universität wien

# MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

„The U.S.-Mexico Borderlands and Contemporary Approaches to Border Security“

Verfasser

Cole Harry

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master (MA)

Wien, 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: | A 067 805 |
| Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: | Individuelles Masterstudium:<br>Global Studies – a European Perspective |
| Betreuerin / Betreuer: | ao. Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Friedrich Edelmayer, MAS |

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

universität wien

# MASTERARBEIT / MASTER THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit /Title of the master thesis

## The U.S.-Mexico Borderlands and Contemporary Approaches to Border Security


Verfasser /Author

Cole Harry


angestrebter akademischer Grad / acadamic degree aspired

Master (MA)

Wien, 2013

| | |
|---|---|
| Studienkennzahl : | A 067 805 |
| Studienrichtung: | Individuelles Masterstudium:<br>Global Studies – a European Perspective |
| Betreuer/Supervisor: | ao. Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Friedrich Edelmayer, MAS |

**Abstract**

This thesis takes a historical look at the U.S.-Mexico border and seeks to contextualize the border as a historical phenomenon. Beginning with the early settlers, both Anglo settlers from the North and Hispanic settlers from the South, this thesis examines early settlement of the borderlands and the interactions the new settlers had with the indigenous people, focusing particularly on the construction of a borderlands identity that is divergent from the arbitrary divisions the border line institutes between the United States and Mexico. As the border developed, there was a shift in focus of the two states from focusing on the borderlands as a zone of military security to regulating cross-border flows. This thesis argues that in post-9/11 United States, the focus has returned to military security, as immigration and the "war on drugs" have been co-opted into issues of national security, and the border is becoming militarized.

**Abstrakt**

Diese Arbeit nimmt einen historischen Blick auf die US-mexikanischen Grenze und versucht, die Grenze als historisches Phänomen zu kontextualisieren. Beginnend mit den frühen Siedler, beide anglo Siedler aus dem Norden und Hispanic Siedler aus dem Süden, untersucht diese These frühe Besiedlung der Grenzgebiete und die Wechselwirkungen die neuen Siedler hatten mit der indigenen Bevölkerung, die sich vor allem auf den Bau eines borderlands Identität, ist abweichend von den willkürlichen Divisionen die Grenze Instituten zwischen den Vereinigten Staaten und Mexiko. Da die Grenze entwickelt, gab es eine Verschiebung im Fokus der beiden Staaten von der Fokussierung auf den Grenzgebieten als eine Zone der militärischen Sicherheit zur Regelung grenzüberschreitenden Stromflüsse. Diese These argumentiert, dass in post-9/11 Vereinigten Staaten, hat sich der Schwerpunkt der militärischen Sicherheit zurückgegeben, wie Einwanderung und der "Krieg gegen Drogen" wurden in Fragen der nationalen Sicherheit kooptiert, und die Grenze wird immer militarisiert.

"La realidad fronteriza, múltiple y compleja, no se agota en la dimensión binaria definida por lo mexicano y lo estadunidense. Tampoco se conforma a partir de relaciones dicotómicas que desconiocen campos intersticiales y procesos transfronterizos que han marcado la vida y la cultura de ambas partes. La frontera es una gramática abierta, un texto inconcluso que se elabora desde múltiples miradas y acepta muchas lecturas."[1]

To live in the borderlands means you
are neither *hispana india negra española*
*ni gabacha, eres mestiza, mulata*, half-breed
caught in the crossfire between camps
while carrying all five races on your back
not knowing which side to turn to, run from;
To live in the Borderlands means knowing that the *india* in you, betrayed for 500 years,
is no longer speaking to you,
the *mexicanas* call you *rajetas*, that denying the Anglo inside you
is as bad as having denied the Indian or Black;
[…]
To survive the Borderlands
you must live *sin fronteras*
be a crossroads.[2]

[1] Valenzuela, Jose Manuel. "Al otro lado de la linea. Representaciones socioculturales en las narrativas sobre la frontera Mexico-Estado Unidos". *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Vol. 62, No. 2, Apr-Jun. 2000, p. 127.

[2] Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands-La Frontera: The New Mestiza.* San Francisco, U.S.A.: Aunt Lute Books, 1987, p. 194-195.

## Table of Contents

## Introduction

The age of globalization is often heralded as the disintegration of borders and deepening of global flows, interactions, and interdependencies. Discourses of contested boundaries, border transgressions, de- and re-territorialization, imagined nations, and unbounded nations are ubiquitous in both academic and laymen discussions of globalization. Given the hegemony of this understanding of globalization, it is difficult to situate the nation-state and its contemporary attempts to maintain territorial sovereignty. As neoliberal economic policies throughout the world give rise to the free and regulated flow of goods and services, there is a simultaneous crackdown by sovereign states to control irregular cross-border flows, such as undocumented migration and illegal drug smuggling. If we begin with the premise of living in a borderless age of increasing global interdependence, how do we explain the contradiction of the rise of border surveillance and security?

Contemporary imaginations of the border area between the United States and Mexico conjure notions of a heavily militarized and politically polarized zone of difference. Sensationalistic news stories of mass deaths and kidnappings from drug cartels dominate the headlines of the global press, and there is increasing political pressure in the United States to further "secure" the border through increased surveillance and military presence. Paradoxically, the securitization and militarization of the border has occurred concurrently with the intertwining of the United States and Mexican economies through increasing cross-border trade and neo-liberal economic policies — most notably with the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), signed in 1994. The border region of the United States and Mexico is exemplary of the contradictions of contemporary globalization: the dissolution of borders for trade and finance with the simultaneous increase in border security regimes through the use of complex technologies and military force.

The border between the U.S. and Mexico is the longest and busiest land border in the world, running 3,169 km through sparsely populated and difficult to control regions with harsh climate and terrain. Throughout the history of the borderlands region, there has been a constant flow of migration, both from Anglo-American settlers entering the formerly Spanish and Mexican territories, and, later, Mexican and Central Americans entering the U.S., with especially high numbers entering in the 20th century. As a result of high levels of immigration and a high birth rate, the Hispanic population of the U.S., according to data from the 2010 Census, grew by 43% between 2000 and 2010, representing over 50 million individuals and 1

in 6 citizens of the U.S.[3] If this trend continues, by 2050, Hispanics could number almost one third of the U.S. population and will be the dominant ethnic majority in the U.S.[4] Both because of the increased border security and the economic crisis in the U.S., irregular migration across the border has massively decreased in the recent years; however, the Hispanic population continues to grow because of the high birth rate and low age of the already present migrants.

While stories of drug cartels and the resulting violence from the so-called "War on Drugs" are well-known and heavily covered in the international press, the resulting humanitarian crisis experienced by migrants attempting to cross the border and facing increasingly dangerous conditions is often overlooked. As a result of U.S. policies to heavily patrol urban areas, migrants have been pushed further into remote areas of the desert to attempt to cross. This forces migrants to go on long and dangerous treks through the extreme heat and cold of the desert, often with scanty supplies and limited food and water, to enter the U.S. Migrants often pay individuals, known as "coyotes", large sums to assist them crossing the border. When crossing, migrants are frequently held up by armed criminal groups or simply robbed by the "coyotes" themselves. These conditions lead to incredibly high death rates of migrants: the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a U.S.-based human rights legal organization, estimates on deaths on the border range from 3,861 to 5,607 between the period of 1995 – 2010.[5] Notably, as surveillance and militarization increased, the border became more deadly. A 2009 study showed that crossing in 2009 was 1.5 times more deadly than 2004, and 17 times more deadly than 1998.[6]

It is crucial to note that this phenomenon is not rooted in history; rather, it is a new episode in borderlands life that was formerly characterized by open flows of humans, goods, and ideas and a shared, hybrid sense of identity between the U.S. and Mexico. Because of the long history of exchange and the close proximity, borderlands cities and regions

---

[3] Ceasar, Stephen. "Hispanic Population Tops 50 Million in U.S.", LA Times Online, March 24, 2011; accessed September 28, 2012. [http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/24/nation/la-na-census-hispanic-20110325]

[4] Passel, Jeffrey and D'vera Cohn. "U.S. Population Projections 2000-2050", Pew Hispanic Center, February 11, 2008; accessed September 29, 2012. [http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-population-projections-2005-2050/]

[5] Jimenez, Maria. "Humanitarian Crisis: Migrant Deaths at the U.S.-Mexico Border", ACLU of San Diego and Imperial Counties and Mexico's National Commission on Human Rights, October 1, 2009. [http://cw.routledge.com/textbooks/9780415996945/migrants/HumanitarianCrisis.pdf], p. 8

[6] Ibid., p. 8.

are significant points of cross-cultural flows and the construction of new identities. The change in character of the border has significantly altered the thriving border culture, and disrupted the lives of border people. Ports of entry, like Douglas, Arizona, were once characterized by a constant flow of cross-border traffic: families would live in Mexico, but work in the U.S., or school children would cross daily from Mexico to attend school in the U.S. Now, the border crossings have become militarized and strictly controlled, and the regulation has made quick and easy crossings impossible, thus forcing individuals to stay on their respective sides and disrupting their cross-border lives.

Civil society groups on both sides of the border have responded in various ways to the perceived crisis of the border. In both Mexico and the U.S., NGOs and humanitarian aid groups have emerged in response to the crisis of migrants dying while trying to cross the border, setting up points in the desert with food and water, and migrant resource centers on both sides of the border. On the other side of the political spectrum, right-wing xenophobic groups have also emerged to attempt to stop the flow of undocumented migration into the U.S. and promote stricter border patrols through highly publicized political actions. These groups particularly increased in number and prominence after September 11 provided a new reason and motivation to "protect" the borders of the U.S. from outsiders. Though these groups have widely varying motives and goals, both have emerged in response to a perceived crisis on the border and should be historically contextualized within the change in character of the border.

The first part of this thesis will outline the historical development of the U.S.-Mexico border from the very earliest settlers until the Mexican-American War and the U.S. acquisition of the Southwest territories. Rather than take the division between the two states as a starting point, I will look at the history of the region from a global history standpoint – understanding the border strictly as a historical phenomenon. This section will seek to contextualize and address the question of how the border was understood before the line was drawn, when the Spanish crown, indigenous people, Anglo-American settlers, and other European colonizers were competing for claims to the land. By placing the current border regime in the context of regional history, the border will be problematized and it will facilitate a more profound understanding of why the current situation is unique.

Acknowledging the historical shift in how the physical border and the borderlands between the U.S. and Mexico are understood, the second chapter of this thesis will look into the historical development of physical border regime itself after the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and its

influence on borderlands culture. It will focus on the shift from the state's focus on military security to the state's focus on securing and controlling cross-border flows. Because of the transnational nature of the border region, the towns and regions on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border have developed a unique history and culture that transcends national identities and fixed allegiances to either the U.S. or Mexico. Cities like Douglas, Arizona, El Paso, Texas, and Tijuana, Mexico formerly existed as porous ports of entry but now are forced to rapidly adapt to the stringent new border policies. The second chapter will seek to understand the initial transformations in border culture in response to the transition from a regime that focused on securing sovereignty over the land to a regime that focused on controlling cross-border flows.

The last chapter will focus on contemporary security regimes and political movements along the border and attempts to situate them historically. Having acknowledged that the establishment of the borderline shifted the state's focus from military security and sovereignty to the management of cross border flows in the late 19th and early 20th century, this chapter will look into the resurgence of militarized regimes of security on the border in the 21st century. It will examine how local groups and actors are responding to the shift in border policy by the U.S. government and try to understand the change in perception of the borderlands as a zone of life and death.

The ultimate goal of this thesis is to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the contemporary dynamics of the border region. The question at hand is how and why did the border change from a low-intensity, politically irrelevant zone to a high-intensity, highly politicized zone over the course of the 20th century. By tracing the history of the region while treating the physical border as a historical phenomenon rather than an unquestionable truth and giving preeminence to transnational border cultures, this thesis will provide an non-nation-state-centric approach towards the subject. Achieving this requires acknowledging the presence of globalization without adopting a specifically pro- or anti-globalization position and falling into the subsequent ideological restrictions. A historical perspective gives the benefit of seeing changes over time and breaking through the quagmire of contemporary political discussions of border politics and security.

As a California native and a life-long enthusiast of Latin American and Chicano/a cultures, I hope this thesis will contribute to a growing dialogue on border issues and serve as a personal jumping off point for further academic exploration of the topic.

## 1. Early Settlers and Competing Claims

Borderlands history, as defined by Samuel Truett, is "[the] story of many peoples, shaped in distinct ways at the continental crossroads of empires, nations, markets, and cultures."[7] When examining histories and contemporary imaginations of the borderlands, it is clear that national histories have triumphed over regional or transnational discussions of the space in both the U.S. and Mexico. U.S. history only includes Mexican history before the land acquisitions of 1848 and 1854, starkly demarcating the shift from Mexican territory to U.S. territory without looking into any of the transnational regional character. As a result of this allegiance to national histories, the borderlands are often viewed in the U.S. as the "land that time forgot, places where renegades and bandits have given way to new barbarians: mercenary *narcotraficantes,* immigrant desperados, and camouflaged vigilantes."[8] The borderlands remain trapped within a "Wild-West" discourse, with the citizens of the U.S. occupying the legitimate place in history as settlers in the name of the triumphant nation-state while the Mexican Others remain a threatening presence across the starkly drawn line. To address this unbalanced history, this chapter will present a regional history that starts from the border itself and includes spaces on both sides as the units of analysis.

Despite its presence in U.S. history, an oft-neglected point in contemporary discussions of immigration and border issues is the fact that present-day California, Teas, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, more than half of Colorado, the Oklahoma Panhandle, and the southwestern corners of Wyoming and Kansas were all parts of Mexico's national territory before the United States acquisition in the mid 19th century. The narrative of Western expansion from Anglo-Americans[9] remains dominant and obfuscates the historical roots of the region, despite the fact that this region has the highest concentration of Chicanos.[10] Recent movements in

---

[7] Truett, Samuel. *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands.* New Haven, U.S.A.: Yale University Press, 2006, p. 8.

[8] Ibid., p. 5.

[9] I acknowledge that this term is not inclusive but will be employed to refer to white North Americans of European descent.

[10] The terminology to describe Latin American immigrants in the U.S. has been contested and discussed. In this paper, I will use the term Chicanos to describe descendents of Latin American migrants already living in the United States. I acknowledge the exclusionary aspects of this word because of the gendered nature of using Chicanos over Chicanas, but, in the interest of being succinct, I will use Chicanos to refer to both male and female descendents of Latin American migrants.

Chicano studies and activism have attempted to reclaim the region as a homeland for Chicanos and construct a new historical narrative that acknowledges the dispossession of Mexican citizens and indigenous people as a result of the U.S. acquisition of the region. This creates a clash between Anglo-American narratives of the old West, characterized by Manifest Destiny and romantic notions of the old West and the rugged pioneer settlers who have been idolized in Western film and literature, and the Chicano narrative of dispossession and affiliation with Mexico and Latin America. Before going into the history of the region, it is important to recognize how these clashing narratives were formed and how they give legitimacy to those who believe them.

As is the case in instances of colonialism and nation building, the history of the U.S.-Mexico border region has been written from the perspective of the dominant group: the Anglo-Americans. The American West occupies a privileged position in North American mythology, history, and culture. Historian Henry Nash Smith named it the myth of the Virgin Land, arguing that "one of the most persistent generalizations concerning American life and character is the notion that our society has been shaped by the pull of a vacant continent drawing population westward through the passes of the Alleghenies, across the Mississippi Valley, over the high plains and mountains of the Far West to the Pacific Coast."[11] The idea of Manifest Destiny and the triumph of Anglo-American colonists to expand the U.S. from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific is still an essential component of the U.S. identity. As John Chavez in *The Chicano Homeland* points out, even referring to the land as the Southwest solidifies the Anglo-American narrative by geographically locating the region with respects to the Eastern-seaboard of the U.S.[12] Before U.S. expansion, the region was understood as the North, taking Mexico City as the reference point for its geographical position.

Looking at the region from the Chicano perspective provides a completely different understanding of its history. Rather than an area of triumphant expansion and progress, it is viewed as a lost land. The mixture of indigenous, Spanish colonizers, and mestizos who lived on the land prior to the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo viewed themselves as a conquered people and had no allegiance to the Anglo-American settlers expanding across the continent. The idea of a conquered people remains prevalent in Chicano scholarship and activism, and post-colonial narratives that

---

[11] Chavez, John. *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest.* New Mexico, U.S.A.: University of New Mexico Press, 1984, p. 2.
[12] Ibid., p. 2.

emphasize the struggle between the native Chicanos of the region with the Anglo-American colonizers can be found throughout Chicano culture. Chicanos often refer to the Southwest as Aztlán after the Aztec city and culture that, according to mythology, dominated the region in the pre-Colombian time period. More details on the Chicano historical narrative and cultural identity will be discussed in Chapter Two. For now it is important to acknowledge that the history of the region is politically contested and any written history has the potential to uproot the claims made to the land. Keeping that in mind, the following section will give an outline of the historical events that led to the construction of the border from a regional perspective, attempting to examine the intersections of cultures and nations that gave the region its unique history. This history is not intended to be exhaustive; indeed, many crucial events and actors are left out in the interest of space. Rather, it is intended to construct a narrative of the region that lends itself to a broader understanding of U.S.-Mexico borderlands history.

Though little is known about the specifics of the indigenous people living in the U.S.-Mexico border region before the arrival of European colonizers, there is evidence of clearly distinguishable cultures existing in south Arizona as far back as 8,000 BCE. Anthropologists believe that the Cochise indigenous culture of southern Arizona was the parent culture of both the Ute of Colorado and the famous Aztecs of the Valley of Mexico.[13] It is believed that the Uto-Aztecean language family stems from the language spoken by the Cochise culture. The languages of many indigenous cultures, including the well-known Pueblos and Aztecs, derived their languages from this family. Anthropologists believe that the Southwest and the Valley of Mexico made contact around 1000 BCE, where the Uto-Aztecean language moved South and the technology of maize cultivation moved North. This led to the replacement of the hunting and gathering culture of the Cochise with the sedentary cultures of the Mogollon, Hohokam, Anasazi, and Pueblos. Additionally, the descendants of the original Cochise people became the direct ancestors of many of the modern-day Mexican people. The influence from the south, particularly from the Aztecs, Toltecs, and Teotihuacanos, continued to grow until the Spanish colonizers arrived in the 16th century. Although this is ancient history, it is relevant to note that the people occupying the Southwest region of the United States have looked south towards the Valley of Mexico for cultural influence for most of history. Even before Spanish colonization, the region was deeply connected to present-day Mexico.

[13] Ibid., 9.

When the Spanish arrived in the 16th century, their never-ending appetites for gold and silver led to the development of a mythology surrounding the border region. Having been awed by the wealth and development of the Valley of Mexico, Spanish colonizers, aided by stories told to them by indigenous people, believed several different myths about the border region — all of which pointed to the fact that the area was home to vast amounts of wealth, particularly gold and silver. They additionally believed in a strait that cut across the North American continent, leading directly to the riches of the Orient. The legends of the golden north led to many expeditions, all of which ended in dashed hopes and unrealized fortunes. The desire to move north was continually refreshed and inspired by new stories from the earliest explorers.

Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca provided one of the most significant and inspiring narratives of the north after being shipwrecked off the coast of Florida, sailing by raft through the Gulf of Mexico, and traversing the great distance back to the Spanish settlements in the south. The shipwreck occurred in 1528, but he did not arrive back in Mexico City until 1536 and had to count on the assistance of indigenous peoples to survive. He and his fellow travelers learned to eat prickly pear fruit, pine nut mash, and mesquite bean flour from indigenous people.[14] Significantly, he discovered buffalo and observed indigenous people with stones of emeralds and turquoise (though they were actually malachite[15]) somewhere around the Río Grande.[16] He noted that some indigenous tribes seemed wealthy and had bestowed about him "many deer and many robes of cotton, better than those of New Spain."[17] Upon returning to Mexico City, his stories inspired many future explorers to look north. Cabeza de Vaca's initial explorations of the region are significant because of the difference in character of his journey. Rather than conquer and overpower the indigenous people of the region, he was forced to cooperate with them and depended on them for his survival because of the harsh terrain and his lack of supplies.

Several different legends attracted the Spanish colonizers towards the north, all of which were attractive based on their promise of endless wealth and prosperity. The predominate legend driving their exploration was that of the Seven Cities of Silver, also know as the Seven Cities of Cíbola. The idea of the seven cities is part of the larger mythology

---

[14] Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands,* p. 16.
[15] Ibid., p. 17.
[16] Arias, David. *Las Raíces Hispanas de los Estados Unidos*. Madrid, Spain: MAPFRE, 1992, p. 126.
[17] Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands,* p. 16.

surrounding Aztlán and the golden north. After discovering the great wealth of the Aztec and Incan empires, the Spanish were easy to convince to continue searching for more sources of gold and silver. According to legend, the Aztecs had left Aztlán in 1168 and moved south to the lakes where they founded Tenochtitlán.[18] Just as Chicano historical narratives point to the ancient city of Aztlán to refer to the pre-Colombian wealth of their ancestors, so did Spanish colonizers idealize the idea of Aztlán, inspired by stories told to them by indigenous people in the Valley of Mexico. In reality, anthropologists and historians believe what was imagined as the city of Aztlán was actually in Nayarit, four hundred miles northwest of Mexico City. In 1530, the conquistador Nuño de Guzmán found a place in Nayarit called Aztatlán, presumably the original location of the mythologized Aztlán. Because of its unspectacular nature and its lack of adherence to the wealth of legends, the Spanish presumed that the real Aztlán must exist farther to the north, and their search continued.

It is commonly believed that in 1538, Juan de la Asunción and Pedro Nadal, two Franciscan friars, led the first expedition to find Aztlán, also referred to as Chicomoztoc, meaning "the place of seven caves."[19] Together with indigenous porters, they marched west from Mexico City to the coast, then headed north, possibly making it all the way to the Colorado River. They did not find anything, but apparently reported having spoken to indigenous people about great cities further north, fueling the Spanish fire for northern exploration and paving the way for future, more ambitious expeditions into the potentially golden north. However, this exploration has recently been questioned by scholars and is now often understood as a misinterpretation of confusing correspondence between Friar Marcos de Niza and Mexico City.[20] Despite its factual uncertainty, this mission is widely referred to in histories of the region, possibly because it fits with the narrative of a slow movement towards more and more exploration of the north, culminating with Vázquez de Coronado's mission of the following year. I have included it here because it remains an integral part of the mythology surrounding the development of the region.

In 1539, Friar Marcos de Niza, a Franciscan priest inspired by the mission of Cabeza de Vaca, received permission from the Spanish viceroy to go on a mission through the north to search for the Seven Cities of Cíbola. He was accompanied by one of the fellow explorers of Cabeza de

---

[18] Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest,* p. 8.
[19] Ibid., p. 13.
[20] Nallino, Michael and William K. Hartmann. "A Supposed Franciscan Exploration of Arizona in 1538: The Origins of a Myth" *Kiva*, Vol. 68, No. 4, Summer, 2003, pp. 283-303.

Vaca, Esteban Azamor, known as Estebanico *el negro*.[21] Upon return, he reported to Spanish colonial officials in Mexico City that he had found the city of Cíbola in what is now New Mexico. The Friar told the officials, "It is situated on a level stretch on the brow of a roundish hill. It appears to be a very beautiful city, the best that I have seen in these parts."[22] He claimed it was as large as the Aztec cities in the Valley of Mexico, and that the roofs of the buildings were made of gold. Some historians believe that he exaggerated because he was inspired to evangelize the indigenous, and needed to garner support to secure a mission.[23] His exaggerated description of the town was successful, and inspired a large and expensive expedition of Spanish colonizers led by Francisco Vázquez de Coronado to embark on a mission to find the city and its supposed riches.

The expedition led by Coronado traveled to Cíbola with over three hundred Spanish adventurers, six Franciscans, more than one thousand indigenous people, and around fifteen hundred horses and pack animals.[24] Upon arrival, they were sorely disappointed to find nothing but a flat city of mud hats and no detectable wealth, especially in comparison to the spectacular Aztec cities of the Mexico Valley. The famed seven cities were actually just small villages, and Coronado was angry with friar Marcos: "He has not told the truth in a single thing that he said, but everything is the opposite of what he related, except the name of the cities and the large stone houses."[25] In a letter to the king, Coronado described what the expedition had discovered during the course of the arduous journey. "The best that I have found is this river of Tiguex where I am and its settlements, which cannot be colonized because besides being four hundred leagues from the Sea of the North, and two hundred from the South Sea … the land is so cold… that it seems impossible to pass a winter in it"[26]

Despite having already failed, the mission continued north on the advice of the local Pueblo indigenous people to search for the city of Quivera. Historians believe that the Pueblo indigenous people fabricated the city of Quivera in order to lure the Spanish mission away from the

---

[21] Arias, *Las Raíces Hispanas de los Estados Unidos*, p. 129.
[22] Drye, Willie. "Seven Cities of Cibola Legend Lures Conquistadors" National Geographic Online; accessed October 2, 2012.
[http://science.nationalgeographic.com/science/archaeology/seven-cities-of-cibola/]
[23] Arias, *Las Raíces Hispanas de los Estados Unidos*, p. 34.
[24] Weber, David J. *The Spanish Frontier in North America.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992, p. 46.
[25] Ibid., p. 47.
[26] Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest,* p. 16.

Pueblo villages they had brutally conquered and occupied. Coronado believed them and continued to lead the expedition north through vast huge tracts of flat, uninspiring land in what now is known as Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. The idea of northern riches was so deeply ingrained in the Spanish colonizers psyche that they continued their search, no matter how futile it seemed. Ultimately, the expedition returned to Mexico City heavily indebted and with nothing to say of their explorations and Coronado faced an official investigation of his management of the expedition. This expedition effectively extinguished the dreams of the golden north and prospects for instant wealth for the Spanish colonizers, though it would continue to be a theme throughout the history of the U.S.-Mexico border region.

A separate legend that drove missions to the border region was the idea of an island of Calafia to the northwest of the Mexico Valley based on a popular Spanish novel, *Las sergas de Esplandián.*[27] The novel spoke of an island of gold called California ruled by an Amazon queen named Calafia, located somewhere near the Indies.[28] The Spanish explorers took this story quite literally, and embarked on several expeditions to find the island of California and its supposed Amazon tribes and mountains of gold. After the capture of Tenochtitlán, Cortés wrote a letter to Spain about he Mexican coast across from present day Baja California:

> "I am told that down the coast {meaning "to the north," since his expeditions went in that direction}… are many provinces … where, it is believed, are great riches and that in these parts of it there is one which is inhabited by women, without a single man, who have children in the way which the ancient histories ascribe to the Amazons."[29]

In 1535, Cortés landed on the coast of present day Baja California and gave it the name of the mythical island. The first explorer of present-day California, Juan Rodríguez Cabrillo, carried the name north when he led a Spanish expedition through California in 1542.

Despite repeated failures to find a city comparable in splendor to the Aztec or Inca cities to the south, exploration of the north continued, inspired by prospects of evangelization and the desire to create a buffer

---

[27] Rodríguez de Montalvo, Garcia. *Las sergas de Esplandián.* Published in 1510 in Sevilla.
[28] The novel also provided the name for the Amazon River, because the explorers heard rumors of tribes of Amazon women along the shores.
[29] Chavez, p. 11

zone between Spanish settlements in the south and increasingly growing European settlements on the North American continent, such as the French in Florida and Louisiana, the Russians in Northern California, and the English on the rest of the continent. The first mission to establish permanent colonies in the north was that of Juan de Oñate, which began in 1596. Oñate was the son of one of the richest men in Mexico, the governor of Nueva Galicia, and married to a niece of Cortés.[30] This mission was different from the prior missions in that they were not searching for instant riches, but rather sought the foundation of permanent colonies. The poet Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá published an epic poem about the journey, entitled *Historia de la Nueva México*,[31] in which he criticized the Coronado journey for abandoning New Mexico during their mission "because they did not stumble over bars of gold and silver immediately upon commencing their march into these regions, and because the streams and lakes and springs they met flowed crystalline waters instead of liquid golden victuals."[32] In contrast, the Oñate mission came prepared to create a settlement: they traveled with 200 soldiers and colonizers, 7000 animals, and 83 wagons filled with provisions.[33]

The Oñate mission and subsequent settlement changed the character of the border region from that of a fabled land of riches, to that of a rugged, dangerous frontier zone that served as a buffer between New Spain and the North American colonies, though not without significant problems for the Spanish crown. Initially Oñate established his headquarters at the site of a Tewa pueblo on the west side of the Rio Grande, giving it the Spanish name of San Gabriel before ultimately moving the capital to Santa Fe, sometime in the early 17th century.[34] The colony in New Mexico ultimately never found the glamorous wealth they had desired, and ended up settling into a frontier life of subsistence farming based on the sedentary agricultural existence of the indigenous people who already lived there. The image of the region changed from that of a fabled land to that of a costly and difficult to maintain frontier region, made up of a mix of Spanish, indigenous, and *mestizo* people and surrounded by hostile indigenous tribes.[35]

---

[30] Arias, *Las Raíces Hispanas de los Estados Unidos,* p. 163.
[31] Pérez de Villagrá, Gaspar. *Historia de la Nueva México: A Critical and Annotated Spanish/English Version.* Albuquerque, New Mexico, U.S.A.: UNM Press, 1992.
[32] Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest,* p. 19.
[33] Arias, *Las Raíces Hispanas de los Estados Unidos,* p. 164.
[34] Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America*, p. 78.
[35] Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest,* p. 19.

Although the strategic geopolitical importance of the frontier borderlands made the territory crucial for New Spain, the distance and isolation made it difficult to populate and develop. Given the breadth and diversity of the Spanish empire, few Spaniards were drawn to settle in the harsh frontier regions — especially when more prosperous options existed, such as the mining regions of Mexico and the Andean region of South America. Furthermore, it was costly for the Spanish administration to maintain as it was not generating revenue like other settled areas. Initially, the settlement in New Mexico relied on private capital, and the Spanish crown promised Oñate that he and his heirs could operate it like a semi-independent fiefdom.[36] However, Oñate's settlement proved terribly problematic because of resistance from local indigenous people, especially the Pueblos. Colonizers began fleeing the settlement to return to Mexico and San Gabriel was nearly deserted. The Spanish viceroys eventually removed him from power and ordered him to be replaced, banishing him from New Mexico forever.

The biggest setback to the New Mexico settlements was what historians often refer to as the Great Northern Revolt occurring around 1680. It was a series of indigenous uprisings that took back significant portions of Spanish colonized land. The Pueblo Indians were particularly strong, and managed to thoroughly expel colonists in New Mexico at Zuni, Taos, Jémez, and a number of Tewa villages.[37] Beginning in the 1660s, Pueblo Indians grew restive in response to Spanish rule and increasingly poor conditions due to drought and disease. Many Pueblos starved and died during this time, and attributed the suffering to the inability of Christianity to deal with supernatural forces.[38] In response, they turned to indigenous priests and held traditional ceremonies to try to restore order. The Spanish responded violently and oppressively, hanging several Pueblo priests and lashing many others.[39] The Pueblo communities rose up together, united against the Spanish, and used their strength in numbers to successfully eliminate Spaniards from New Mexico above El Paso in a matter of weeks. They killed over 400 Spaniards, destroyed every Spanish building, and laid waste to the Spanish fields.[40] This impressive showing by the Pueblos intimidated the Spanish, and they retreated to El Paso or

---

[36] Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America*, p. 88.
[37] These are the areas that were initially colonized by Oñate's mission.
[38] Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America*., p. 134.
[39] Ibid., p. 134.
[40] Ibid., p. 135.

further South, wary of continuing to colonize the restive and difficult North.

Given the success of the Pueblo uprisings against the Spanish, there was limited desire to attempt to re-colonize the regions until the arrival of Diego de Vargas to El Paso in 1691. He quickly made allies with Pueblos in El Paso and re-entered the territory in 1692 with an occupying force and colonizers and managed to more or less reclaim the territory in the name of the Spanish crown by 1694 through both diplomacy and force. He gained control over all the rebellious indigenous tribes except for the northernmost Hopi, who maintained independence throughout the next century.[41] The returning colonists were different in character from the original colonists: they were,

> "not the displaced soldier-sons seeking booty, tribute, riches, and gold, but rather rural and urban peoples looking for a place to create and develop through their own efforts an to escape the restrictions of a caste-ridden colonial regime."[42]

The significance of the history of the Great Northern Revolt to the narrative of the borderlands is that it provoked a significant change and adaptation on the part of the Spanish to re-settle the territory. To re-enter the territory, they were forced to use diplomacy to make allies with the indigenous people. Once they regained the territory, they were much more lenient in accepting Pueblo religious traditions and significantly less demanding on Pueblo laborers.[43] This story of re-settlement and accommodation and re-appropriation of indigenous people is further indicative of how the border regions are significantly different in character from other parts of colonized Mexico.

As the New Mexico settlements became more established and the indigenous threat was under control, they were affected by the greater problems of the over-stretched, under-funded Spanish empire. With Napolean's invasion of the Iberian Peninsula and the subsequent wars of the early 19th century, the Spanish Crown re-diverted much of its resources towards its European wars, leaving Spain broke and the colonies under-funded. Though the border region was a frontier outpost providing protection from both nomadic indigenous tribes and the increasing

---

[41] Ibid., p. 140.
[42] Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos G. *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States.* Tuscon, Arizona, U.S.A.: University of Arizona Press, 1996, p. 37.
[43] Weber, p. 141.

incursions from the quickly growing United States, the Spanish crown never was able to supply a big enough budget for its military. As a result, soldiers often went without pay and the majority of the resources available had to be put towards defense, preventing any significant economic or administrative development.[44] Furthermore, the distance from the more populated areas and administrative centers made life complicated at the borderlands.

Though these stories of exploration and colonization are from the very distant past, it is crucial to include them in any thorough history of the border region because they provide the foundation from which the regional identity and history is constructed. The Spanish colonizers on the frontiers of New Spain were forced to adapt their behavior and lifestyles because of the isolation of the region from the port of Veracruz and Mexico City[45], through which all of the European goods were forced to come. Just as the earliest explorer, Cabeza de Vaca, was forced to depend on indigenous people for his survival after the shipwreck, the later settlers were not able to successfully install the traditional Spanish colonial lifestyle in the region and had to rely on a combination of indigenous and Spanish modes of life to survive at the frontiers. One can see this compromise and the construction of a new regional space that was a pragmatic hybrid of American and European cultures in the writings of Father Ignaz Pfefferkorn[46], a Jesuit missionary in the Sonoran borderlands. He laments the inability to build a church of stone with arched ceilings, instead having to construct churches with locally made bricks and flat, log-ceilings. In the fields, they were forced to use wood plows because iron was much too expensive in Sonora. Just as native people began incorporating Old World food into their diets, so did Spanish and *mestizo* settlers:

> "There is little difference between the food of the Indian and that of the common Spaniard in Sonora. Spaniards do not eat rats, snakes, and other such Indian delicacies, but they get along with posole, pinole, atole, and tortillas, and they are completely satisfied if with these dishes they have a piece of driwed cow-beef ….

---

[44] Chavez, p. 24.

[45] It is approximately 2,000 kilometers from Mexico City to the border region, and could be further depending on the route and what part of the border they wished to visit. Furthermore, the terrain is difficult to cross because it is mostly desert. Veracruz is an additional 200 kilometers from Mexico City.

[46] Father Ignaz Pfefferkorn was a German Jesuit missionary and a naturalist. He arrived in Sonora, Mexico in 1756 and wrote the first description of Sonora, later published in the book, *Sonora: A Description of the Province.*

> Mutton, chicken, and other good dishes are only for the tables of the wealthy."[47]

Unsurprisingly, social mobility was much easier to achieve on the frontiers, and the racial-based hierarchy did not exist as rigidly as they did in the heavily colonized regions.[48] As a result, the frontier land settlers were more racially mixed and less tied to purely Spanish colonial culture than their fellow colonizers located closer to Mexico City. This is not to say that there was no discrimination; it remained a deeply ingrained caste system, with only native Spanish enjoying the full rights of crowns. However, record keeping was lax on the border and the civil officials responsible for recording the caste of individuals often did not verify the claims made by the individuals.[49] Often *mestizos* would claim to be Spanish, and mulattos would claim to be *mestizo*. The sparse population and lack of colonial officials resulted in a relative apathy regarding racial purity. Seemingly, there were more pressing issues to deal with in the frontier regions.

The narratives, myths, and new cultures established by the early Spanish explorations and settlements remain relevant to the contemporary nature of the region. Indeed, Chicano histories often point to this intermingling of Spanish and indigenous people on the borderlands as the birthplace of their current identity. My aim in including these histories of Spanish exploration and colonization of the region are to establish the region as a colonial frontier characterized by a contested terrain of nations, empires, and indigenous communities. As will become clear, the forging of a new frontier culture and identity played a significant role in the future geopolitical order when political turmoil from Mexican independence and U.S. expansionism encroached upon the region. The next part of the history will look into how the region was transformed from a colonial frontier into a transnational border zone, catalyzed by Mexican independence from Spain and U.S. expansionism and acquisition.

To contextualize the history of the frontier after independence from Spain and before the Mexican-American War, it is important to give a brief description of how Mexico became independent and what the motives for independence were. The first cry (*el grito*, now a national symbol) for independence came in 1810 from Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla in Querétaro, creating a popular revolt that was soon squashed by both *peninsulares* and

---

[47] Truett, p. 23.
[48] Weber, p. 326.
[49] Ibid., p. 327.

*criollos* forces.[50] However, *criollo* support for the Spanish crown quickly dissolved with the liberal Spanish Constitution of 1812[51], which greatly increased the authority of *peninsulares* and restricted the power of the Mexican elite. This resulted in the rising up of the *criollo* elite with the masses, united behind a formerly Conservative military leader turned *caudillo*, Agustín de Iturbide. The resulting revolution and counterrevolution left a half million people dead and the country in chaos and ruin.[52] The last viceroy of Spain, Lieutenant General Don Juan de O'Donojú, landed in Verz Cruz on July 30, 1821 to a city under siege by revolutionaries seeking independence. By August 21, 1821, the Treaty of Córdoba was signed, granting independence to New Spain and placing it in the hands of Agustín de Iturbide and, later, Antonio López de Santa Ana.

Independence led to significant instability for the new Mexican state, and the revolutions and counter-revolutions ravaged and destroyed the economy. After the wars of independence, the frontier's regions ties to Mexico City and Spain were dramatically weakened. Spanish private capital rapidly evaporated from the region, leaving behind economic ruin and abandoned industry.[53] However, the abolition of the colonial trade restrictions that formerly restricted Spanish colonies from engaging in trade with non-Spanish entities oriented the frontier regions economically more towards the European and North American merchants in the Pacific trade. Many in newly independent Mexico viewed the lifting of the trade restriction positively, especially those on the frontier lands who struggled through centuries of isolation from major Spanish ports and trade routes. Indeed, one of the primary reasons for rebelling against the Spanish crown

---

[50] *Peninsulares* are European-born Spanish who maintained close ties to the Spanish Crown and Madrid. *Criollos* are also of Spanish descent but were born in Mexico. These two groups often clashed because *peninsulares* had much less dedication to the land than the *criollos* and were focused more on making money for the Spanish crown than overseeing the establishment of a successful colony. The clashes between *peninsulares* and *criollos* were the primary cause of independence movements throughout Latin America during the 19th centuries, especially after the radical Spanish Constitution of 1812.
Clary, David. *Eagles and Empire: The United States, Mexico, and the Struggle for a Continent.* New York, NY: Random House, 2009, p. 17.

[51] The Spanish Constitution of 1812 was signed in Cádiz by the legislative assembly of Spain in refuge from the Peninsular Wars against Napolean. There was significant tension between Spain and its overseas colonies because representatives from the overseas colonies wanted to extend the right to suffrage to indigenous, *mestizo*, and free black people in the colonies. This would give significant advantage to non-*peninsulares* in the national assembly, and was opposed by the Spanish. Ultimately, they developed a form of naturalized Spanish citizenship that excluded millions of individuals in the colonies.

[52] Clary, *Eagles and Empire: The United States, Mexico, and the Struggle for a Continent,* p. 16.

[53] Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands*, p. 31.

was the desire for opening up the trade with the U.S. This represented the beginning of a shift in orientation away from Europe and towards the North American continent and its settlers.

During the early 19th century, Anglo-American settlers were rapidly settling the border region, bolstered by the economic opportunity of new trade with an independent Mexico. The high number of Anglo-Americans led many Mexicans to feel like foreigners in their own land, a notion that continues to exist today in Chicano narratives of the Southwest. In 1827, José María Sánchez, a draftsmen appointed by the Mexican government to examine the eastern boundary between Mexico and the U.S., wrote of the influences of the Anglo-Americans on the Mexican population in Nacogdoches, a major town on the Mexican side of the Texas border:

> "The Mexicans who live here … because of their education and environment … are ignorant not only of the customs of our great cities, but even of the occurrences of our Revolution… Accustomed to the continued trade with the North Americans, they have adopted their customs and habits, and one may truly say that they are not Mexicans except by birth, for the even speak Spanish with marked incorrectness."[54]

He commented further on the Anglo-Americans who settled in Texas, using language that is markedly similar to contemporary anti-immigrant language directed against Mexican immigrants:

> "The Americans from the north have taken possession of practically all the eastern part of Texas, in most cases without permission of the authorities. They immigrate constantly, finding no one to prevent them … Repeated and urgent appeals have been made to the Supreme Government of the Federation of Mexico regarding the imminent danger in which this interesting Department is of becoming the prize of the ambitious North Americans."[55]

Clearly the Mexican government felt threatened by the presence of Anglo-American settlers, and their economic dominance in the region continued to grow as they established more points of trade with the border region.

---

[54] Chavez, p. 29.
[55] Ibid, p. 29.

To respond to this situation, the Mexican government made a series of attempts to "Mexicanize" Texas beginning in 1830. These efforts can be compared to contemporary attempts to pass laws that attempt to "de-Mexicanize" areas of the Southwest, such as SB1070[56], passed in 2011 in Arizona, and Proposition 187[57] passed in 1994 in California. The Mexican government attempted to forbid Anglo-Americans from entering the province and planned a string of forts with surrounding settlements of Mexicans. They gave all of the settlements indigenous names, including Anáhuac, Lipantitlan, and Tenoxtitlán, in an attempt to fortify the bond between indigenous communities and Mexicans against the new Anglo-American settlers. Tenoxtitlán was intended to be the capital of the province, but, despite Mexico City's best efforts, many of the initial settlers were actually Anglo-Americans. The commander of the fort at Tenoxtitlán permitted Anglo-Americans to settle, arguing "I cannot help seeing the advantages which, to my way of thinking, would result if we admitted honest, hard-working people, regardless of what country they came from … even hell itself"[58] Similar arguments in favor of Mexican immigration into the U.S. can be found in neo-liberal and conservative pro-immigrant rhetoric today. By all measures, Mexico's attempt to "Mexicanize" Texas failed, and when news reached Texas that Antonio López de Santa Ana was abandoning the federalist model in favor of a new, highly centralized government[59], Texas revolted. Rather than go into the details of the struggles of independence in Texas, I will now skip forward to the achievement of independence and discuss how the Anglo-Americans dealt with the newly conquered Mexican inhabitants.

When Texas achieved independence and seceded from Mexico in 1836, the majority of its population was Anglo-American. The Mexican residents lived primarily between San Antonio and the Rio Grande in the

---

[56] SB1070 was a bill passed in 2011 by the Arizona state legislature to attempt to limit the presence of undocumented migrants in the state of Arizona through extensive employer controls and policies of racial profiling. It will be discussed in more detail in the third chapter.

[57] Proposition 187, also known as "Save-Our-State" initiative, was a voter backed referendum that sought to limit undocumented migration through a state-run citizenship screening system and to cut off all social services for undocumented migrants. It was ultimately found unconstitutional by a federal court, but enjoyed popular support.

[58] Chavez, p. 32.

[59] Santa Ana announced that he was discarding the federalist constitution with the Plan of Cuernavaca, announced in Cuernavaca, Mexico in 1834. Many Mexicans in Texas had been hoping to achieve a higher degree of autonomy from Mexico City, so Santa Ana's announcement that he would be moving towards a more centralized power structure upset them and allied them with the Anglos who wanted total independence.

Southern part of the new state, and many were driven South into Mexico after the war.[60] As the U.S. conquered Texas,

> "Mexican ranchers, shepherds, and small farmers were systematically dispossessed of their property by a coterie of newly arrived Anglo elites, whose acquisition and enclosure of Mexican lands was backed by the U.S. Army and the Texas Rangers."[61]

This facilitated what David Spener refers to as the proletarization of the Mexican people, forcing them out of positions of land ownership and into positions of laborers for the newly dominant Anglo-American settlers. Anglo-American settlers exhibited significant racism towards Mexican people and the Mexican State, strongly believing in the superiority of the U.S. and its political system. Stephen Austin of Texas characterized the conflict as a "war of barbarism and of despotic principles, waged by the mongrel Spanish-Indian and Negro race, against civilization and the Anglo-American race."[62] The racism exhibited by the Anglo-Americans in newly independent Texas set the tone for the dichotomization of white "Americans" versus brown Mexicans. The racially charged rhetoric delegitimized the Mexican claim to the land and effectively subjugated them to the status of second-class citizen. Furthermore, the implications of this racism can still be seen today. According to a study, African-Americans and Hispanic Americans are three times as likely to live in poverty as their Anglo counterparts.[63] The story of Texas' independence and the racial stereotypes adopted by the Anglo settlers is not exclusive to Texas. Indeed, the independence of Texas was the first significant step towards the Mexican-American War and the subsequent Mexican cession of territory to the U.S.

In a similar line with Texas' Independence, the details of the Mexican-American War are not crucial to this thesis. It suffices to say that the U.S. successfully acquired territory from Mexico that constitutes the present-day West and Southwest of the U.S through a successful military campaign, motivated by expansionist political views throughout the U.S. It is important to note, however, that the victory of the Mexican-American War for the U.S. did not mean that they gained complete control over the

---

[60] Spener, David. *Clandestine Crossings: Migrants and Coyotes on the Texas-Mexico Border*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2009, p. 33.
[61] Ibid., p. 33.
[62] Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States*, p. 74.
[63] University of Texas at Austin. "Poverty in Texas", *Texas* Politics 3rd Edition, 2009. [http://texaspolitics.laits.utexas.edu/12_2_0.html]

region. It remained a contested zone, and relationships between Anglo-Americans, Mexicans, and indigenous were incredibly conflicted as the balance in power shifted towards the U.S. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo was signed at the end of the war and its terms dictated the future of the border region and how the U.S. was to deal with the acquisition of the new territory and its Mexican inhabitants. Essentially the treaty allowed for Mexicans residing in the newly acquired territories to become naturalized citizens of the U.S., provided they sever their allegiances to Mexico.[64] Upon becoming citizens, they were to be afforded the equal rights of citizenship as their Anglo-American counterparts.[65] These clauses were not without controversy; many Anglo-Texans resisted signing the Treaty because they did not wish to extend citizenship to the large Mexican population in the territory. Furthermore, at the time, U.S. law limited naturalization to "white" immigrants, which forced the courts to classify Mexicans as "white" for naturalization purposes. This angered many of the racist Anglo-American settlers.

In the end, the promises made to afford Mexican's equal rights were never realized, and they were ultimately treated like a conquered people. Having the law behind them, Anglo-Americans were able to manipulate the system to undermine Mexican claims to the land and assure the dominance of "white" settlers. In his book on race and immigration in American history, *Almost All Aliens*, Paul Spickard argues that the Mexican people were conquered with a measure of Whiteness: "legal citizenship, but social Brownness."[66] Despite the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, many Mexicans did not claim citizenship from the U.S. and thus had very little

---

[64] Article VII of the treaty states: "Mexicans now established in territories previously belonging to Mexico, and which remain for the future within…the United States…shall be free to continue where they now reside, or to remove to the Mexican Republic… those who shall prefer to remain in said territories, may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens, or acquire those of citizens of the United States. But, they shall be under the obligation to make their election within one year from the date of the exchange of ratification of this treaty; and those who shall remain in said territories after the expiration of that year, without having declared their intention to retain the character of Mexicans, shall be considered to have elected to become citizens of the United States."
[http://faculty.washington.edu/qtaylor/documents_us/trty_guadalupe_hidalgo.htm]

[65] Article IX states: "the Mexicans who…shall not preserve the character of citizens of the Mexican Republic…shall be incorporated into the Union of the United States and be admitted, at the proper time (to be judged by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution."
[http://faculty.washington.edu/qtaylor/documents_us/trty_guadalupe_hidalgo.htm]

[66] Spickard, Paul. *Almost All Aliens: Immigration, Race, and Colonialism in American History*. New York, NY: Routeledge Press, 2007, p. 129.

rights. Many Mexicans came from Sonora or Chihuahua after 1854 to work in the mines and did not bother to change their citizenship.[67] As a result, Mexicans were not represented in the new U.S. political system and their lack of political power resulted in their being denied basic rights and services.

After the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and the Gadsden Purchase[68], it was difficult to peacefully forge a cohesive identity for different inhabitants of the region including the Spanish-speaking Mexicans, Spaniards, the indigenous people, and the now dominant Anglo-Americans. Having won the war and convinced of their own racial, cultural, religious, and commercial superiority, the Anglo-Americans did not pay much attention to Mexican claims to the land. Despite this, throughout the Southwest, one can continue to see a strong presence of Hispanic culture and influence. Weber argues that this is not because of Spanish strength and continued dominance, but rather, simply, because the Spanish were the first to arrive, and the Anglo-Americans built their institutions from the foundations already laid by the Spanish settlements.[69] When traveling through the Southwest U.S. today, one finds towns and cities throughout the region with Spanish names and often with old Spanish colonial-style city centers. In spite of this cultural legacy, the inter-minglings of Anglo-Americans with Hispanics were not in anyway harmonious, and were characterized by incredibly racist and xenophobic attitudes from both sides.

Anglo-American settlers were pre-disposed to look down upon Spanish people, having inherited the prejudice from Protestant Europe and its anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish attitudes. This Hispanophobia derives from what Spanish historians came to call *la leyenda negra*, the Black Legend. It originated among Protestant northern Europeans in response to Spain's Catholicism and its highly successful imperialism. The essential idea of the Black Legend is that Spaniards were "unusually cruel, avaricious, treacherous, fanatical, superstitious, cowardly, corrupt, decadent, indolent, and authoritarian"[70] Anglo-Americans also looked disparagingly upon the

---

[67] Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest,* p. 67.

[68] The Gadsden Purchase is a 76,800-squared kilometer region including southern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico. James Gadsden, the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico in 1853, arranged its purchase for $10 million. It was the last major territorial acquisition of the continental United States.

[69] Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America,* p. 333.

[70] Ibid., p. 336.

One needs to look no further than the cover of the tabloid newspapers in Germany and Austria to see the re-emergence of *la leyenda negra* in contemporary anti-Southern European rhetoric in the context of the European Union financial crisis.

racial mixing of the Spaniards and the indigenous people. When describing *mestizos* in California, Thomas Jefferson Farnham, a lawyer from Maine, wrote:

> "The half-breed, as might be expected, exhibits much of the Indian character; the dull suspicious countenance, the small twinkling piercing eye, the laziness and filth of a free brute, using freedom as mere means of animal enjoyment."[71]

Contemporary manifestations of the rhetoric of *la leyenda negra* can be found in relatively recent Anglo-American histories of the frontier regions, especially in narratives of the Mexican-American war.

A good example of conservative scholarship from an Anglo-American perspective is the book *Eagles and Empire* by David Clary, published in 2009. Clary is a military and natural historian with a wide range of books on the American West. Throughout the book, Clary disparages the pre-U.S. Mexico and argues for the superiority of the U.S. settlers, using arguments that are often just as moral as they are political. He begins the book with a description of the Aztecs, setting the tone for the rest of the book. "They were a dirty, savage, bloodthirsty people with a bad habit of stealing women and a disgusting one of sacrificing humans wholesale."[72] This contrasts significantly to idealized depictions of pre-Hispanic people by Chicano historians. Clary is equally disdainful of the Spanish colonists:

> "Spain had missed out on the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution, and so had its colonies. The result was a corrupt government and society where the entrenched powers resisted any hint of reform or modernization. Pretensions to aristocracy at the upper end meant that those who could have developed an economic and a government sniffed at getting their hands dirty. Mexico came into being, then, as a nearly medieval society, lacking a class of people who could lead it into the modern industrial world. The dead hand of the past held the whole country back."[73]

He continues with anti-Catholic arguments, stating that the upper echelons of the church "walled in luxury, worked the *Indios* to death on the estates,

---

[71] Vélez-Ibáñez, *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States,* p. 73.
[72] Clary, *Eagles and Empire: The United States, Mexico, and the Struggle for a Continent*, p. 1.
[73] Ibid., p. 13.

and fathered bastards."[74] Clearly, in the eyes of Clary, the moral superiority of the Anglo-Americans was necessary to save the region from the bloodthirsty indigenous and the incompetent Spanish.

On the other side of the spectrum, Mexicans living in the newly conquered territories saw the struggle for racial and cultural survival in the U.S. as part of a larger conflict between the Latin and Anglo-Saxon civilizations. Throughout Latin America there were reports of the events in Mexico and fears of the expansionist U.S. In 1855, a Chilean newspaper from Valparaíso published the following:

> "No one doubts … the hostile and ambitious spirit manifested by that nation (the U.S.) toward the republics of the south, that all are more or less threatened by... annexation that is the article of faith which it seems the Anglo-Saxons of North America have adopted with respect to any state inhabited by the Spanish or their descendents … it should not be surprising that the cabinet in Washington is presently striving to advance that which a few years back … its predecessors left planned in the annexation of Texas and California, acquisitions which they have not been able to justify on the basis of any … human law, it has not mattered, since the territory of the Union has been made larger."[75]

The conflict between the U.S. and Mexico, therefore, was often viewed in civilization terms, exacerbated by the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny[76] from the U.S.

From a Chicano historical point of view, therefore, the Mexican-American War was a war of conquest, and one that dictated the future relationship between the two countries. Throughout Chicano histories, one can find similar discussions of this theme. In the book, *Al Norte de la Frontera: El Pueblo Chicano*, by David R. Maciel and José Guillermo Saavedra, they frame the war in these terms:

> "La guerra entre los Estados Unidos y México, así también como sus consecuencias, iban a establecer desde entonces los modelos de

---

[74] Ibid., p. 13.

[75] Chavez, *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest,* p. 67.

[76] Manifest Destiny was a prominent ideology in the 19th century that argued for the necessity of the U.S. to expand to cover the entire North American continent, in the name of spreading their superior culture, religion, and governance. It was the driving force behind much of the movements to expand West in the 19th century and instilled an almost religious zeal in the minds of the expansionists.

> relaciones básicas entre los dos países, y determinarían el trato que se le iba a dar a la población que radicaba en la region del norte de México que ahora quedaba 'incorporada' a otro país por la imposición de la conquista. En un plano internacional, la adquisición de este gran dominio que cotaba con vastos recursos minerales, contribuyó al surgimiento de Estados Unidios como uno de los poderes mundiales más importantes."[77]

These diverging narratives of the same time period indicate that the history of the region is still conflicted, and the vision of the U.S. as an expansionist invader has not left the psyche of many Chicanos still living in the Southwest.

To illustrate the complicated relationship between the newly dominant Anglo-Americans and the already established Hispanic occupants of the new U.S. territories, it is useful to look into a few examples of individuals in the region and how they navigated the new political territory. The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo led to the construction of new border towns, including Eagle Pass, Texas and Piedras Negras, Coahuila, both of which were formed to be military garrisons to monitor the border and stop indigenous groups from raiding.

Directly after the Anglo-Americans became the dominant ethnic group in the Southwest, they began to form their own towns and cities. My hometown of Benicia, California, located northeast of San Francisco, was the first city formed exclusively by Anglo-Americans. The history of Benicia and the individuals responsible for founding Benicia is a prime example of the complex relationships between the new and old settlers, and demonstrative of the processes through which the United States quickly came to dominate the region. Though it is located quite far from the border itself[78], its story is nonetheless relevant because it includes themes that can be found throughout the founding of cities and towns in the Southwest territory of the U.S. after the Mexican cession of the mid-19th century.

The first individual important to the history of Benicia is the General Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo, a native *californio*[79] from a prominent Hispanic-Californian family. He lived in Sonoma, California[80] and was well-

---

[77] Maciel, David and José Guillermo Saavedra. Al Norte de la Frontera: El Pueblo Chicano. México: Consejo Nacional de Población, 1988, p. 19.

[78] Benicia is approximately 820 kilometers from the nearest border crossing.

[79] *Californio* means native Californian and refers to individuals who settled in California when when it was a Spanish and Mexican territory.

[80] Sonoma is especially significant for the history of Mexican settlements in California. It was the northernmost settlement, established first as a Mission and later as a Presidio

known for his hospitality towards visitors throughout the region. Many travelogues from European visitors discuss paying a visit to General Vallejo, and, somewhat condescendingly, comment on the unique nature of his hospitality, stemming from a combination of European and indigenous traditions. Sir George Simpson, Governor in Chief of the Hudson Bay Company[81], commented on the strangeness of California in response to indigenous made furniture: "this was California all over — the richest and most influential individual in a professedly civilized settlement obliged to borrow the means of sitting from savages."[82] Simpson also commented on the cuisine, finding it highly offensive for the European palate: "every mouthful was poisoned with the everlasting compound of pepper and garlick."[83] Despite the foreign lifestyle, Europeans and Anglo-Americans generally respected General Vallejo and the *californios*, especially for their strong military showing against indigenous uprisings throughout California. Historian Hubert Howe Bancroft[84] commented, "General Vallejo's Indian policy must be regarded as excellent and effective when compared with any other policy followed in California."[85]

Anglo-American immigrants began arriving in the Sacramento Valley[86] of California in the 1840s, creating problems for Mexican-American authorities. General Vallejo had a generally positive view of Anglo-Americans: he had three Anglo-American brothers in law, and all but one of his children eventually married Anglo-Americans. Newspapers in the United States reported that the immigration to Calfornia marked the beginnings of the stages of the acquisition of California, and Mexican diplomats worriedly sent clippings to Mexico City. As a result, Mexican

---

controlled by Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo. It served to control the indigenous population of the North and observe Russian Activity in the far North at Fort Ross. Today it continues to have a historical old town built in the Mexican/Spanish style.

[81] The Hudson Bay Company extensively explored Northern California in the early 19th century, coming south from Fort Vancouver in present-day Canada.

[82] Tays, George. "Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo and Sonoma: A Biography and a History". *California Historical Society Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1938, p. 142.

[83] Ibid., p. 143.

[84] Bancroft was an Ohioan born historian who moved to California in 1852 to establish a publishing house. He dedicated his life to writing a history of California and amassed a large library of documents, maps, letters, books, and other sources,which were ultimately purchased by the University of California. Today, the main library at University of California Berkeley is named after him.

[85] Tays, George. "Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo and Sonoma: A Biography and a History". *California Historical Society Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1938, p. 150.

[86] The Sacramento Valley is the northern part of the California Central Valley, lying to the east of the Northern Coast Ranges and to the north of the Sacramento Delta. It attracted settlers because of its fertile soil and agreeable climate.

officials stated that any foreigners present in California required Mexican-issued passports and, without them, traveled at their own risk. The reality on the ground was significantly different, however, and Mexican *californios* were generally quite welcoming to Anglo-American immigrants, acknowledging that they could bring prosperity to the economically under-developed region. Just as in Texas before the independence movement, these actions of kindness may have been more out of necessity than actual desire to foster a relationship. The coffers of the state of California were practically empty[87], and Governor Micheltorena was forced to finance the state by borrowing from wealthy individuals, including General Vallejo himself. It made economic sense for General Vallejo to facilitate the settlement of individuals who wanted to contribute to the economic development of the region, even if he thought it might threaten Mexico's political control. General Vallejo, therefore, was conflicted between a desire to bring population grown and economic development and desire to keep California part of Mexico. Despite his positive view of individual Anglo-Americans, he viewed U.S. expansionism as a whole with skepticism, and was nearly certain that, if proper steps were not taken, they would successfully acquire California within a few years.[88] His prediction proved correct, and General Vallejo was forced to quickly adapt to being a foreigner in his own land after California became part of the United States.

In 1846, Anglo-American settlers launched the Bear Flag Revolt and captured[89] the Mexican garrison in Sonoma where General Vallejo was stationed. He was taken prisoner by the rebels and they took him overland back to Sutter's Fort, in present-day Sacramento. One of the members of the group that escorted Vallejo to Sutter's Fort was Robert Semple, an Anglo-American from Kentucky who came to California in 1845 in a party headed by Lansford Hastings, one of the early Anglo-American settlers to California. The goal of their mission was to employ tactics used by Anglo-Americans in Texas: first settle, and then, by sheer numbers and force, take California to be part of the U.S. Robert Semple quickly emerged as a leader among Anglo-American settlers in California and played a crucial role in the Bear Flag Revolt. According to records, after signing the capitulation, it

---

[87] A seemingly persistent phenomenon that continues to this day.

[88] Tays, "Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo and Sonoma: A Biography and a History". *California Historical Society Quarterly,* p. 151.

[89] In reality he had no protection and was in bed, asleep, when the Bear Flag Revolt happened. Vallejo and the "Bear Flaggers" signed the capitulation on friendly terms while drinking *aguardiente*.

was Semple who urged the rebels not to sack and destroy Sonoma.[90] For that, he remained in the good graces of General Vallejo. While transporting General Vallejo to Sutter's Fort from Sonoma, Semple crossed through Vallejo's Soscol Rancho on the banks of the Carquinez Strait.[91][92] Semple was inspired by the sight of the fertile valleys and the potential harbor and made plans to someday found a city there. After leaving Vallejo and the other Sonoman's at Sutter's Fort, Semple went on to continue activities with the goal of constructing American civil government in California, such as founding a newspaper and developing a post system. He was also involved with some acts of filibustering, which will be discussed in more detail in the third chapter. When he returned to Sutter's Fort, he spoke with General Vallejo about his ideas for a city on the Carquinez Strait. In return for Semple's kind treatment of him while he was held captive in the Bear Flag Revolt, Vallejo gifted Semple with half a five-square tract of land in his Soscol Ranch (present day Benicia) and encouraged him to start a city on the land.[93]

Semple lacked capital to fully develop Benicia and accordingly partnered with Thomas Larkin, a Northeastern merchant and former American consul who had capital to spare. Though only significant to Benicia because he supplied the initial capital, Larkin's biography is useful to this thesis because it is indicative of the new type of settlers that came to the frontier region of the Southwest. His life after moving to California became thoroughly bi-national and he formed his new identity based on the intersections of the two cultures. Larkin was an early settler in California, moving from New England in 1832 when he was twenty-nine. He and his wife gave birth to the first surviving child of Anglo-American descent in California. He established himself in Monterey and began to work as a middleman for the trading of various goods, including hides, tallow, lumber, foodstuffs, and soap, between Mexicans and Anglo-Americans. Quickly he rose to prominence as an interlocutor between the U.S. and Mexico, being one of few who spoke fluent Spanish. The seat of the Mexican provincial government was in Monterey, so Larkin often represented Anglo-Americans in Mexican tribunals and facilitated business and discussions between the Mexican government and the U.S. government. Eventually the U.S. government officially appointed him as

---

[90] Radcliffe, Zoe Green. "Robert Baylor Semple, Pioneer" *California Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 2, June 1927, p. 227.
[91] Ibid., p. 224.
[92] The Carquinez Strait connects the San Francisco Bay to the Sacramento Delta. It is an important thoroughfare for ships traveling into California from the Pacific Ocean.
[93] Radcliffe, ."Robert Baylor Semple, Pioneer" *California Historical Quarterly,* p. 228.

the consul for the region. According to reports, Larkin enjoyed living in Mexican-California and had good relations with the Mexican government. He was not a hotheaded warmonger as many of the early settlers were and advocated for a peaceful transfer of sovereignty for California.[94] This, of course, did not happen.

Interestingly, Thomas Larkin is not one of the famous Anglo-American Californians still remembered today, despite the fact that he was one of the earliest and most important settlers for establishing initial contacts with the Mexican government. The early Anglo-American settlers of California were known as *paisanos* and, late in his life, Thomas Larkin considered himself different from the new way of life in U.S. controlled California with the massive influx of Anglo-American immigrants from the East. He compiled a book with a list of names of all of the *paisanos* and supposedly spoke of longing for the earlier days ("halcyon days") of the initial settlers.[95] Shortly before his death, he wrote to President Buchanan requesting a government position in Mexico, stating, "I know the Mexicans well."[96] He never received the position, and died a year later. Larkin is perfectly representative of the processes that took place in the frontier region between Mexico and the U.S. Just as the Spanish settlers in the north of Mexico were forced to adapt to the new lifestyle and mix with indigenous culture when they initially settled, the first Anglos to the region also developed a new culture and identity. Larkin's nostalgia for the days of the *paisanos* after the U.S. acquisition of California also indicates how quickly the U.S. came to dominate the region, and how swiftly the Anglo-American immigration changed the orientation of the region from Mexico to the U.S.

Benicia was one of the many cities on which Thomas Larkin used his capital to speculate. Originally, Semple named the city "Francisca" after the wife of Vallejo. However, when Semple went to Yerba Buena (present day San Francisco) to request the deeds for the new town of Francisca, the *alcalde*, Washington Bartlett, was skeptical because of its closeness to the name of the world-famous San Francisco Mission. Soon after granting the deed to Semple, Yerba Buena announced that it was changing its name to San Francisco and the competition between already established San Francisco and newly born Francisca began. Semple responded by changing the name from Francisca to Benicia, which was one of General Vallejo's

---

[94] Hague, Harlan. "The Reluctant Retirement of Thomas Larkin". *California History,* Vol 62, No. 1, 1983, p. 62.
[95] Ibid., p. 63.
[96] Ibid., p. 64.

wife's second names. By all indications, Benicia was destined to be one of California's most prosperous cities: it had backing from both General Vallejo, the state's largest land owner, and Thomas Larkin, one of the wealthiest men in the state at the time, and a fresh-water marina with the potential for a good port.

Having been established primarily by General Vallejo, Robert Semple, and Thomas Larkin, it is clear that Benicia has a history that is thoroughly hybridized between Mexico and the U.S., though the Anglo-American narrative dominates. General Vallejo was of Spanish origin, but friendly and receptive towards Anglo-American settlers. Thomas Larkin was a Northerner, but came to identify as a *paisano* and had good relations with the Mexican government. Robert Semple was a rugged adventurer settler in the classic, Wild-West sense. The intersection of these three men and their varied identities is often overlooked in traditional discussions of the history of Benicia. When studying local history in schools, the focus lies primarily on the triumph of the U.S. settling in Benicia and establishing the town as an important U.S. outpost, with brief lip service paid to General Vallejo's wife for providing the name of the city. Today, the town considers itself an "old frontier town" and festivals and historical landmarks throughout the town celebrate the rugged lives of the Anglo-Americans who ventured West to found Benicia. There is little mention of the cooperation from General Vallejo and the unique nature of California as a meeting point between Mexico and the Anglo-American settlers from the East. While other cities in the Southwest reconstruct buildings in the old Spanish colonial style, Benicia has a historical committee that requires buildings in the historic center to adhere to the 19th century styles used by the Anglo-American settlers. To this day, the town remains an enclave of white Anglo-Americans, surrounded by cities and towns that are predominantly inhabited by immigrants or African-Americans, indicative of the lasting power of the racial divisions established early in the formation of California and the frontier zone of the U.S. and Mexico.[97]

The purpose of this chapter was set the tone for the future development of a border regime along the U.S.-Mexico border. By looking at the various narratives and claims placed on the region, the idea of a clear

[97] According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the Hispanic population of Benicia is 12% of the total, while self-identified "whites" make up 72.5%. Following the same data, Vallejo is 22.6% Hispanic and only 32.8% "white". Certainly this has a lot to do with contemporary economic and migratory trends and cannot be attributed to the founding of the cities, but it is important to recognize nonetheless because it demonstrates how strong racial divisions remain in contemporary border regions. Similar trends of "white" and Hispanic enclaves exist throughout the Southwest of the U.S.

border becomes problematic and impossible to maintain. The present conception of the division of the two countries is black and white, while the reality is much more ambiguous. A thoroughly historical approach that goes back to the earliest explorations reveals a constant tendency for cultural hybridization and new formations of identity along the border zone. The first Spanish settlers were forced to diverge from traditional colonial practices and adopt habits from the indigenous people in order to survive the harsh terrain. The early Anglo settlers were also forced to change and adapt towards life in indigenous and Spanish settled territories. The result was a thoroughly new life style that did not conform nearly with any identity, neither indigenous, Spanish-American, nor Anglo-American. This is not to say that there were not attempts to distinguish races from one another and that caste-based racial hierarchies did not exist: they did, and continue to exist to this day. However, when compared to other colonized or settled areas, they were much easier to blur and distort. By looking at individuals and towns of the early borderlands, the mixing of narratives becomes clearer. The next chapter will start from the establishment of the border itself and look into how the creation of the border regime continued in the same transnational fashion as the initial explorations and settlements.

## 2. Drawing the Line: From Issues of Sovereignty to the Maintenance of Cross Border Flows

Having established the history of the frontier region in the previous chapter, this chapter will look into the development of the border regime itself from the Mexican cession until the early 20th century. It will argue that there was a shift in character of nation-state involvement on the border after the line was established. Rather than focusing on military security and maintaining territorial sovereignty, as was the practice before the borderline was drawn, the new issue became the management of cross-border flows, through regulation of migration and goods. To do explain this shift, one must examine the historical trends of the border regime from the initial surveying missions post-Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo until the establishment of the border and the subsequent regime of control. Keeping in line with the focus of the previous chapter on the transnational and fluid nature of the border region, I will attempt to construct a history that takes the border as an object as a starting point but does not arbitrarily divide the two sides from each other. The first part of this chapter will look at how the line was drawn after the Mexican Cession, taking into account the difficulties faced by the surveyors from both Mexico and the U.S. The second part will explore the history of immigration control itself and see how a regime of security emerged along the border. The last part will look into cross-border flows and migration and try to understand the construction of identities and ideologies that resulted from the division of the two countries, especially focusing on the rise of racially motivated violence. Ultimately this chapter attempts to understand the construction of the border from its conception and explain how the drawing of the line disrupted borderlands life. As in the previous chapter, the history is not intended to be exhaustive; rather, it seeks to highlight critical points of transborder activity and continue to support the thesis that the borderlands have developed in a historically and culturally discrete fashion from the other parts of Mexico and the U.S.

The notion in the U.S. of the border being "out of control" dominates contemporary discussions of the borderlands and how the U.S. should formulate its border policies. This view is understandable, as it is the world's most heavily crossed land border, and comes with a massive flow of illegal drugs, undocumented migrants, and deaths from violence and attempted crossings. The problematic nature of the "out of control" hypothesis is that it leads to calls for the state to "regain" control. This vision of the border coincides with historical prejudices from Anglo-Americans against Spanish-speaking and indigenous peoples. It is in some

ways an extension of *la leyend negra* from the early colonial days. José Manuel Valenzuela Arce, professor of cultural studies in El Colegio de la Frontera Norte in Tijuana, Mexico, describes the dominant Anglo-American view of the border as the line that divides what is in control and desirable from what is out of control and morally reprehensible:

> "Para las perspectivas dominantes anglosajonas, la frontera ha significado una colindancia con la barbarie, el atraso, el otro lado del espejo, donde lo mexicano allude a la opacidad, al fracaso visible; es la referencia que amplifica las virtudes propias. La frontera es la trinchera donde tiene lugar la lucha contra la contaminación, la inmigración amenazante, la degradación racial, económica y moral."[98]

Following this understanding of the border that is steeped in moral arguments, the popular idea of gaining control over the border is understandable. However, the assumption that the border is an entity that can be controlled, or has ever been controlled in the past, is a-historical and unsupportable.

Historically, the border has never been controlled by a state. It has proved elusive to state control throughout its history, both as a frontier region and as an official borderline between the countries. Furthermore, arguing that the state should re-assert control ignores the fact that, in many instances, the state directly created and benefited from the porous and "out of control" nature of the border. Peter Reuter and Donald Ronfeldt point this out in their report on drug smuggling across the border in the 1980s:

> "Mexicans have always been available to supply whatever Americans want but cannot obtain legally in their own country — just as Americans have always been ready to provide whatever Mexicans want and cannot acquire readily in their own country."[99]

A thorough examination of the history of the border and the border regime reveals the folly of the calls for the state to regain control of the border. While illustrating the shift from military security to cross-border

---

[98] Valenzuela, Jose Manuel. "Al otro lado de la linea. Representaciones socioculturales en las narrativas sobre la frontera Mexico-Estado Unidos". *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Vol. 62, No. 2, Apr-Jun. 2000, p. 135.

[99] Reuter, Peter and David Ronfledt. *Quest for Integrity: The Mexican-U.S. Drug Issue in the 1980s*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1991, p. 10.

flow management, this chapter will also provide examples throughout the history of the border to illustrate how the border has eluded state control and specifically bring up cases in which an "out of control" border was beneficial to the states. By doing so, the argument for regaining control will be proven historically untenable.

To begin this chapter, it is necessary to examine the very roots of the border and look into the problems faced by the initial task force designated to draw the borderline. It proved to be incredibly difficult for the surveyors to navigate the inhospitable terrain and pacify historically rebellious indigenous groups. When the U.S. acquired the territory after the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, it is estimated that there were 150,000 Mexicans and 180,000 indigenous people living in the new Southwest.[100] To draw a new line that would displace so many people was an incredibly difficult task. Article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo formed a commission known as the Joint United States and Mexican Boundary Commission that would work to draw the line post-Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. The initial committee labored for several years, only to later be made obsolete by the Gadsden Purchase, which moved the border south by several hundred kilometers. The joint commission was comprised of over one hundred men, and the struggles they faced to draw the border are not a surprise when looking at the history of the previous attempts to settle the region. The first problem faced by the commission was political: the act of drawing the line was the culmination of years of war and diplomatic negotiation. There was contested political significance for both parties involved, and neither wished to cede more than necessary to the other. This conflict played out just as much in Washington D.C. and Mexico City as it did directly on the ground in the desert with the commission. In theory, the division was to be simple: both the U.S. and Mexico dispatched the survey teams that comprised the joint commission. The idea was to quickly draw the line through a patchwork of rivers and natural boundaries. Reflecting the naïveté of the U.S. government towards the simplicity of the task is the fact that they only initially allocated $50,000 for the task. In the end, it took seven years and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars.[101]

---

[100] Hernandez, Kelly Lyttle. *Migra: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2010, p. 22.

[101] St. John, Rachel. *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011, p. 24.
After the passage of the Secure Fence Act of 2006, which enabled the construction of the border fence, the U.S Congress had a similarly inadequate estimate for the cost of the task. This will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

One of the principle members of the U.S.-Mexican Boundary Commission from the U.S. was John Russell Bartlett. He had never set foot in the region prior to arriving with the commission, and his observations chronicled in his writings reveal a high level of naïveté towards the region and its inhabitants. Furthermore, his viewpoint illustrates the pre-dominant mindset of U.S. expansionists: the firm belief in Manifest Destiny and the inevitable dominance of the U.S. In one of his writings from his time at the border he states: "There is no project too great for the Californian of the present day. He is ready for any undertaking, whether it be to make a railroad to the Atlantic, to swallow up Mexico, or invade the empire of Japan."[102] His idea of the border region was that of an unpopulated wasteland and much of his commentary focuses on natural aspects, rather than looking at how humans have shaped the territory. The ghost towns and abandoned settlements left by earlier Spanish settlers confirmed his belief in the decline of the Spanish and Mexican presence and pre-dominance of the U.S.[103]

Beyond the political disagreements, which were not insignificant, the surveyors faced problems of inaccurate information from the sources they already had, poor weather and harsh conditions, and, most problematically, hostile indigenous people who did not respect their rights to be on the land. The line the U.S. and Mexico were drawing directly cut through land claimed by indigenous people, who, despite repeated incursions by Mexican and Anglo-American settlers, had successfully retained control of the land through the Mexican-American War. The boundary line cut through the lands of Apache, Tohono, O'odham, Pima, Maricopa, Yuma, Cocopah, and Digueño peoples.[104] Although many were hostile towards the commission, some indigenous groups served as guides and provided food and information for the commission, especially the Pimas and Maricopas. The Apaches and Yumas, however, were constant threats to the commission and continued to wage raids on the group throughout the surveying process. Under Article XI of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the U.S. government agreed to protect Mexicans from raids from indigenous groups and vowed to return any Mexicans who had been captured by the indigenous groups. This proved impossible to follow, and further demonstrated the ignorance of the U.S. government towards the task of drawing and enforcing the border.

---

[102] Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands,* p. 15.
[103] Ibid., p. 15.
[104] St. John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border,* p. 31.

Bartlett was of the impression that the Apache's would easily yield to U.S. sovereignty in the region if they were treated with respect. He blamed the past insurgencies not on their desire to maintain their claims to the land, but rather on the evils committed by Spanish and Anglo-American explorers. He was determined to use diplomacy and his faith in the superiority of the U.S. system of justice and values to pacify the indigenous groups. This proved impossible, as the Apaches continued to raid the border commission, repeatedly stealing mules and horses and forcing the travelers to use military escorts to fend off attacks. Even after the border had been drawn, the Apache's continued to be a problem for U.S. settlers in the region, and by the 1860s, contingencies of U.S. settlers, Mexican settlers, and other indigenous groups were fighting Apaches on a regular basis. The situation did not improve for U.S. settlers until 1872, when the U.S. sent General George Crook to Arizona specifically to pacify the Apaches.[105] The fact that the Apache's and other indigenous tribes continued to cause so many problems for any state attempting to control the border region is indicative of how difficult the region was to govern. Despite the expansionist zeal of the U.S., they struggled for many years to assert a firm grip on the territory and its inhabitants. This continues to be a theme today, although Apaches have been replaced with drug smugglers and undocumented migrants.

Once the line was established and sovereignty was more or less exercised over the territory by the respective nation-states, the new issue arose of how to regulate the territory. Rachel St. John points to the securing of territory as a shift in character of how the states dealt with the borderlands:

> "As the threat of Apaches and filibusters faded, the border shifted from a site where the state proved its power through military defense of its territory to one in which sovereignty was measured in customs collected, immigrants rejected, and bandits arrested. All of these responsibilities demanded that U.S. and Mexican officials not only knew where the border was but also attempted to control who and what crossed it."[106]

It is important to note that this shift in nature of state enforcement does not indicate that the state gained power; rather, the focus changed, and they began to address phenomena that proved just as difficult to control as the

---

[105] Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands,* p. 60.
[106] St. John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border*, p. 90.

initial establishment of territory. The dominant presence of the nation-state shifted from military security to customs and immigration enforcement, or the regulation of cross-border flows.

To begin a discussion of how the border enforcement laws and the border patrol itself was formed, it is important to look at the early history of immigration control in the U.S. Although the country founded itself as a nation of immigrants, the 19th century saw the rise of nativist movements that sought to define the U.S. as a nation of white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant people and limit immigration from other ethnic groups. In the book *A Forgetful Nation*, Ali Behdad argues that anti-immigrant sentiment is a historical constant in the history of U.S. and has been used to construct a sense of national identity. He points out that there has been attempts to stop perceived Others from entering from the very beginning, despite the rhetoric of the U.S. as a nation of immigrants:

> "Even during the so-called era of the open door, anti-immigrant sentiment ran high against newcomers: against Germans for their 'clannishness,' against Jews for their 'parvenu spirit' or radicalism, against the Irish for their 'low and squalid' way of life, against Italians and Poles for their Catholicism, and against the Chinese for their 'criminality' and inability to assimilate."[107]

The first large-scale and institutionalized xenophobic movement to limit immigration in the new Southwest of the U.S. was against the Chinese. The Chinese immigrated in large numbers in the 1880s to construct the railroad, and their significant presence resulted in anti-Chinese sentiment among Anglo-Americans. This resulted in the U.S. government passing the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, which barred nearly all Chinese from legally entering the U.S. Subsequent legislation and agreements limited migration from Filipino[108] and Japanese laborers.[109] At the borderlands, however, the need for labor conflicted with the racism and xenophobia, and led to the creation of a system that was founded on loopholes and legal gray areas, and encouraged undocumented migration to facilitate the construction of a docile working class that did not have the legal rights to organize or challenge the status quo.

---

[107] Behdad, Ali. *A Forgetful Nation*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 2005, p. 114.

[108] The Tydings-McDuffie Act of 1934 stopped Filipino laborers from entering the U.S.

[109] The so-called "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1907 ended Japanese immigration into the U.S.

The area in which it is most evident that the state directly benefited from a historical lack of control at the border is in the unregulated flow of migrants from Mexico into the U.S. Examining the policy of the U.S. from the very beginning of the establishment of the Southwest as a U.S. territory reveals a policy that was geared towards encouraging undocumented migration. This policy was prompted by the desires of big agricultural firms controlled by North Americans for cheap, disposable labor. The racist tendencies in U.S. history became challenged in the new Southwest because of this need for a large and docile labor force to work in the fields. Unlike other parts of the U.S., the new territory from Mexico had been divided into large land holdings and there were very few small, family operated farms. This created a huge demand for labor, and Mexicans were the ideal group for many of the landowners. To this day, agricultural workers throughout the Southwest of the U.S. are predominantly Mexican and many of them remain undocumented laborers. The system of exploiting cheap and docile Mexican labor is deeply entrenched in the history of the Southwest. An examination of the discussions in Washington D.C. regarding immigration control reveal how the Southwest manipulated the system to create the conditions that fostered undocumented migration for cheap labor.

The most significant law to understanding how the U.S. would deal with immigration from Latin America in the future is the Immigration Act of 1924. Roger Daniels, historian and scholar of immigration, refers to the 1924 act as the transition point between a period of high immigration and growing regulation, into a period of decreasing immigration and severe regulation.[110] Even before the passage of the 1924 act, the U.S. had passed many laws to exclude immigrants from entering for various reasons, including "All Asians, illiterates, prostitutes, criminals, contract laborers, unaccompanied children, idiots, epileptics, the insane, paupers, the diseased and defective, alcoholics, beggars, polygamists, anarchists, and more."[111] Continuing in this fashion, the 1924 law introduced a nationality-based quota system that limited the number of immigrants allowed to enter the U.S. each year. Germany, Britain, and Northern Ireland had 60 percent of the total number of slots, and Europeans in general had 96 percent.[112] The main supporter of the act was Albert Johnson, the chair of the House immigration committee. He was a known anti-Semite and worked to

---

[110] Daniels, Roger and Graham, Otis. *Debating American Immigration, 1882-Present.* Maryland, U.S.A: Rowman and Littlefield Publications, 2001, p. 8.
[111] Hernández, *Migra: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol,* p. 27.
[112] Ibid., p. 28.

manipulate the quota system so the lowest number of eastern and southern Europeans would be allowed.[113] However, when it came to the issue of Western Hemisphere immigration, there was a huge debate between nativists in the Congress and the interests of Southwestern agribusiness.

The debate that raged between nativists in Congress and representatives of the Southwest, who were by no means supporting immigration for equality purposes, is further indicative of the disparities between borderlands people and the rest of the U.S. The Southwestern representatives managed to insert an exemption in the 1924 act for all immigrants from countries in the Western Hemisphere, thus allowing Mexican migrant labor to enter the U.S. without any preset numerical limit. The victory in 1924 did not stop nativist attempts to limit Mexican migration: in 1926, Congressman John Box of Texas co-sponsored a new bill explicitly to limit Mexican immigration. He argued that the exemption for Mexicans had to end because "Our great Southwest is rapidly creating for itself a new racial problem, as our old South did when it imported slave labor from Africa."[114] In response, the Southwestern agribusiness did not refute the racial language, but rather sought to ensure the nativists that they were able to "control" the Mexican population. S. Parker Friselle of the California Farm Bureau Federation said:

> "With the Mexican comes a social problem … It is a serious one. It comes into our schools, it comes into our cities, and it comes into our whole civilization in California … .we, gentlemen, are just as anxious as you are not to build the civilization of California or any other western district upon a Mexican foundation … We, in California, think we can handle that social problem."[115]

As was clear from the beginning of the Anglo-American conquest of the Southwest, the dominant class of Anglo-Americans would ensure that Mexicans remained second-class citizens, despite the rhetoric of the pathway to citizenship and equality under law in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. The social pact that emerged as the U.S. took hold in the Southwest was one that depended on a constant supply of cheap and docile Mexican labor for the massive agricultural farms in the area. There was and continues to be a strongly established hierarchy between Anglo-American landowners and Mexican workers, and it is maintained through social

---

[113] Daniels, *Debating American Immigration, 1882-Present,* p. 21.
[114] Hernandez, *Migra: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol,* p. 29.
[115] Ibid., p. 29.

segregation and political repression. The fact that Mexicans remained as undocumented workers prevented them from exercising rights afforded to workers under U.S. law. Under constant threat of deportation, Mexicans could not organize themselves the way documented citizens were able to. Therefore, the laws of 1924 served two functions: they gave the appearance of control over who is entering the country while simultaneously supporting the land-owning elite of the Southwest. As Behdad states,

> "The ambivalent immigration laws of 1917–1924 at once quelled the general public's desire for regulation and catered to the capitalists' need for cheap labor. The state simultaneously acted independently of the ruling class and intervened politically to maintain the stability of the capitalist economic structure."[116]

Also occurring with the Immigration Act of 1924 was the establishment of funds for the patrolling and securing of the borders, which led to the eventual establishment of the Federal Border Patrol. It marked the first time that the U.S. state sought to close off the borders on a federal level, and provided the foundations for what is now a massive operation that depends on billions of dollars a year in federal funding. The beginnings of the border patrol were quite humble and the way in which they developed elucidates the trajectory the organization has taken over the course of the 20th century. Examining the early history of the border patrol reveals that it is an organization thoroughly based in borderlands culture and history, and it must be understood within a context that takes the unique nature of the borderlands into consideration.

Before the establishment of border patrol, the only regulation of migrants entering the U.S. was through the Bureau of Immigration in Washington D.C. In 1904 they appointed eighteen men who were responsible for enforcing the early laws of exclusion, such as the Chinese Exclusion Act and the various prohibitions against other types of individuals. They established only five immigrant stations on the border and, naturally, had very little success. A quote from a U.S. report reveals how little they were able to accomplish:

> "There are … row boats, carriage roads, pathways, and mountain trails, throughout this broad expanse of *imaginary line*, all passable and all being used for surreptitious entry into the United States.

---

[116] Behdad, *A Forgetful Nation,* p. 172.

> However vigilant the border inspectors may be, a mere handful of them can accomplish next to nothing."[117]

The initial appropriation for the border patrol as part of the Labor Appropriations Act of 1924 was small, at only one million dollars allocated for the entire U.S.-Mexico border. Thus in 1925, the border patrol began as a rag-tag group of 472 men, the vast majority of whom were working-class individuals from the borderlands themselves.[118] The establishment of the border patrol, though humble in its beginnings and unable to effectively curb any sort of migration, signified a change for migrants entering the U.S. from Mexico and marked the beginning of clandestine crossings and the concept of "illegal" migrants.

While the U.S. was engaging in policies that were working to clamp down on migration, except when it was useful for business, the Mexican government was engaging in policies that unwittingly created conditions that provoked large-scale Northern migration in the early 20th century. The presidency of Porfirio Díaz, known as *el Porfiriato*, changed the character of the Mexican economy through a modernization project that encouraged the switch from debt peonage to wage labor. The campaign of his government was "order and progress" and its achievements saw an estimated five million Mexican campesinos escape from debt peonage and laid tens of thousands of miles of railroad tracks.[119] Clearly, this policy made the Mexican population much more mobile, and the subsequent rise in poverty under Díaz led to mass migration to the north. As a result, it is estimated that five hundred thousand Mexicans crossed the border into the United States between 1900 and 1910, drawn by U.S. industry and agricultural jobs.[120] This trend was exacerbated by the chaos that swept Mexico with the Mexican Revolution after *el Porifirato.*

To illustrate the problems faced by the governments to regulate the cross-border flows in the early stages of the border, it is useful to look into the history of border settlements and how they were affected by the drawing of the line. One town that is particularly demonstrative is Nogales, located both in Arizona and Sonora. After the line was drawn, the city became a relative boomtown for cross-border trade. Because there was no border enforcement, residents were able to situate themselves accordingly to enjoy the best of both states. For example, there was a saloon that

---

[117] St. John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border,* p. 105.
[118] Hernandez, *Migra: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol*, p. 33.
[119] Ibid., p. 25.
[120] Ibid.

straddled the border on International Street that was strategically positioned to sell both Mexican cigars and American liquor duty-free. The cigars were sold from a stand in front of the saloon on the Mexican side, and the liquor was sold from the bar on the U.S. side.[121] U.S. officials quickly realized that these individuals were acting within the law, but obstructing the ability of border enforcement:

> "The grasping and overreaching actions of the United States settlers in building right up to the boundary line results in many inconveniences to the customs officials and peace officers of the United States, who, in order to patrol this important street, must rely for permission to do so on the kindness and courtesy of the Mexican officials."[122]

To respond to this problem, the U.S. ordered a new boundary commission to do additional surveying and make recommendations for how to enforce the border. The new commission found almost all of the original border monuments completely destroyed, indicative of how unpopular the line was in the region, particularly with Mexicans. To deal with the issue of Nogales, the federal government issued a decree that required a sixty-foot buffer zone to be constructed between the U.S. and Mexico, thus marking the first federally mandated geographical separation of the region. Photo 1 shows Nogales after the buffer zone was created, though the exact date is unknown.

---

[121] St. John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border,* p. 90.
[122] Ibid., p. 94.

Photo 1[123]

As the line solidified, the fluid identities of the frontier period became more dichotomized and identities began to be constructed that divided the borderlands population. This is not to say that there were not racial divisions before, or that the construction of the border eliminated any hybrid cultures already existent at the border. However, the border did lead to the creation of "Mexican" vs. "American"[124] dichotomy, and allowed for xenophobic attitudes to be nation-state based rather than simply ethnically based. As mentioned before, nativist politics were already existent in the U.S., with large popular movements in the Northeast against Eastern European or Catholic immigrants. The Mexican cession saw the

[123] http://borderzine.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/800px-Nogales_1899.jpg
[124] The prevalent use of the term "American" to refer to someone from the U.S. is indicative of the victory of Manifest Destiny. Despite the entire continent, from Alaska to Patagonia, being called America, U.S. citizens have taken claim of being called Americans. In Spanish they are referred to as *estadounidense*, but there exists no noun in English for a person from the U.S. Therefore, for the rest of the paper, I will alternate between using the normative term "American" and the Spanish term *estadounidense* to refer to people from the U.S.

acquisition of land that was already populated by Spanish-American, *mestizo*, and indigenous people. For nativist movements obsessed with the idea of a white, Protestant United States, this was a problem. Described from a Mexican point of view, one can see how this division was a traumatic and violent process for Mexican people living on both sides of the border, and how its legacy in history continues to be remembered as an act of colonization and disenfranchisement:

> "La línea fronteriza no se limitaba a la demarcación polarizada entre población anglosajona y población mexicana, protestantes y católicos, personas de piel blanca o morena, inmigrantes y personas con redes sociales prehispanicas, sino que también dividía a familias, redes sociales y afectos. En el norte mexicano, la población quedaba lejos de los procesos nacionales definidos desde el centro, mientras que en el sur estadunidense, los mexicanos, subitamente "extranjerizados" vivían un proceso de colonización, sometidos a condiciones desventajosas, despojados de sus propiedades e inscritos en un régimen sociopolítico que los estereotipaba y discriminaba."[125]

Vélez Ibañéz describes the changing landscape of civility during the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century as the insertion of "racial poison" between Anglo-Americans, Mexican people, and indigenous people:

> "Since the nineteenth century these continuing struggles over physical, social, linguistic, and cultural survival have been generally cast within the context of racial poison. This poison has followed the south to north movement of Mexicans in search of cultural space and place, and it has influenced the varying versions of political action that have partially defined the cultural development of Mexicans since the American *entrada*."[126]

The establishment of U.S. industry often threatened Mexican sheedherding, traditional agriculture, access to water, and the land holdings of individuals. This led to racial discrimination from both sides and intensified hatred between Mexicans and Americans. Just in southern Arizona between 1857

---

[125] Valenzuela, "Al otro lado de la linea. Representaciones socioculturales en las narrativas sobre la frontera Mexico-Estado Unidos". *Revista Mexicana de Sociología,* p. 128.
[126] Vélez Ibañéz, *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States,* p. 92.

and 1861, there were 172 violent deaths, 111 of which were Anglo-Americans and 57 of which were Mexicans.[127]

It is also important to note that much of racial violence included a class dimension as well. The darker-skinned Mexicans were particularly discriminated against for their perceived racial impurity. Anglo-American settlers viewed them as a mixture of indigenous, Spanish, and African blood and, because of the obsession with racial purity of the times, discriminated against them for this mixture. Consequently, the majority of the targets of racial violence were labor class Mexicans. In his study of citizen vigilantism on the U.S.-Mexico border, Peter Yoxall argues that the high number of instances of ritualized torture and sadism during instances of lynching indicates the racially fuelled motivations behind white Anglo-Americans persecution of Mexicans. They were not lynching the Mexicans for culpability in a discrete issue; rather, it was part of a larger pattern of race-based hatred that motivated these groups.[128]

As explained earlier, Mexicans were excluded from the quota system that sought to restrict European migration into the U.S. Although the primary function of excluding Mexicans from the quota system was to appease the wishes of the agribusiness elite, there were also individuals in the borderlands who opposed regulation because they felt they shared an identity with Mexicans. There emerged in the borderlands a discourse that positioned Mexicans as a race between white and black. Nativists from the Northeast and Southern parts of the U.S. equated Mexicans with African-Americans, and wished to suppress their rights in similar ways. Many people in the borderlands rejected this notion, and the placement of Mexican people in an ambiguous zone, though still incredibly racist, problematized the attempts of the nativists to make everything black or white. The San Diego superintendent of schools referred to Mexican-Americans as Spanish and argued that they were the equal of white children, rejecting the push for racializing Mexican-Americans as was done with African-Americans.[129] Many Southwesterners involved in agribusiness pushed for a racial understanding of Mexicans that viewed them as superior to other non-white laborers. This was not because they were not racist, but rather was a pragmatic choice in order to evade the nativist pushes for the exclusion of Mexican immigration.

---

[127] Vélez Ibañéz, *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States,* p. 94.
[128] Yoxall, Peter. "The Minuteman Project, Gone in a Minute or Here to Stay? The Origin, History and Future of Citizen Activism on the United States-Mexico Border" *The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review,* Vol.37, No. 3,Spring-Summer 2006, p 10.
[129] Hernandez, *Migra: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol,* p. 30.

Further complicating the identity issue of the division of the two states was the fact that many indigenous people remained allegiant to their own tribal affiliations, and rejected the push to identify with either the United States or Mexico. This vacuum of political allegiance exists to this day, and can be seen in the childhood memoirs of Julia Sanchez, a half-indigenous, half-Mexican woman who grew up as a migrant farm worker in the 50s in California. She identified neither as a Mexican nor as an indigenous, and suffered discrimination from Anglo-Americans (for being brown skinned), Mexicans (for being indigenous), and indigenous (for not being indigenous enough). Her story is demonstrative of the intersections of cultures and identity that occur in borderlands:

> "When we went up to [my dad's] reservation, we had a hard time. The kids on the reservation did not accept us too well either. We spoke Spanish and they said we did not belong up there. My oldest brother would get into a fight almost every day for almost a whole year. The [Indian] kids did not accept him. Every day after school, they would say, 'You half-breed! You are just a dumb Mexican! You don't belong up here [on the reservation]!' They did not have a school on the reservation. We would have to go downtown, and, of course, all the kids from the reservation had to take one bus downtown. Knowing that they would call it 'the Indian bus,' the kids from downtown would call us Indians. They did not like us either. So what are we supposed to do. The Mexicans in town would say that we were Indians, and the Indians would say that we were Mexican. It was very confusing."[130]

The issue of indigenous identity is also brought up in the article, "Humanität im Exil: Die Zuwanderung Mexikanischer Indianer in den Südwesten der USA und der Aufbau einer transnationalen Identiät" by Aarón Grageda Bustamante. Though the article is focused on the contemporary, it points on the difficulties of identity construction when there are multiple levels of identities and allegiances involved. He looks into the Mixtek people from the Oaxaca region of Mexico and their presence in California. In the mid-1990s, there were an estimated 60,000 Mixtek immigrants working in the fruit and vegetable fields of the Central Valley of

---

[130] Ramirez, Renya. "Julia Sanchez's Story: An Indigenous Woman between Nations" *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 2, Indigenous Women, 2002, p. 66.

California.[131] The article argues that the movement of Mixteka people to California facilitates the construction of a new identity that alters the established relations between different indigenous communities in Oaxaca:

> "In diesem transnationalen Raum zwischen Oaxaca und Kalifornien entwickeln die Indianer besondere Formen der Identitätspflege, bei der sie, obwohl sie sich nicht hunderprozentig von der traditionalen Sinnlogik der lokalen Zugehörigkeit trennen, trotzdem neue, wertvolle Elemente eingliedern. Das Exil ermöglicht eine Erweiterung der lokalen Vorstellung von Solidarität über bestehende Grenzen hinaus."[132]

This argument is in line with the historical observation that people living within the borderlands are consistently forced to create new identities based on a hybridization of cultures.

After the Mexican-American War and the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the borderlands region was transformed from a contested zone occupied by multiple actors to a strictly delineated zone occupied by two nation-states. Before the line was drawn, the primary focus in the region was in securing sovereignty through military security. The Spanish settlers were the first to attempt to settle the region for the Spanish crown, followed by the newly independent Mexican state, and the encroaching United States. All had to compete with previous claims by indigenous groups who had long-standing claims to the land before European settlement. Over the course of the 19th century, when the threat from indigenous groups and non-state actors was more or less eliminated, the focus of the two states shifted from securing sovereignty to managing and controlling cross-border flows. The line that was drawn more or less arbitrarily through the massive, uncontrollable desert suddenly had to be enforced in a way that could enact customs on goods crossing and control human migration. This resulted in a massive change of character for the region and divided the previously connected communities. It also resulted in the rise of nativist and anti-immigrant ideologies in the U.S. and saw the insertion of racial violence as a means of maintaining Anglo-American

---

[131] Aarón Grageda Bustamante, „Humanität im Exil: Die Zuwanderung mexikanischer Indianer in den Südwesten der USA und der Aufbau einer transnationalen Identität", in Gala Rebane et al. *Humanismus Polyphon. Menschlichkeit im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, 2009, p. 165.

[132] Ibid., p. 172.

dominance on the U.S. side of the border. Nonetheless, a hybridized borderlands identity continued to exist as evident by the extremely mixed cultures of Mexican, Anglo-American, and indigenous along the border. The next chapter will move forward to the present and look into how the border changed over the 20th century to become a heavily militarized zone steeped in discourses of national security.

## 3. A Resurgence of Military Security: Contemporary Political Actors and Trends on the Border

Just as there was a shift from military security to cross-border flow management at the end of the 19th century, the end of the 20th century has witnessed a renaissance of sorts of the rhetoric of military security that was long absent from the border region. The most important change on the contemporary border has been the extreme militarization and securitization of the region that seems to be increasing unabated, especially post-September 11, 2001. The borderlands have been inserted into a discussion of national security in a way that is similar to early attempts to secure the territory before the line was drawn. Furthermore, the tactics used by nativist groups on the border is remarkably similar to the non-state actors known as filibusters attempting to assert territorial claims to the "out of control" border of the 19th century. The language of the so-called "War on Terror" has blended itself seamlessly with discussions of migration and border policy. Each U.S. president since Bill Clinton has unsuccessfully attempted to pass immigration reform laws but they have all failed because of the deep political divisions regarding immigration. Simultaneously, every president has increased security on the border, leading to a massive growth in domestic spending on border security issues and the development of a massive military industrial complex on the border.

After the attacks of September 11 brought national security to the forefront in the U.S., the character of the border changed dramatically. The processes of securitization that had begun in the end of the 20th century were massively accelerated. The ports of entry were nearly completely shut down, starving the economies of both Mexican and U.S. border towns that depended on trade between the two countries. The 2003 budget alone provided an increase of more than $2 billion for border security.[133] The Mexican state became involved in the U.S. "war on terror" by detaining hundreds of people from the Middle East, restricting the entry of citizens from many Central Asian and Middle Eastern countries, and providing the U.S. with intelligence information on possible terrorist suspects in Mexico, among other things.[134] Continuing with the tendency towards securitization, the enforcing of the border has come under the branch of federal government created after September 11 known as "homeland security." This new mandate permitted federal law enforcement agencies

---

[133] Andreas, Peter. *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide.* New York, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009, p. 154.
[134] Ibid., p. 156.

and the U.S. military to expand their presence on the border. In a coup de grace for establishing the borderlands as a military zone, President Obama sent 1200 federal troops to the border in 2010 in the name of national security. Conservative critics argued that it was not nearly enough and asked Obama to send 6000, with 3000 in Arizona alone.[135]

The manner in which border patrol has expanded has produced a situation on the border that forces potential crosses to go to the most dangerous regions for crossing, resulting in high levels of death to due dehydration and extreme elements. Whereas the border used to be relatively porous and one could simply cross a few kilometers outside of a major city, now the only zones that are possible for crossing are in the large expanses of desert that, due to their extreme size, are still not completely under surveillance and control. Operation Gatekeeper in particular was responsible for the rise in deadliness. Five years after it was initiated, border crossings were reduced only by 1.2%; instead, migrants moved deeper into the desert, and died at a much higher rate. Despite this, it was hailed as a success by lawmakers for "controlling" the border. In actuality, it contributed to the escalation of a humanitarian crisis and only "controlled" the most visible parts of the border — the densely populated urban zones. Had the lawmakers understood the historic impossibility of attempting to manage cross-border flows, perhaps this short-sighted attempt could have been avoided.

---

[135] Archibald, Randal. "Obama to Send 1,200 Troops to Border" *New York Times*. 25 May 2010; accessed 15 November 2012.
[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/26/us/26border.html?_r=0](

Photo 2[136]

In 2006, U.S. Congress passed what became known as the "Secure Fence Act" as part of an escalation in efforts to control international land and maritime borders. The law sought "the prevention of all unlawful entries into the United States, including entries by terrorists, other unlawful aliens, instruments of terrorism, narcotics, and other contraband."[137] The law institutionalized the coupling of undocumented migration with security issues, most notably through the juxtaposition of "unlawful aliens" with terrorists in the language used. The law was pushed through the U.S. Congress through nativist rhetoric, and passed easily. A Republican congressman, Steve King of Iowa, argued in favor of the law by referencing the Mexican-American War, and referring to the migrants crossing the border as soldiers trying to retake the U.S. for Mexico:

---

136 http://inapcache.boston.com/universal/site_graphics/blogs/bigpicture/mxborder_03_25/m28_18302519.jpg

137 St John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border,* p. 198.

> "…we are also watching today as 4 million illegals cross this border a year, that's 11,000 a night. Santa Ana's army was 6,000 strong. Twice that number every night is coming into America. You can't sit on the border in the dark like I have and listen to that infiltration and believe that you can do it with something called virtual. It has got to be a physical barrier."[138]

The new law cancelled out previously existing property laws and environmental laws that were designed to protect the rights of individuals on the border in the name of national security in a similar fashion as many of the other draconian post-September 11 laws. The effects of the law on individuals living the border are summed up in a statement by the mayor of Brownsville, a border community in Texas:

> "To appease people in middle America, they are going to kill our communities along the border. The rest of America has no idea how we live our lives here. We are linked by the Rio Grande, not divided by it. Our history, our families, our neighbors are tied together on both sides of the river.[139]

This wording of this law, particularly the association of undocumented immigrants with terrorists, makes clear the new policy of how to confront immigration into the United States. The undocumented migrants entering from Mexico occupy the same legal status as the terrorists being persecuted in Guantanamo Bay. They have no legal rights, and exist in a sort of state of exception to universal declaration of human rights. Giorgio Agamben would argue that they exist in the category of *homo sacer*: humans between the worlds of citizen (as in citizen of the nation-state, endowed with the subsequent rights) and man as a universal entity that deserves human rights.[140] The way in which the U.S. legal language conceptualizes and treats undocumented places them in this state of exception and profoundly violates any notion of universal human rights that the migrants would have according to international law.

Congress initially allocated $1.2 billion for the new border fence, but it ultimately cost more than five times as much. This oversight by

---

[138] St John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border,* p. 199.

[139] Witt, Howard. "U.S. fence creates river of ill will on Texas border" *Chicago Tribune*, 16 January 2008; accessed 15 February 2013. [http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/chi-080115fence,0,6983165.story ]

[140] Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1995, p. 131.

Washington D.C. is reminiscent of the small allocation for the drawing of the border line after the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. Significantly, the construction of the fence and the subsequent security apparatuses has been overseen by many of the same private companies that were working in the war on Iraq, including Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Halliburton, and Northropp Grumman. The fence itself is being constructed by Elbit Systems, a subsidiary of Boeing company and, interestingly enough, the same company that constructed the Palestinian Wall in the occupied territories.[141] The explosion in federal money for border patrol resources has proved incredibly profitable for these companies and has led to the development of a military industrial complex along the border. In the face of increased security and declining economic opportunities in the U.S., numbers of Mexican migrants crossing the border has sharply declined since 2000. In 2000, the number of migrants crossing the border was estimated to be around 525,000, while in 2010 it is estimated to be fewer than 100,000.[142] Additional possibilities for the decline include demographic changes in Mexico, an increase in Mexican's earning college degrees, and an increase in costs to cross the border.[143]

In contemporary U.S. politics, nativist political movements have become dominant in conservative political movements, resulting in the popular passage of laws that seek to further criminalize undocumented migration into the U.S., focusing specifically on preventing Mexican migrants from crossing the border. Though the popular nativist movements grew in the 80s and 90s, post-9/11 saw immigration issues inserted into discourses of national security and provided new justification for increased control of immigration. To illustrate the change in severity of the nativist push, I will use two examples: Proposition 187 from California in the 1990s and SB1070 from Arizona in 2010. A comparison indicates how security concerns post-9/11 have fueled the passions of anti-immigrant movements and made them far more extreme in character. Beyond just popular movements for laws, post-9/11 border politics has witnessed the re-emergence of militia-type non-state actors on the border who are seeking to regain control of the border through individual means, much like the filibusterers of the 19th century.

---

[141] Hutchings, Peter. "Mural Sovereignty: From the Twin Towers to the Twin Walls." *Law and Critique.* August 2009, Volume 20, Issue 2. p. 144.

[142] Rios, Viridiana. "Security issues and immigration flows: Drug-violence refugees, the new Mexican immigrants" Nov. 16, 2011, p. 2.; accessed 20 February 2013. [http://www.gov.harvard.edu/files/Rios2011_DrugViolenceRefugees.pdf]

[143] Rios, p. 2.

Proposition 187 was a voter-sponsored amendment in California in the mid-1990s that is indicative of how strongly popular opinion has shifted to become anti-immigrant and how migration issues have become dominant domestic political problems in the U.S. in the past few decades. The law, which was put up to a popular vote based on a petition drive, would prohibit social services, such as health care and public education, and establish a state-wide screening system to check for citizenship. It is significant because it marks the first time that an individual state passed immigration law; in the past, immigration issues had been handled exclusively on a federal level. This is indicative of the growing popular anti-immigrant movements throughout the Southwestern border states towards the end of the 20th century. It provides an early context from which to understand the massive mobilization of resources for border security over the past few decades.

SB1070 was a law designed and backed by Arizona state governor Jan Brewer. Although the law only applied to the state of Arizona, its controversial nature forced it into national political discussions and divided the country. The law was announced shortly after the rise of the Tea Party in 2008, a far-right movement that emerged in response to the proposed "big government" of Barack Obama and the Democrat party. The national popular support amassed for SB1070 from the Tea Party reveals the underlying nativist ideologies that have become predominant in U.S. conservative politics. Furthermore, the bill was consistently discussed in terms of national security, as proponents argued that it was a necessary step in protecting the sovereignty of the U.S. and preventing terrorist attacks like 9/11 from occurring again. Following its passage, many other states drafted similar laws and received full support from national and local Tea Party leaders.

The law itself streamlined the criminalization of undocumented immigrants and sparked national controversy for its perceived racial discrimination. According to the Arizona State Senate fact sheet for SB 1070, the law,

> "requires a reasonable attempt to be made to determine the immigration status of a person during any legitimate contact made by an official or agency of the state or a county, city, town or political subdivision if reasonable suspicion exists that the person is an alien who is unlawfully present in the U.S."[144]

[144] Arizona State Senate. "Fact Sheet for SB1070". 15 January 2010. [http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/summary/s.1070pshs.doc.htm]

Essentially, this gives the rights to any government official to verify the immigration status of anyone they deem "suspicious." Naturally, in a state full of Mexican immigrants, the suspicious individuals will be brown skinned. According to those who opposed the law, the "reasonable attempt … to determine the immigration status of a person" amounts to racial profiling and would lead to the prosecution of Hispanic people throughout Arizona. It is clear that this bill could only exist in a paranoid, post-9/11 culture because of its broad language reminiscent of the Patriot Act of 2001[145] and the Secure Fence Act of 2006. Just as the Patriot Act and Secure Fence Act disregarded human rights in the name of national security, SB1070 disregarded human rights in the name of border security. The precedent set by the earlier acts provided legitimacy for the bill.

Most indicative of the new rhetoric of security on the border is the emergence of the Minuteman Project and the related Minuteman Civil Defense Corps (MCDC). The MCDC is an armed citizen militia group that seeks to control the border through independent patrols. Throughout the history of the border, non-state actors have played a large role in shaping boder policy and politics. As was shown in Chapter 1 and 2, the role of Spanish and Anglo-American settlers in forming border communities was crucial to how the border was conceptualized and ultimately drawn. The independence movements in Texas and California were the result of non-state militias, though they had implicit support from Washington D.C. While the border was drawn, filibusterers on both sides of the border attempted to assert sovereignty on uncontrolled territory or gain more territory for the respective states. In 1857, for example, Californian Henry Crabb invaded Caborca, Sonora with a citizen's militia in an attempt to gain control of the territory for the U.S.[146] Similarly, rebellious bands of Mexicans threatening to cross into Arizona during the Orozco rebellion of 1912 in the early 20th century led to the creation of local "home guards" that were intended to be mobilized in response to perceived Mexican threats.[147] Repeated attempts by U.S. filibusterers to invade Mexican lands in the mid 19th century led to the creation of vigilante groups on the Mexican side of the border to defend Mexican territorial sovereignty.[148]

---

[145] The Patriot Act of 2001 was passed directly after 9/11 and gave the federal government sweeping powers to detain, question, search, and observe any individual suspected of being a terrorist.

[146] Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands*, p. 46.

[147] Ibid., p. 164.

[148] St. John, *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border,* p. 45.

The MCDC was founded in 2005 by two Californians, Chris Simcox and Jim Gilchrist. From April 1 to April 30, 2005, the group organized over 900 volunteers at different posts along the border in Arizona to stand watch against undocumented migrants. The volunteers along the border were often armed, but could not use force against any undocumented migrants they found; instead, they would summon border patrol with a radio. According to MCDC statistics, they helped arrest 335 undocumented immigrants. However, a Congressional Report on the situation reported that, in fact, they interfered with Border Patrol and made patrolling the border much more difficult by continually setting off the high-tech sensors that were already in place along the border.[149] Nonetheless, the campaign continued and expanded into several different states over the course of the year. Today, the Minuteman Project exists as an advocacy group for immigration reform and stricter border policy but there are no longer group patrols organized along the border. The success of the group lies with the fact that they received so much publicity. Much of what they accomplished was symbolic, and pushed U.S. politicians to lobby for even more resources for border control. The emergence and success of the MCDC is indicative of how polarized the border region has become in recent years, especially with the hyper-paranoid security politics of post-September 11.

During the MCDC's patrolling of the border, they often came into conflict not only with migrants, but also with transnational humanitarian aid groups that were operating within the same region to assist migrants and prevent deaths from lack of food or water and over-exposure. A popular American radio show embedded a journalist with the MCDC and recorded the interactions between the two opposing groups. A conversation between an old Minuteman named Larry and a young, Mexican-American rescue worker named Rafael is of particular interest because of the way they conceptualized the border and how the relate to it. Larry pleasantly introduced himself to Rafael, and told him that they both believe in helping people. Larry said, "I don't want to see anyone get hurt either" and then told Rafael to "follow his heart" and to "do what he feels he has to do." Rafael responded, "I believe we are both on the same side, because you love this country, and I love this country. The one difference

---

[149] Yoxall, "The Minuteman Project, Gone in a Minute or Here to Stay? The Origin, History and Future of Citizen Activism on the United States-Mexico Border" *The University of Miami Inter-American Law Review,* p. 533.

is, I've got two countries."[150] This exchange simultaneously reveals how divided the borderlands have become and how, despite the fact, there are many individuals who feel very connected to them.

The dramatic increase in security over the past few decades along the border has risen from and fueled a new culture of paranoia and xenophobia. In the past, though racism was always prevalent, immigration was confronted in a more or less pragmatic way through federal legislation. The radicalized domestic political culture combined with the paranoid politics of the "War on Terror" has created a situation of unfettered military spending and security growth along the border. The transnational cultures that have long existed along the border are being brutally divided in the name of national security. When looking at the contemporary status of the border, it is clear that the present situation is a historical anomaly. It also comes with a degree of irony, as it is occurring simultaneously with massive projects of trade liberalization and a push for more economic "open borders" across the globe.

[150] Spring, James. "El Gato y el Ratoncito" *This American Life.* Prod. Ira Glass, WBEZ Chicago, 24 February 2006.

## Conclusion

A historical perspective provides the benefit of contextualizing contemporary phenomena to see their origins and how they have developed over time. In the age of the nation-state, the lines on a map are taken as a concrete truth, but the reality is that they are more often than not drawn arbitrarily, the results of political negotiating and military force. The humans living on the intersections of these lines are forced to declare their allegiances to the side that they belong to, and history is made accordingly. In Europe, the ambiguous nature of nation-state boundaries is very evident by simply looking at the similarities in cultures in borderlands. Throughout Europe, there are small regions of "in-between" people, like German-speaking Italians in Sud-Tirol, who have been forced to legally identify with a nation-state that is not reflective of their personal identity. The same occurred with the drawing of the border between the U.S. and Mexico.

When examining the history of the U.S.-Mexico border over the course of history, it becomes apparent that the present status of the border as a highly militarized zone is a historical anomaly. The line that was the result of hundreds of years of settlements and competing claims and was ultimately drawn so haphazardly has been transformed into a powerful tool used by both the U.S. and Mexico to regulate who and what can enter the respective nations. The new perceived threats to the border are not threats to sovereignty or foreign invaders; rather, they are undocumented migrants and drug smugglers. This is indicative of the changing nature of borders in globalization. Mexico and the U.S., through the passage of NAFTA, embarked on one of the most massive programs of trade liberalization in world history. Despite this, a mere decade later, the U.S. Congress passed a bill to construct a multi-billion dollar fence between the two countries. This change in character inevitably leads to the question of what the future of the border will be. Will it continue to grow stronger and stronger, ultimately leading to something reminiscent of the Berlin Wall? Or will the militarization recede at some point and return the border to its historical roots as a porous and ambiguous line?

Peter Andreas, the author of *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Border*, discusses for the future of the border by giving two examples of scenarios, which would be on the extreme end. The first is the creation of what he refers to as "fortress America", which would see security concerns surrounding the borders override all other considerations of economic cooperation. This scenario is unlikely, he argues, because economic interests would go against it. Another scenario would be a multilateral policy harmonization between Mexico, the U.S., and Canada to create a

mutual North American security perimeter. This would move the North American continent towards European Union like legislation for security purposes, and is very unlikely given the current political climate. Most likely, he argues, the reality will prove to be a combination of the two, moving slowly and piece by piece as new legislation is made and dictated by domestic political movements.[151] His speculations on the future of the border are useful for concluding this thesis because it has focused primarily on how the contemporary nature of the border represents a historical break. It is clear that it would be incredibly difficult (if not impossible) to return to a more porous border. Therefore, the question that remains is how sustainable it will be to maintain such an expensive and resource draining border policy.

Unfortunately, as the debate on immigration reform in the U.S. slowly chugs along, it seems clear that the reality will without a doubt be the "fortress America" scenario. Xenophobic politicians, specifically members of gerry-mandered[152] Republican Congress districts, are making any discussion of immigration reform contingent upon massive increases in spending on border security. Some proposals are demanding as much as $46 billion in extra spending, much of which would go to private firms and exacerbate the already incredibly powerful military-industrial complex on the border. They would hire an additional 19,200 border guards to patrol the area.[153] Despite the absurdity of this level of spending in an already highly indebted economy, the political tactics of the right wing are succeeding in the debate and Democratic and pro-immigrant Republican politicians are accepting their terms for increases in security in exchange for a deal that would reform the system.

Ironically, the same extreme-right wing politicians and voters that are blocking immigration reform are the ones who worship the idea of the

---

[151] Andreas, p. 172.

[152] Gerry-mandering refers to the re-drawing of Congressional districts to make them "safe" from election challengers, based on the political make up of the area. In 2010, there was a massive re-drawing of Congressional districts in Republican controlled states, making many districts safe from a Democratic challenger. This results in pushing Republican Congresspeople in those districts further to the right politically because they do not have to worry about dealing with a challenger from the Democrats, but rather dealing with a more conservative challenger from their own party. It is this small group of Republicans that is holding back immigration reform, reflecting the extremely conservative nature of their districts.

[153] Peterson, Kristina. "House Border-Control Bill Gains Backers", *Wall Street Journal Online.* 1 August 2013 (accessed 5 August 2013). [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324144304578624292442735984.html]

free market and neo-liberal economic policies. As Saskia Sassen points out, this is a massive contradiction:

> Current immigration policy in the highly developed countries is increasingly at odds with other major policy frameworks in the international system. There is a combination of drives to create border-free economic spaces yet intensify border control to keep immigrants and refugees out. The juxtaposition between these two dynamics provides one of the principal contexts in which today's efforts to stop immigration assume their significance. There are, in effect, two major epistemic communities: one dealing with the flow of capital and information; the other with immigration.[154]

One of the primary goals of this thesis is to make the argument for the importance of historically contextualizing the border in order to understand its contemporary character. Ideas and issues from the earliest history of the borderlands region continually re-emerge in contemporary contexts. For example, the theme of Aztlán, though never realized by the earliest explorers, lives on in the Chicano mindset and is an omnipresent theme in contemporary Chicano understandings of the border.

In light of the on-going discussions on immigration reform, I wish to contribute to a body of work that focuses less on the distinctions between the two nation-states, and more on what brings them together. The shared history on the borderlands provides a powerful argument for providing citizenship to the millions of undocumented immigrants residing in the United States. Furthermore, it delegitimizes the calls for increased border security, as the border can be viewed as what it truly is: an arbitrary line drawn in the desert sands.

---

[154] Sassen, Saskia. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization.* New York, U.S.A.: Columbia University Press, 1996. p. 92.

## Works Cited


Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands-La Frontera: The New Mestiza.* San Francisco, U.S.A.: Aunt Lute Books, 1987.

Archibald, Randal. "Obama to Send 1,200 Troops to Border" *New York Times.*, 25 May 2010; accessed 15 November 2012. [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/26/us/26border.html?_r=0]

Arias, David. *Las Raíces Hispanas de los Estados Unidos.* Madrid, Spain: MAPFRE, 1992.

Arizona State Senate. "Fact Sheet for SB1070". 15 January 2010. [http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/summary/s.1070pshs.doc.htm].

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Andreas, Peter. *Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide.* New York, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Arreola, Daniel. "Border-City Idee Fix". *Geographical Review.* Vol. 86, No. 3, Latin American Geography, July 1996, pp. 356-369.

Behdad, Ali. *A Forgetful Nation.* Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 2005.

Bustamante, Aarón Grageda. „Humanität im Exil: Die Zuwanderung mexikanischer Indianer in den Südwesten der USA und der Aufbau einer transnationalen Identität", in Gala Rebane et al. *Humanismus Polyphon. Menschlichkeit im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, 2009, pp. 161-178.

Ceasar, Stephen. "Hispanic Population Tops 50 Million in U.S.", LA Times Online, March 24, 2011; accessed September 28, 2012. [http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/24/nation/la-na-census-hispanic- 20110325]

Chavez, John. *The Lost Land: The Chicano Image of the Southwest.* U.S.A.: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.

Clary, David. *Eagles and Empire: The United States, Mexico, and the Struggle for a Continent*. New York, NY: Random House, 2009.

Daniels, Roger and Graham, Otis. *Debating American Immigration, 1882-Present.* 2001 Rowman and Littlefield Publications: Maryland
Drye, Willie. "Seven Cities of Cibola Legend Lures Conquistadors" National Geographic Online; accessed October 2, 2012. [http://science.nationalgeographic.com/science/archaeology/seven-cities-of-cibola/]

Eisenhower, John S.D. *So Far From God: Creating the War with Mexico 1846-1848*. New York, NY: Random House, 1989.

Hague, Harlan. "The Reluctant Retirement of Thomas Larkin". *California History,* Vol 62, No. 1, 1983, pp. 60-66.

Hernandez, Kelly Lyttle. *Migra: A History of the U.S. Border Patrol.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2010.

Hutchings, Peter. "Mural Sovereignty: From the Twin Towers to the Twin Walls." *Law and Critique.* August 2009, Volume 20, Issue 2. pp. 133 -146.
Jimenez, Maria. "Humanitarian Crisis: Migrant Deaths at the U.S.-Mexico Border", ACLU of San Diego and Imperial Counties and Mexico's National Commission on Human Rights, October 1, 2009. [http://cw .routledge.com/textbooks/9780415996945/migrants/HumanitarianCrisis.pdf].

Maciel, David and Jose Guillermo Saavedra. *Al Norte de la Frontera: El Pueblo Chicano*. Mexico: Consejo Nacional de Población, 1988.

Nallino, Michael and William K. Hartmann. "A Supposed Franciscan Exploration of Arizona in 1538: The Origins of a Myth" *Kiva*, Vol. 68, No. 4, Summer, 2003, pp. 283-303.

Nash, Gerald D. *Creating the West: Historical Interpretations 1890-1990.* Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1991.

Passel, Jeffrey and D'vera Cohn. "U.S. Population Projections 2000-2050", Pew Hispanic Center, February 11, 2008; accessed September 29, 2012.

[http://www .pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-population-projections-2005-2050/].

Pérez de Villagrá, Gaspar. *Historia de la Nueva México: A Critical and Annotated Spanish/English Version*. Albuquerque, New Mexico, U.S.A.: UNM Press, 1992.

Peterson, Kristina. "House Border-Control Bill Gains Backers", Wall Street Journal Online. 1 August 2013 (accessed 5 August 2013). [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324144304578624292442735984.html]

Radcliffe, Zoe Green. "Robert Baylor Semple, Pioneer" *California Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 2, June 1927, pp. 130-158.

Reuter, Peter and David Ronfledt, *Quest for Integrity: The Mexican-U.S. Drug Issue in the 1980s*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1991.

Rios, Viridiana. "Security issues and immigration flows: Drug-violence refugees, the new Mexican immigrants" Nov. 16, 2011, p. 2.; accessed 20 February 2013. [http://www.gov.harvard.edu/files/Rios2011_DrugViolenceRefugees.pdf]

Sassen, Saskia. *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization*. New York, U.S.A.: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Spener, David. *Clandestine Crossings: Migrants and Coyotes on the Texas-Mexico Border*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Spickard, Paul. *Almost All Aliens: Immigration, Race, and Colonialism in American History*. Routledge: New York, NY, 2007.

Spring, James. "El Gato y el Ratoncito" *This American Life*. Prod. Ira Glass, WBEZ Chicago, 24 February 2006.

St. John, Rachel. *Line in the Sand: A History of the Western U.S.-Mexico Border*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Tays, George. "Mariano Guadalupe Vallejo and Sonoma: A Biography and a History". *California Historical Society Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 2, June 1938, pp. 141-167.

Truett, Samuel. *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands*. New Haven, U.S.A.: Yale University Press, 2006.

University of Texas at Austin. "Poverty in Texas", Texas Politics 3rd Edition, 2009. [http://texaspolitics.laits.utexas.edu/12_2_0.html].

Valenzuela, Jose Manuel. "Al otro lado de la linea. Representaciones socioculturales en las narrativas sobre la frontera Mexico-Estado Unidos". *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Vol. 62, No. 2, Apr-Jun. 2000, pp. 125-149.

Van Nuys, Frank. *Americanizing the West: Race, Immigrants, and Citizenship, 1890-1930*. Wichita, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 2002.

Vélez-Ibáñez, Carlos G. *Border Visions: Mexican Cultures of the Southwest United States*. Tuscon, Arizona, U.S.A.: University of Arizona Press, 1996.

Weber, David J. *The Spanish Frontier in North America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Witt, Howard. "U.S. fence creates river of ill will on Texas border" *Chicago Tribune*. 16 January 2008; accessed February 15, 2013. [http://www .chicagotribune.com/news/chi-080115fence,0,6983165.story] (accessed February 15, 2013).

Yoxall, Peter. "The Minuteman Project, Gone in a Minute or Here to Stay? The Origin, History and Future of Citizen Activism on the United States-Mexico Border" *The Universiy of Miami Inter-American Law Review,* Vol.37, No. 3,Spring-Summer 2006, pp 517-566.

# COLE HARRY

Gablenzgasse 30/38
1160 Vienna, Austria
cole.harry88@gmail.com

## EDUCATION

**UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG / UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA** **September 2010 - September 2012**
MA Erasmus Mundus Global Studies- A European Perspective Leipzig, Germany/Vienna, Austria

- A two-year, interdisciplinary, research-based masters offered by a consortium of five European universities: Roskilde University (Denmark), University of Wroclaw (Poland), University of Vienna (Austria), London School of Economics (UK), and University of Leipzig (Germany)
- The first year was completed at University of Leipzig and the second year at University of Vienna

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA BARBARA** **September 2006 - June 2010**
BA Global Studies Santa Barbara, CA

- 3.6 GPA, graduated with honors
- Completed one academic year (2008-2009) at Universidad de Chile in Santiago, Chile through a UC EAP immersion program
- Relevant coursework: Professional Writing for Global Careers, International Political Economy, Global Economic Development, Spanish, Portuguese, and French language courses

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR MIGRATION** **July 2012 – September 2012**
Counter-Trafficking and Assisted Voluntary Return and Integration Assistant Vienna, Austria

- Research and write reports related to migration issues in the Eastern European, South-Eastern European, and Central Asian region
- Draft proposals for potential regional migration projects
- Compile a weekly news digest for the region
- Update and maintain the project database

**THOMSON REUTERS** **June 2011 - August 2011**
Intern Leipzig, Germany

- Worked in Media Research, Online Services, and Investor Services departments
- Researched media outlets in the UK and Ireland
- Created media databases to be used for press releases by individual clients

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATION ABROAD PROGRAM** **September 2009 - June 2010**
Peer Advisor Santa Barbara, CA

- Advised students on study abroad opportunities
- Organized recruitment and outreach activities on campus
- Oversaw orientation and pre-departure procedures for students
- Reviewed and assisted with applications
- Daily tasks of office operations: answering phone, mailing, fax, and customer service

**ENTRÉE TRAVEL MAGAZINE** **July 2007 - May 2008**
Assistant to the Editor Santa Barbara, CA

- Maintained and organized office: answered phone, sent and received mail
- Assisted Editor with daily tasks
- Processed new subscribers and oversaw distribution of the magazine
- Contributed small writing assignments to magazine including advertisements, book reviews, and restaurant reviews

**UC SANTA BARBARA MODEL UNITED NATIONS** **January 2010 - June 2010**
Delegate Santa Barbara, CA

- Represented Cote d'Ivoire at National Model United Nations in New York City in April 2010
- Compiled extensive research on United Nations policies and procedures

**UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION SANTA BARBARA** **Aug. 2007 - June 2008, Aug. 2009 - April 2010**
Intern: UN World Affairs Chair Santa Barbara, CA

- Gave monthly report on UN news
- Promoted and attended UN functions around Southern California
- Acted as an advocate for UN policies
- Educated public about UN-U.S. relationship

**CENTRO DE CULTURA MAPUCHE (MAPUCHE CULTURAL CENTER)** **March 2009 - July 2009**
Student Intern Santiago, Chile

- Studied Mapuche culture and language and its changing role in urban Chile
- Worked to build awareness and understanding of the Mapuche culture
- Assisted in daily tasks of the cultural center
- Prepared a report on the political and social problems facing indigenous people in Chile

**COLEGIO INTEGRACIONAL DE LATINOAMÉRICA** **March 2009 - July 2009**
English Teacher Santiago, Chile

- Taught supplemental English conversation courses to 30 beginning students
- Designed curriculum and evaluated students

**ENGLISH OPENS DOORS** **July 2008 - December 2009**
Tutor/Teacher Assistant Santiago, Chile

- English teacher assistant for public high school through the Chilean Ministry of Education and United Nations Development Program
- Assisted host teacher with listening and speaking activities
- Facilitated cultural exchange

## LANGUAGE ABILITIES

Fluent English

Advanced Spanish (C1 spoken and written)

Intermediate German (B2 spoken/B1 written)

Basic French and Brazilian Portuguese