the new spirit of revolutionary nationalism and its determination to assure: (a) that Mexicans were properly treated in the United States; (b) that they were discouraged from leaving *la madre patria*; (c) that private employers would honor labor contracts involving Mexican nationals; and (d) that Mexican consuls would do all in their power to promote *Mexicanidad* and repatriation. This sense of determination was usually accompanied by a feeling of national frustration that the benefits of Mexico's social revolution and agrarian reform were not yet tangible enough to keep Mexican laborers and their families at home.

Alfonso Fabila's tract, *El problema de la emigración de obreros y campesinos mexicanos* (México: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1928; 38 pp.), written in Los Angeles and published and distributed by the Mexican government, is an interesting example of semi-official propaganda (like that sometimes fed to Mexican newspapers) warning La Raza not to emigrate to the American El Dorado because they would most likely find themselves the victims of social discrimination, hard labor, vicious competition, high taxes, and unbearable Americanization pressures from the public schools. Another example of official concern is shown by the writings of Enrique Santibáñez. This writer, a Mexican Consul-General in San Antonio in the 1920s, was asked by President Portes Gil to write on the nature of Mexican emigration to the United States and to suggest possible solutions to the exodus. Santibáñez responded with a series of articles for *Excelsior*, one of the leading national newspapers. These articles were then brought together and published as *Ensayo acerca de la inmigración mexicana en los Estados Unidos* (San Antonio: Clegg Co., 1930; 105 pp.).

The Government's protective and paternal mission abroad as communicated to consular officers, particularly in the United States, is illustrated by *La migración y la protección de Mexicanos en el extranjero. Labor de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores en los Estados Unidos y Guatemala* (Mimeographed. México, D.F.: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1928; 60 pp.). This work was later published as *El servicio de migración en México* (México, Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1930; 60 pp.) with the author identified as Andrés Landa y Pina, head of the Department of Migration.

A work by Mexico's most noted and influential demographer, Gilberto Loyo, *Emigración de Mexicanos a los Estados Unidos* (Roma: Instituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1931; 15 pp.), may also be classified as a semi-official statement of concern, originally presented to the International Congress of Population Studies in Rome, but actually aimed at the Mexican government. Loyo expressed alarm at the Mexican labor

exodus of the 1920s, and stated his profound doubts that Mexicans of the mestizo or Indian type could be fully assimilated or accepted as North American citizens because of racial differences and prejudice. Loyo, who had interviewed *repatriados*, urged the revolutionary government to remove the causes of population-loss and labor-loss through industrial developments, better health and education services, and agrarian colonies to settle the landless campesinos. He elaborated on the need for a national population policy in *Las deficiencias cuantitativas de la población de México y una política demográfica nacional* (Roma, 1932; 24 pp.), and in one of his major works, sponsored by the ruling Revolutionary Party, *La política demográfica de México* (México: La Impresora, 1935; 485 pp.). Some of the proposals of Loyo, Landa y Pina, Gamio, and others concerned about the loss of population through emigration were incorporated into the Cárdenas' Six-Year Plan for bringing all Mexicans under the protective wings of the social revolution, including those in the "lost territories" over the border.

Manuel Gamio's works on Mexican emigration we have already mentioned. It is remarkable that thus far only one of these studies, namely, *The Mexican Immigrant* has been published in Spanish, and that in 1969 (!), under the title *El inmigrante mexicano: la historia de su vida. Notas preliminares de Gilberto Loyo sobre la inmigración de Mexicanos a los Estados Unidos de 1900 a 1967* (México: UNAM, 1969; 271 pp.). The Mexican edition contains a long introductory essay by Loyo, who used materials from the UCLA Mexican-American Study Project, directed by Leo Grebler, to provide a statistical updating to 1967.

No published work is known to exist, by Mexican agencies or individuals, devoted to the mass repatriation of Mexicans during the depression years, 1930–34, although one can find many revealing references to repatriados, as in the speeches by President Cárdenas, the government Memorias, newspaper editorials, and agrarian reform plans. For example, an official textbook for public schools on the subject of land reform contains a chapter on "Emigrants and Repatriates" that suggests how these repentant children of La Raza should be received in *ejidos*. (See Ernesto Martínez de Alva, *Vida rural*) (México: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1933; 309 pp.). A recent historical survey of the depression decade that also explores Mexican government efforts to meet the challenge of several hundred thousand returning repatriates by settling some of them in agrarian colonies is "Los efectos sociales de la crisis del '29" by Moisés González Navarro in *Historia Mexicana*, 20:2:536–558 (1970).

In spite of the limited number of Mexican publications directly concerned with emigration to the United States, other works exist by Mexican writers that could be useful for explaining the historical background and causes of the campesino exodus up to 1929. Three studies that offer an excellent historical treatment of Porfirian attempts to promote foreign colonization, especially in agricultural colonies, even as Mexican peons and artisans were fleeing semi-feudal conditions, are: Moisés T. de la Peña, "Problemas demográficos y agrarios," in *Problemas agrícolas e industriales de México* (II:3–4; julio–septiembre–octubre–diciembre de 1950; 9–327); and two studies by historian Moisés González Navarro, namely, *La colonización en México*,

Latin American Research Review

1877–1910 (México, D.F., 1960; 160 pp.), and “La política colonizadora del Porfiriato,” *Estudios Históricos Americanos* (México: El Colegio de México, 1953; pp. 183–239). These studies, especially that by González Navarro, contain a bibliography of source materials that indicate the rural conditions that condemned Porfirian colonization schemes to failure, and at the same time suggest the root causes of Mexican emigration to the United States.

Many other studies by both Mexican and North American authors describing a range of agrarian conditions in Mexico during the twentieth century, including latifundism, land-hunger, peonage conditions, static wages, rural misery, revolutionary upheavals, relative over-population, and agrarian reform failures, could serve as a background to emigration. One might begin with Andrés Molina Enríquez, *Los grandes problemas nacionales* (México, D.F., 1909), and include such fundamental studies as George M. McBride’s *The Land Systems of Mexico* (N.Y., 1923), and Nathan Whetten’s *Rural Mexico* (Chicago, 1948).

The second exodus of Mexicans to the United States that began during World War II generated a great quantity of comments by Mexican writers. The binational nature of the bracero agreements and the responsibilities undertaken by both governments in administering the program made Mexican labor migration a sensitive matter of national pride and concern. As in the United States, so in Mexico, the bracero question and the related phenomenon of wetbackism absorbed Mexican interest. In fact, in the 1950s alone, more was written by Mexicans about labor migration to United States than in the previous half-century. At one time or another it seemed that nearly every Mexican official, economist, editorialist, and reporter felt called upon to comment on the program of “controlled temporary migration to the United States,” and to give advice to the government or complain of abuses. In spite of the flood of comments in newspapers, magazines, published reports, and speeches on what was commonly called *bracerismo*, no Mexican writer has yet published a history or a full descriptive account of that subject, nor of the problem of wetback control, nor of other important aspects of Mexican emigration such as the great rise in legal emigration to the United States following World War II.

Much of the emigration literature published by the Mexican government after 1940 again falls, as in the 1920s, into the category of “official concern,” in this case, concern with protecting Mexican workers according to contract rights, and explaining or defending the bracero program to a rather critical public whose leftist sectors impudently asked why the Institutionalized Revolutionary Party could not keep Mexican labor at home. Two such typical statements by prominent Mexican officials are: Ezequiel Padilla and Antonio Rivas Guillén, *Braceros mexicanos en los Estados Unidos. Discursos* (México: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, ca. 1947); and Ignacio García Tellez, *La migración de braceros a los Estados Unidos* (México, D.F., 1955). Perhaps the most informative of government-sponsored studies is that published by the Secretaría de Trabajo, Dirección de Previsión Social, *Los braceros* (México, D.F.: Librería Ars, 1946; 120 pp.), an illustrated account prepared by Fernandes del Campo and others involved in the bracero program. It provides information about

immigrant laborers and their origins by use of interviews and health examinations, and also devotes attention to the problems of protecting unregistered “wetbacks.”

Among the more notable studies by Mexican social scientists which focus on the protection of Mexican labor under international control agreements is Mario Ojeda Gómez, *La protección de los trabajadores emigrantes* (México, D.F., 1957). Also, many dissertations have been written on the subject of bracerismo, particularly on administrative and contract arrangements, by Mexican students of law, political science, international relations, and economics. Some examples are: Rubén Martínez Zavala, “Estudio socio-jurídico sobre el trabajador mexicano emigrante” (Tesis en Derecho. UNAM, 1965; 177 pp.); Roberto Quiñones Díaz, “El contrato del trabajador agrícola migratoria” (Tesis en Derecho. UNAM, 1965; 157 pp.); and Gloria R. Vargas y Campos, “El problema del bracero mexicano” (Tesis en Economía. UNAM, 1964; 144 pp.).

Dozens of studies have examined the economic causes or economic impact of bracerismo. Some salient examples would be: Julián Rodríguez Adame, “El problema agrario mexicano y la mecanización agrícola,” in *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México* (1:1, julio–sept., 1946; 105–118); Luis Yáñez-Pérez, *Mecanización de la agricultura mexicana* (México, D.F.: Editorial Cultura, 1957; 419 pp.); and Edmundo Flores, “Los braceros y la política de fomento económico,” *Revista de Economía* (14:2; febrero, 1951; 12–15). Some writers used bracero emigration as an argument in favor of rapid industrialization to absorb rural migrants, as, for example, Manuel Germán Parra, *La industrialización de México* (México, D.F.: Imprenta Universitaria, 1954; 203 pp.). Other works were designed to promote reform in the bracero program. Two of the most comprehensive are: José Lazaro Salinas, *La emigración de braceros; visión objetiva de un problema mexicano* (León, Guanajuato: Imprenta Cuauhtémoc, 1955; 304 pp.), and Ernesto Galarza’s excellent review of labor abuses and labor displacement, “Trabajadores mexicanos en tierra extraña,” *Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales de México* (10:1; enero-marzo de 1962; 1–84). Other Mexican studies having some utility for research on Mexican emigration could be added here. However, most such items would be of marginal importance; for example, anthropologist Gilberto López y Riva’s *Los Chicanos, una minoría nacional explotada* (México: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1971), which borrows heavily from McWilliams, the UCLA Mexican-American Study Project, and the literature of Chicano militancy. In the future one can probably expect some important publications by Mexican scholars responding to the expectations of Chicano pilgrims, but the fact is that up to the present, Gamio’s *The Mexican Immigrant* (1931), translated, reprinted, and statistically updated by Gilberto Loyo (1969), is the most scholarly work by Mexican writers to be found in the Spanish language on the subject of Mexican emigration.

C. RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES IN MEXICAN EMIGRATION STUDIES

Having made a rapid survey to indicate the nature of historical and social science studies to date on Mexican emigration topics, published in English and Spanish, we

Latin American Research Review

will now suggest some opportunities in this neglected field of research, and at the same time briefly outline some of the primary and archival sources in the United States and Mexico that could be used to document such research. To begin with, no major historical study exists in published form about U.S. immigration policy toward Mexico. However, a start has been made in this direction by certain dissertations, some of which we have already mentioned: Martínez (1957); Neal (1941); Lipshultz (1962); and Hoffman (1970). Also, certain works on the bi-national bracero agreements and border-commuter arrangements have covered some aspects of U.S. immigration and labor policy toward Mexico, and the interest groups involved; for example, Galarza (1965), Craig (1971), Carney (1957), Tomasek (1958), and McCain (1970), to mention only a few.

Equally surprising is the lack of scholarly publications about the U.S. Border Patrol, the enforcement arm of the national immigration service. So far the only adult books available on the subject are by Mary Kidder Rak and John H. Myers. However, Rak's *Border Patrol* is an anecdotal account more concerned with liquor smuggling during the prohibition years, 1910–33, than with alien smuggling. Myers, a professional writer of Western Americana, derives most of his information from interviews and an intimate knowledge of the borderlands. His book, *The Border Wardens* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971), meets a need for a popular account of border-control problems. Myers lets veteran officers tell it as it was—and is—for some attention is given to the “new-style wetback invasion” underway to American cities since 1967. Samora's study of *Los mojados*, and Carney's thesis, previously referred to, contain much information on patrol activities and enforcement questions but these works are in no sense full accounts of this branch of federal service. To these studies, one should also add Richard T. Jernigin's account of the reform-impact of the wetback invasion of the 1950s on the Border Patrol: “The Effect of Increased Mexican Migration upon the Organization and Operations of the United States Immigration Border Patrol, Southwest Region” (Master's thesis. University of Southern California, 1957; 225 pp.).

Sources to document U.S. immigration policy toward Mexico and the Border Patrol, not fully utilized in the aforementioned studies, are: consular correspondence in the U.S. National Archives, open to 1945; files in the Central Office of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (open only to qualified researchers); articles by service personnel in the I.N.S. *Monthly Review* (later changed to *INS Reporter*); congressional hearings and reports; the *Congressional Record*; and interviews with veterans of the I.N.S. and congressional leaders who have been concerned with immigration policy and international labor programs. For government publications, see the bibliography in Frank L. Auerbach, *Immigration Laws of the United States* (2nd ed., Indianapolis, 1961; pp. 533–541).

Monographs on American attitudes toward Mexican migration and settlement are rare. Here it may be observed that no systematic use has yet been made by historians or by social scientists of a category of materials that bear directly on this sub-

ject, namely, the many reports dating from 1910, by missionaries, social and health workers, educators, social scientists, and reporters who had first-hand contact with Mexican campesinos, refugees, braceros, and wetbacks. Such accounts can be found in the *Los Angeles Times*, *San Antonio News*, *El Paso Herald-Times*, *The Fresno Bee*, and numerous other Southwestern and Western dailies.

From the viewpoint of studying American public reaction to Mexican laborers and settlers, these same articles and editorials may be considered primary sources, and so may dozens of books and symposia that have sought to “explain the Mexican” to the general public: for example, missionary Robert McLean’s *That Mexican! As He Really Is, North and South of the Rio Grande* (N.Y., London [etc.], Fleming Revell Co., 1928; 184 pp.); and *The National Conference Concerning Mexicans and Spanish Americans in the United States* (El Paso, Texas; Dec., 1926; 130 pp.). More recent examples of this prolific genre of literature are books and articles by social reformers who sympathetically explain César Chávez, the grapepickers, and *La Huelga* to the American public, studies such as Steve Allen’s *The Ground Under Our Table* (N.Y., 1966).

The stereotypes projected by the huge quantity of literature explaining Mexicans to the American public, especially the “Mexican social problem,” are now being vehemently combatted by ethnic scholars in such quarterlies as *Aztlán* and *El Grito*. See, for example, Nick C. Vaca, “The Mexican-Americans in the Social Sciences, 1912–1970,” Part I: 1912–1935, in *El Grito* (3:3:3–24; Spring 1970); and Part II: 1936–1970 (4:1:17–51; Fall 1970). However, no major study has yet been published by an historian or a social scientist or an ethnic scholar on the American public’s attitudes toward Mexican immigration and settlement, although Lipshultz’s dissertation, mentioned earlier, is a start. For compilations of literature relevant to public attitudes see Emory S. Bogardus (1934), Robert C. Jones (1940); George I. Sánchez and Howard Putnam (1958), Ralph Guzmán (1967), and Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Rivera (1971). These and other useful bibliographies are listed at the end of this article. The interested scholar will also find that the *Congressional Record* and congressional hearings and reports carry a wealth of illustrations. Certain dissertations described above can serve as introductions to these congressional sources, such as those by Neal or Lipshultz.

Research on related subjects, such as the more precise identification of U.S. interest groups and motives involved in debating the pros and cons of Mexican immigration and the bracero question, could use the aforementioned sources. Research possibilities are suggested by Harvey A. Levenstein’s article on the AFL’s frustrated attempts to persuade Mexican leaders to adopt a policy of voluntary restriction of Mexican labor: “The American Federation of Labor and Mexican Immigration in the 1920’s: An Experiment in Labor’s Diplomacy,” in *Hispanic American Historical Review* (48: 206–219; May 1968). See also Levenstein’s *Labor Organizations in the United States and Mexico: A History of their Relations* (Westport, Conn., 1971); Craig’s book on the bracero program (1971), and Ellis W. Hawley’s excellent study

of how a coalition of vested interests managed to renew the bracero program time after time: "The Politics of the Mexican Labor Issue, 1950–1965," in *Agricultural History* (40:3: 157–176); July 1966).

Although they form a small percentage of the total migration from Mexico to the United States in the present century, no published history exists of the settlement of Mexican political or religious refugees in the Southwest, particularly in key cities like San Antonio, El Paso, and Los Angeles, where they have exercised an influence disproportionate to their numbers on the social and subcultural structure of Mexican-American communities. A few dissertations and community studies have touched on the subject but this is still one of the most neglected facets of Mexican emigration. The serious researcher would probably want to consult such sources as the following: U.S. consular correspondence to 1945 in the National Archives; articles by North American missionaries and social workers in the border cities; newspapers, especially *La Prensa* of San Antonio and *La Opinión* of Los Angeles; consular correspondence in the Archivo de Relaciones Exteriores to 1940; presidential papers in the Archivo Nacional to 1940; interviews with members of refugee families who can easily be found in border cities, and possibly family archives of these highly literate groups.

The lack of general historical studies devoted to the theme of Mexican repatriation is now being partly remedied by the Mexican-American studies movement. We have already mentioned the Hoffman thesis on repatriation of Mexican nationals during the Great Depression (1970), while the Mexican American Cultural Center at UCLA has projected a monograph series, edited by Juan Gómez Quiñones and Roberto Sifuentes, which will include such subjects as "The Zoot-Suit Riots" and "Los Repatriados, 1930–1935." However, many aspects of repatriation, especially outside California, have not yet been studied by historians or social scientists. An article by Norman D. Humphrey points in this direction: "Mexican Repatriation from Michigan, Public Assistance in Historical Perspective," *Social Service Review* (15:3: 497–513; Sept., 1941). Consular correspondence in the U.S. National Archives, and in the Archivo de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, as well as documents in the central files of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and of immigrant aid societies, American railroads, and welfare agencies, deserve consideration by qualified investigators. See also the Hoffman thesis, which contains a commentary on source materials.

As previously indicated, monographs are lacking on the influence of the bracero program on the mass emigration of Mexicans to the United States since World War II. This program was intended to be temporary in nature. However, as many authors of bracero studies have pointed out, what in Mexico was known as *bracerismo* was also a form of permanent emigration and settlement *en el otro lado*, since hundreds of thousands of braceros, normally excluded under U.S. immigration laws, found the door wide open. Many of them were permanently "immigrated" by their employers, who acted as sponsors. Thousands more, having learned their way around the U.S. labor market, jumped or "skipped" under their contracts, or returned as wetbacks. Many who married Mexican-American women in the United States, or had children

born here in a “wetback family,” or found permanent jobs, were later able to legalize their residency through various forms of priority established by the U.S. Department of Labor or by U.S. immigration laws, especially those laws designed to keep the family together. Moreover, those who legally immigrated almost invariably sent for their immediate relatives.

As the research scholar might see it, the bracero program served as a pump-primer for a second wave of Mexican emigration, legal and otherwise, that has brought over two million Mexican settlers to the United States since 1945. This approach is suggested, though not developed, by several writers; for example, Grebler, *Mexican Immigration to the United States: The Record and the Implications* (1966), and Elizabeth Hadley, “A Critical Analysis of the Wetback Problem,” in *Law and Contemporary Problems* (21: 334–357; 1966). Aside from bracero studies and official publications cited by Grebler, systematic research of this topic would suppose interview information from U.S. Mexican officials, active and retired; Mexican settlers; and long-time observers of Mexican labor-migration such as Ernesto Galarza, Paul S. Taylor, and Robert C. Jones.

As indicated, bracero studies have taken note of “skips” and “wets” but, obviously, unregistered migration which may account in one form or another for half or more of the present Mexican-American population is a major subject in itself. Scruggs is one of the few American historians to probe the subject, but his aforementioned article on “United States, Mexico and the Wetbacks, 1942–1947” (1961), is concerned principally with commitments to control the bracero program. The fact is that *Los Mojados: the Wetback Story* (1971), by socialist Samora, stands alone as the most informative, factual study of the phenomenon thus far, particularly since the 1940s. However, there are many facets of this subject still to be studied from both sides of the border. For example, a forthcoming study by Harlan B. Carter, until recently Commissioner of the Southwest Region, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, will emphasize the complex nature of migration control problems on the Mexican border; and certain studies in the “Occasional Papers” series, sponsored by the Border-State Consortium for Latin America and published by the Inter-American Institute, University of Texas at El Paso, will cover border-control problems. Besides official publications and interviews suggested by Samora’s study, there is much primary material for qualified researchers in U.S. consular correspondence, in the central files of the INS, in the fraudulent document center of the INS in Yuma, Arizona, and in Mexican national archives and government Memorias.

Demographers, economic geographers, and sociologists have prepared many useful reports, monographs, profiles, and articles on mortality, mobility, urbanization, employment, and the geographical distribution of Mexicans and Mexican-American or Spanish-American groups. However, it should be noted that nearly all such studies, whether under public or private auspices, rely heavily on the incomplete and defective information given in INS reports and U.S. census studies, such as the “Special Reports on Spanish-Surnamed Population.” For critical appraisals of such data see Grebler (1966) and Taylor, *Mexican Labor . . . Migration Statistics* (6:3:: 247–254;

Aug. 1929). Given the enormous statistical gaps in measuring the ebb and flow of Mexican migration it is understandable that no researcher as yet has dared to attempt a comprehensive sorting out of unregistered settlers and their descendants from other groups of Mexican origin in the Southwest. One might apply here Grebler's observation that measuring Mexican migration is like measuring the dimensions of an iceberg—only a small surface of firm statistics is visible. Yet it would seem that if in the future better estimates of Mexican settlement are to be made, one must call for interpolative studies in historical demography. A suggestive study is Richard L. Nostrand, "The Hispano-American Borderlands. A Regional, Historical Geography (doctoral dissertation, UCLA, 1968; 359 pp.).

Hundreds of studies and reports on Mexican migrant labor and mobility patterns have been published in the United States, but virtually no histories. Taylor's works, especially his *A Mexican-American Frontier* (1934), contain much historical material. Coalsen's doctoral dissertation on migratory labor in Texas, also mentioned earlier, is another rare example of an historical study. Many other accounts contain some historical perspectives, such as Harry Schwartz, *Seasonal Farm Labor in the United States* (N.Y., 1945) or McWilliams' works previously cited, particularly his *Factories in the Field* (1939). Nevertheless, this area is wide open for historical monographs. Sources are suggested in bibliographies and guides on agricultural labor appended to this article.

Another important facet of Mexican migrancy rarely studied is the relation between migrant labor and settlement patterns in colonias and barrios near railroads, mines, agricultural or industrial areas, or near border regions convenient to Mexico. Historian Carlos Cortés, sociologist Joan Moore, and other members of a research group associated with the University of California, Riverside, have carried out a survey of Mexican settlement and labor history in the San Bernardino area. Johnny McCain of San Antonio College is currently engaged in a study of San Antonio as a Mexican settlement mecca and as a recruiting center for migrant labor. A model for this kind of study that suggests the type of source materials and interview information that could be used is Taylor's work described above.

The relation between social-service agencies (or what Octavio Romano calls "caretaker institutions") and Mexican settlement and emigration patterns has not been studied. Here one would want to know to what extent missionaries, social workers, immigrant-aid societies, and now workers in federal anti-poverty programs have served through the years to attract Mexican refugees and laborers and their families to settle on the U.S. side, particularly near urban centers like El Paso, San Antonio, and Los Angeles, where extensive social services are available. Also one would want to ascertain to what extent such services encouraged migrancy or served as a subsidy for employers by caring for laborers' families during the off-season, or while the menfolk went in search of seasonal jobs. Aside from countless reports written by social-agency personnel, much of it published in periodical literature, sources would include interviews at and the files of church-charity and social-work agencies, and of such immigrant-aid societies as that maintained by the Department of Immigration of the United States Catholic Conference, located in El Paso, Texas.

Social scientists such as Victor S. Clark (1908), Gamio (1930, 1931), Taylor (1928–34), and more recently Grebler (1966), have all given attention to causes of Mexican labor migration, and so have many authors of bracero studies, but special monographs on this phenomenon that fully analyze socio-economic conditions in Mexico (and what Grebler calls the “push-pull factors” on both sides of the border) have yet to be published in English or Spanish. Lawrence Cardoso, a University of Wyoming Latin Americanist, is presently working on the causes of Mexican emigration before 1930. Historian Moisés González Navarro, of El Colegio de México, is engaged in research on internal migration and its relation to the bracero exodus, and there are probably some ethnic scholars at work on this topic. A full account of the Mexican side of repatriation during the 1920s and 1930s has not yet been published, although Mercedes Carreras de Velasco, a graduate student in international relations at El Colegio de México, has just completed a master’s thesis on this theme.

Thus far it seems that no one has thoroughly analyzed the resistance of Mexican settlers to Americanization or naturalization. As indicated by Mexican “official literature,” such a study would probably find that the Mexican government for many years did all in its power to encourage resistance to assimilation by the *coloso yanqui*. Concerned with population loss and moved by a fierce revolutionary pride, as exemplified by Cárdenas, the Mexican government began in the early 1920s to “redeem the Mexican race,” especially the Indio-campesino, and to instill the consciousness of La Raza and Mexicanidad in Mexicans everywhere. Mexican consuls were charged not only with repatriation but with instilling a Mexican national conscience in the *emigrados* living in U.S. barrios and labor colonies, by sponsoring Mexican clubs, mutual aid societies, fiestas honoring *la patria*, consular libraries, and *Comisiones Honoríficas* of Mexican residents to aid in this mission where consuls were not present. Although this revolutionary fervor has dropped dramatically since 1950, such sponsoring of Mexicanidad is still a unique devotional duty of Mexican diplomatic and consular personnel serving in the United States. The effects of such cultural missions on the crisis of cultural identity supposedly suffered by Chicano barrio youth in the United States has not been investigated by historians or social scientists. The major source of information for such a study would be Mexican consular correspondence from U.S. cities, and also interviews with Mexican immigration officials, “Americanization” teachers, and Mexican settlers. One should also review American periodical literature on Mexican assimilation questions, as for example, the Bogardus bibliography (1934), and a rare autobiography by a Mexican immigrant, namely, Ernesto Galarza’s *Barrio Boy* (Notre Dame, 1971), as well as a very subjective account of the Mexican migration experience by Rodolfo Alvarez, “The Psycho-Historical and Socioeconomic Development of the Chicano Community in the United States,” *Social Science Quarterly*, LII (March, 1973), 920–942.

The “Border Study Project” directed by Julian Samora, University of Notre Dame, with the collaboration of other researchers such as Fred Schmidt, Institute of Industrial Relations, UCLA, is presently investigating such topics as wetbacks, commuters, wages, and other unique characteristics of the border economy. In the larger

Latin American Research Review

framework, that is, the Southwestern region, there is need to study and interpret the influence of Mexican labor on economic development during the twentieth century, if one would attempt more satisfying answers to such questions as the extent to which domestic labor was displaced by Mexican newcomers; the effect of Mexican casuals on labor unions, wages, and non-mechanization in agriculture; the deflection of black and "poor-white" labor from the Southwest states; the extent to which Mexican migrant families settled near jobs and social services out of the migrant-labor stream, leading to demands for "fresh, unspoiled labor" from Mexico; and other questions concerning the dynamics of economic development in the Southwest region and the Mexican contribution. Put another way, this would mean picking up the research at a point near where Paul S. Taylor left it in 1934. Continuation of this work of synthesis should perhaps be left to those investigators who are not only familiar with economic development theory but with the vast panorama of literature on Mexican migrant labor in the United States.

Finally, some of the Mexican-American studies centers endowed with research fellowships are now beginning to look in the direction of migration research, and so are some of the new ethnic journals like *Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and Arts* (Mexican American Cultural Center, University of California, Los Angeles). Another publication, already mentioned, the *Journal of Mexican-American History*, has a natural interest in similar studies, and so does the new *Journal of Ethnic Studies* sponsored by Western Washington State College, Bellingham.

D. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AIDS.

To date, there is no satisfactory bibliography or guide in published form, in English or Spanish, specifically concerned with modern Mexican migration to the United States. Pertinent literature including books, articles, unpublished dissertations, government publications with some references to Mexican works, special collections, and other useful bibliographies, can be found scattered in a number of studies previously mentioned and in such selected bibliographies as the following:

Charles C. Cumberland, *The United States-Mexican Border: A Selective Guide to the Literature of the Region* (Supplement to *Rural Sociology*, 25:2, June 1960), 223 pp. Annotated; covers from Spanish times to 1960, all aspects.

Emory S. Bogardus, "Literature and Research on Mexicans and Mexican-Americans." In: *The Mexicans in the United States* (University of Southern California Press, 1934; pp. 99-123). Annotated; emphasis on immigration and adjustment problems. Originally printed as: *The Mexican Immigrant, an Annotated Bibliography* (Council on International Relations, Los Angeles, 1929; 21 pp.)

Robert C. Jones, *Mexicans in the United States: A Bibliography* (Pan American Union, 1942; 14 pp.). Supplements Bogardus; unannotated.

Murray R. Benedict, Paul S. Taylor, et al., *Agricultural Labor in the Pacific Coast States. A Bibliography and Suggestions for Research* (Pacific Coast Regional Committee of the Social Science Research Council. August 1938; 64 pp.).

Mitchell Slobodek, *A Selective Bibliography of California Labor History* (Insti-

- tute of Industrial Relations, UCLA, 1964; 265 pp.). Annotated; covers period 1873–1963.
- David C. Ruesink and Brice T. Batson, *Bibliography Relating to Agricultural Labor* (Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas A. & M., College Station, Texas, 1969; 96 pp.). Unannotated; lists over 1,000 items, including bibliographies and unpublished materials produced in period 1964–69.
- Isao Fujimoto and Jo Claire Schieffer, *Guide to Sources on Agricultural Labor* (Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences, University of California, Davis, 1969. Mimeographed. 39 pp.). Annotated guide suggesting location of many materials from government and non-government agencies, and supplementary bibliographies.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Dictionary Catalog of the National Agricultural Library, 1862–1965* (New York: Rowan and Littlefield, 1969). Unannotated. Vol. 41: pp. 197–278, concerned with Mexicans in the United States.
- Paul S. Taylor, "California's Farm Labor: A Review," *Agricultural History* (42:1, January 1968; 49–54). Suggests some unpublished sources for the study of agricultural labor in California such as the materials collected by the Federal Writers Project (WPA) now in the Bancroft Library. Taylor's own papers are also at the University of California, Berkeley.
- Michael N. Cutsumbis, "The National Archives and Immigration Research," *The International Migration Review* (3:2: 90–99; Summer 1970). Provides a general introduction.
- George I. Sánchez and Howard Putnam, *Materials Relating to the Education of Spanish-Speaking People in the United States: An Annotated Bibliography* (University of Texas Institute of Latin American Studies, 1959; 74 pp.). Covers much more than education.
- Ralph Gúzman, *Revised Bibliography*. Advance Report 3, Mexican-American Study Project (Graduate School of Business Research, UCLA, 1967; 99 pp.). Comprehensive but non-annotated. Reprinted in Leo Grebler, et al., *The Mexican-American People: the Nation's Second Largest Minority* (N.Y., 1970; pp. 677–742).
- Stanford University, Center for Latin American Studies, *The Mexican American. A Selected and Annotated Bibliography* (Mimeographed. Stanford University Bookstore, 1969; 139 pp. Rev. ed., Luis G. Nogales, ed. 1971; 162 pp.). Abstracts of the more important works on Mexican-Americans designed for ethnic-study use. Lists other bibliographies.
- Ernie Barrios, et al., *Bibliografía de Aztlán; An Annotated Chicano Bibliography* (Mimeographed. Centro de Estudios Chicanos, San Diego State College, 1971; 167 pp.) Intended to provide a Chicano critique of the more important works on Mexican-Americans.
- Matt S. Meier and Feliciano Rivera, *A Selective Bibliography for the Study of Mexican American History* (Mimeographed. Spartan Bookstore, San Jose College,

Latin American Research Review

1971; 79 pp. Reprinted by R and E Associates, San Francisco, 1972; 96 pp.) Unannotated, but one of the most comprehensive listings prepared for ethnic studies. Lists other bibliographies.

Finally, it might be noted that other bibliographies, inspired by the ethnic-study movement, will soon be forthcoming. For example, the Border-Study group directed by Julian Samora is preparing an extensive compilation, including government publications, that will cover several aspects of Mexican emigration; and an annotated bibliography is being prepared by a research group associated with a project to study Mexican migration to the United States since 1900, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, and under the direction of Arthur F. Corwin of the University of Connecticut.