Chapter 4, Part III
Racist Landscapes: U.S. and Mexican Borderland Landscapes

III. U.S. and Mexican Borderlands

Latin American-origin and/or Spanish speakers are labeled Hispanics by the U.S. Census and are commonly thought to be a “racial” group, particularly in civil rights laws and affirmative action and employment policies and practices. In fact, the Hispanic category includes all major “racial” categories from White (Spanish-origin), Black (ex-slaves), Indian, and even Asian (Filipinos). In North America, Hispanics are commonly a multi-racial category of Indians and Europeans (mestizos in Spanish) or Blacks and Whites (Puerto Ricans). Hispanics do share a Spanish-origin culture and language, even though they don’t all speak Spanish and their cultural forms vary significantly from one country to another. The term Hispanic is only used in the United States and represents a minority ethnic group outside of its homeland. In the Mexican homeland, Hispanic is not used; instead the labels Mexicans or mestizos are used. In this chapter, most of the focus will be on the U.S. side of the Mexican border but the U.S. influences on Mexico’s border cities and region will also be considered. The Spanish and later the U.S. treatment of Indians and Mexicans, respectively, in the Borderlands was predicated on racial categories of inferiority and institutional responses to the local population and their lands was and continues to be informed by race-based, or racist, actions.

The 2000 U.S. Census classified 12.5 percent of the U.S. population as Hispanics, up from nine percent in 1990, making them one of the fastest growing demographic groups in the United States. Although most Hispanics are Roman Catholics and speak dialects of Spanish, they are otherwise a very heterogeneous cultural and racial group, including some large nationalities such as Mexicans (7.3 percent of the total U.S. population in 2000), Puerto Ricans (1.2 percent), and Cubans (0.4 percent) and a host of much smaller groups from other Central and South American countries.

In 2004 the five states with the largest percentage of Hispanics were New Mexico with 43 percent; Texas and California with 35 percent each; Arizona with 28 percent; and Nevada with 23 percent (Statistical Abstract of the United States 2006). At the county level, only 51 U.S. counties had 50 percent or more Hispanics, another 153 counties had 25 to 50 percent Hispanics. In other words, only 204 out of 3,141 U.S. counties, or 15 percent, had a sizeable Hispanics population. Figure 4-III-1 shows the high concentration of Hispanics along the Mexico-U.S. border. The top 25 U.S. counties ranked by the highest percentage of Hispanics were all in Texas and three in New Mexico. Only seven counties in states outside the U.S. Borderlands had large numbers of Hispanics, usually in large metropolitan areas such as New York (Queens, King, Bronx), Illinois (Cook), and Florida (Dade, Broward) (County and City Data Book 2000).

Aside from ethnicity, or country of origin, people can be classified by the language(s) they speak. Spanish speakers in the United States are also highly localized in northern metropolitan areas and regionally in the U.S. Borderlands. Although Spanish speakers and Mexicans are almost synonymous in the Southwest, one area is different: Hispanics in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado who speak Spanish but are not Mexicans (Figure 4-III-2).

Figure 4-III-1. Percentage of U.S. Census-identified Hispanics in the Southwest by county in 2000. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on U.S. Census 2000.

Historically, the Spanish Empire dominated the native peoples of the southern areas of North America as the French Empire controlled the St. Lawrence River basin, the British Empire controlled most of North
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America, and the Russian Empire reached along the Pacific Coast as far south as today’s San Francisco.

The U.S. Borderland is defined here by the largest ancestry of Mexicans and Hispanolând by the largest ancestry of Hispanic/Spanish in each county in 2000 (Figure 4-III-4). The pattern of these contemporary regions results from the historical extent of Spanish settlements (i.e., forts, missions, and Hispanic villages), Mexican territorial claims, and U.S. annexation of northern Mexico, and the subsequent trans-border interactions and migrations to U.S border areas. Hispanolând is often included in the U.S. Borderland without differentiating the Spanish settlers in today’s northern New Mexico and southern Colorado, called Hispanos. Only Hispanics identify with the census label “Hispanic.” For people from Latin American countries Hispanic is too European; they prefer terms like Latinos in general or more specific terms like Chicano/as for Mexicans or country-specific labels, such as Honduran Americans. The traits of the U.S. Borderlands, which include both the U.S. Borderland and Hispanolând, can not be used to define the border regions in Mexico where people are obviously Mexicans, Spanish-speakers, and overwhelmingly Roman Catholics. Nevertheless, the Mexican Borderland, nevertheless, has distinctive socio-economic and landscape features from the rest of Mexico - - these we will discuss later in this chapter.

Despite the large number and wide-spread distribution of Spanish speakers in the United States today, 22 states have expressed their anti-Spanish and related anti-immigrant attitudes by declaring that English is their official language. Communities have likewise expressed their xenophobia of foreigners. The small town of Norcoss, Georgia (a wealthy Atlanta suburb), passed a law penalizing linguistic "infringements." Maria Cobarrubias was fined $115 for her sign, Supermercado Jalisco, which was posted outside her supermarket. She had violated Norcross' ordinance banning signs that are less than 75 percent English "as determined by local authorities." The law has also been used against several Korean churches and an Asian beauty shop (Eat the State! 2006). In another case, Arcade, Wisconsin, the mayor of this city of a Mexican population of three percent proposed in August 2006 that the city pass an ordinance to require the U.S. flag to be flown with any other flag, e.g. Mexican; all commercial signs be in English, and landlords would be fined for renting to “illegals” all the while the two largest employers of Mexicans, poultry processing and furniture manufacturing, have assured the mayor that their workers are all legal.

The Spanish Empire in North America created the distinctive region of the Borderlands and Hispanolând. The Spanish crown was particularly aggressive and pervasive in its colonization of people and land. The state
and the Roman Catholic Church joined forces in subjecting the Americas for the Spanish monarchy and Christianity and in the process massively transformed the native peoples and lands of North America, which eventually created the U.S. Borderland and Hispanoland.

Figure 4-III-4. The U.S. and Mexican Borderlands and Hispanoland. Source: Ingolf Vogeler.

Cultural Landscapes of the Borderlands
Along the United States of Mexico and the United States of America international border, three unique cultural landscape regions have developed on either side of the international border and the border itself.

On the U.S. Side of the Border
The U.S. side of the international border with Mexico is a strikingly different region from the rest of the United States reflecting Spanish, Mexican, and U.S. policies actions. Each of the major forces and institutions that created and shaped this region are discussed.

Spanish Continental Empire
In Central and North America, Spain transplanted its rigid and legalistic political and religious structures to the “New World.” The Spanish Empire controlled large amounts of continuous land in which Indian societies were profoundly transformed, economically, culturally, and racially. Indians were organized to work the mines and plantations that profited the political, economic, and religious European elites in the new lands and at home. To achieve this hegemony, extensive road systems and cities were built, irrespectively of pre-existing Indian trails and settlements. Donald Meining (1969) calls these land-based empires in the Americas, Continental Empires. Ports like Veracruz were connected by sea to Spain and by land to major cities like Mexico City, from which roads radiated out to regional towns (Figure 4-III-5).

Native languages, social structures, and religions, such as the Aztecs and Mayans in Mexico, were destroyed, replaced, or at least transformed by European languages, law, and Roman Catholicism. Large numbers of European men came without their families, if they had any, to work as administrators, soldiers, craftsmen, and priests. Whites themselves were divided into criollo (those born in the New World) and peninsular (those born in Spain). Regardless of their station in life, these European men had legal, or more commonly illegitimate, sexual relations with Indian women; resulting in a large racially mixed population, called mestizos. Today only a small percentage of Mexico’s population remains Indians and only eight percent of Mexico’s population spoke Indian languages in 1990. But the European Spanish elites have persisted, evidenced by the lighter skin colors.
of business and political elites in Mexico. The Continental Empire created single, hierarchical, multi-racial, and land-based societies throughout Latin America including what was to become the Southwestern United States.

Spanish settlements in the Southwest date from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The earliest settlements were in Santa Fe, which was founded in 1609. Over the next 200 years additional settlements were established; by the early nineteenth century, major Spanish settlements were found in the New Mexico, southern and southeastern Texas, and along the California coast. These Spanish areas had contact with the United States, particularly with Missouri merchants in St. Louis with the opening of the Santa Fe Trail in 1822. While Anglos traded and engaged in land speculation in New Mexico and later in California by following the overland Old Spanish Trail, Texas received the most Anglo settlers. In Texas, Spain and later Mexico used land grants to encourage both Hispanic and Anglo settlements -- the biggest of the latter was the Austin Colony. By the 1830s, Texas contained 25,000 Anglos and 4,000 Spanish-speaking Mexicans. Only the areas around and south of San Antonio were distinctively Mexican.

Beginning in 1493, Spain colonized Nueva España (New Spain, consisting of present-day Mexico and the Southwestern United States). Aggressive U.S. land claims resulted in the 1819 treaty between Spain and the United States which established the border of Spanish claims in what is now the Southwest (Figure 4-III-6). Spanish colonization on the northern frontier consisted of forts (presidios), towns, and missions where they introduced European livestock, fruits, vegetables, and industries. The northward spread of Spanish colonization throughout the eighteenth century created by 1850 a distinctive cultural landscape of Hispanic settlement forms (Figure 4-III-7). Spanish settlements, particularly the missions in each of the Border States, and the Spanish settlers (Hispanos) in New Mexico are examined in detail to illustrate the unique features of the cultural landscapes in the U.S. Borderlands from this historical period.

**Spanish Missions in California**

Roman Catholics religious orders, e.g., Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans, established missions throughout what today is the west coast of Mexico and California. In these communal Christian communities, Indians were concentrated in villages where they were to be acculturated into Spanish culture by way of religion, agriculture, and crafts. While 25 missions were built in Baja California, in Mexico today, and 21 missions were built in today’s U.S. California. Two specific missions are examined in detail to show the landscape characteristics of missions in California.

![Figure 4-III-6. Spanish territorial claims by 1819. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on maps at the University of Texas, Map Collection 2006.](chart)
Figure 4-III-7. Hispanic settlements and state populations in 1850 in today’s Southwestern United States. Source: Ingolf Vogeler based on various sources, such as Mission California 2006, Ancient Arizona 2006, American Catholic 2006, and Wikipedia 2006.

Santa Barbara Mission, founded in 1786 as the tenth mission of the 21 Franciscan missions in California, is considered "the queen" of the missions in the state and is the most visited. Early in the nineteenth century the mission had more than 1,700 Indian neophytes living in a village of 250 adobe houses. The Santa Barbara Indians made the mission self-sustaining. They had worships for weaving, candle making, wood work, leather, blacksmiths, pottery, and painting religious icons. They produced grains, vegetables, fruits, wool, and meat. Some foods were introduced from Spain: wheat and barley; others from Mexico: corn, chilies, and beans. Wild plants and herbs, game, and fish were also part of their diet. At one time 150 neophytes were armed and drilled to reinforce the Spanish presidio guard. After secularization by Mexico, the mission became a parish church (Figure 4-III-8).

As a restored and “working” mission today, Las Purisima Concepcion illustrates the distinctive functions, appearance, land uses, and spatial layout of missions. This mission was partially restored to its 1812 (after an earthquake) appearance by the Civil Conservation Corp (CCC) in the 1930s. The restored buildings, replanted gardens, restocked livestock, and replanted fields are now part of the Las Purisima Mission State Historic Park of California (Figure 4-III-9).
The topographic map (in the bottom, right-hand corner of Figure 4-III-10) shows the restored mission buildings (long black rectangles) on the westside of the valley with a stream. The visitor center is on the eastside. Contrary to the layout of most missions, the La Purisima is not an enclosed rectangle but rather a nearly one-sided, linear arrangement of buildings. All references to building numbers refer to Figure 4-III-10.
The large church with its bell tower (#3) and European cemetery anchored the mission (Figure 4-III-11).

Quarters for soldiers (#4) were followed by the workshops (#5) that produced the needs of the mission and for outside sales. The highest ranking officer at the mission got his orders from the presidio in Santa Barbara. The blacksmith and his family had a separate buildings (#9), removed from the rest of the mission buildings because of the noise and danger from fire (Figure 4-III-12). Because iron was imported, the blacksmith repaired and reworked every iron implement. The warehouses (#11) were near the El Camino Real (King’s “highway”).

The pottery shop in this mission produced 40,000 flat floor tiles, 200,000 roof tiles, and two miles of clay pipes for irrigation. Water was taken from the spring house (#14) to irrigate the fields, orchards, and the fountain in the garden (Figure 4-III-13). The topographic map shows the spring house in the upper right-hand corner as an outlined square (□).

Each mission had at least two priests, one for spiritual matters and the other for administrative affairs. The residence for the two priests, which had 139 books on topics ranging from spiritual to agricultural, and the private chapel (#8) over looked the garden of trees and shrubs for fruits
(pear, date), dyes (Nevin’s Barberry), fibers (Basket Bush), and medicines (Coffee Berry). In 1820, the mission had a population of 874, mostly **Chumash Indians** who lived on the eastside of the valley (Figure 4-III-14). The Indian girls’ dormitory (#12), used by girls older than 11 and who were not yet married, and the barracks (#13) for the Indians contrasted with the Chumash village (#18), where the Indians lived who preferred their “traditional” lifestyle (Figure 4-III-14). The topographic map shows only one cemetery which was used by the Indians (#10) and it was located next to the infirmary (#11). Unlike the Europeans, the Chumash bathed frequently and the laundry (#19) was used by them for bathing and washing their clothing.

In 1820, the mission operated 3,000 acres and had 9,500 cattle, 12,600 sheep, 1,305 horses, 288 mules, 15 burros, 86 swine, 40 goats, and many ducks, turkeys, chickens, and geese. **Soap and tallow vats** (#2), and **grist** (#7) and **olive** (in back of #4) **mills** were also important buildings that allowed for self-sufficiency (Figure 4-III-15).

---

**Spanish Missions in Arizona**

In Arizona, unlike Mexico, missionization proceeded slowly. Twenty missions in eight mission district were built throughout the Pimeria Alta region. Nine missions were established in the Sonoran Desert alone which covers most of southern Arizona (Through Our Parents’ Eyes 2006). Following the Colorado and Gila rivers, missions such as **San Xavier del Bac** were built south of Tucson, Arizona, where a **presidio** was built 75 years later. Today the main church sits opposite the former plaza, where the Arts and Crafts Center is located (Figure 4-III-16 and 17). The typical Indian cemetery is on the edge of the settlement (Figure 4-III-18).
Figure 4-III-16. Only the main church of the San Xavier del Bac Mission, founded in 1692, remains on the Indian reservation with the same name. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Figure 4-III-17. The plaza of the mission is now an Arts and Craft Center of the San Xavier Indian reservation. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Figure 4-III-18. The cemetery on the San Xavier reservation is illustrative of Indian cemeteries everywhere: wooden grave markers indicate low incomes and the crosses and religious statutes indicate Roman Catholicism. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Spanish Missions in New Mexico

Spanish settlements in New Mexico in the eighteenth century consisted of towns and missions, usually located at Indian pueblos (Figure 4-III-19). In 1609, Santa Fe became the capital of New Mexico and is the oldest capital in the United States. In the states that are now called Arizona and New Mexico, Indians lived in compact villages of stone or adobe, often in multi-storied rowhouses. When Spaniards encountered Indians already living in villages, they named them non-descriptively Pueblo (Spanish for village) Indians. Although the tribes of northwestern New Mexico and northeastern Arizona belong to four distinct linguistic groups, their cultures were and continue to be closely related. Only a few of the pueblo villages are still inhabited; most are uninhabited or extinct. In the case of the Tigua pueblos, only six villages are still inhabited, 23 are uninhabited, and 14 are now extinct (Access Genealogy 2006).

New Mexico's current 25 Indian pueblos predate Spanish conquest (Figure 4-III-20). Spanish influence was restricted to adding settlement features to the existing villages rather than creating them anew as elsewhere as in Texas and California. Spanish churches, quarters for religious orders, cemeteries, plazas, and administrative buildings were added to the existing Indian villages. In San Felipe the mission church is still the centerpiece of the plaza. In San Agustin de la Isleta, a pueblo dating back to the 1300s,
more than 300 years before the arrival of the Spanish, the conversion to Christianity is indicated by the mission church, also known by its English name, Saint Augustine Church. At Nuestra Senora de la Asuncion de Zia, established in 1706, a mass baptism of Zia residents took place following the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 and the subsequent reconquest of the area by the Spanish. Although Zia was one of the first pueblos to be visited by the Spanish in the early 1500s, it took two centuries before Christianity and Spanish control really took hold here.

While the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest were Christianized, Spanish conquest eventually had far more cultural and landscape impact in New Mexico than on the more isolated and resistant Hopi in Arizona although they shared the same basic cultural traits of the other pueblo tribes. Spaniards established 17 missions in New Mexico (New Mexico Tourism Department 2006). What remains today of the earliest contacts between Spanish colonials and Pueblo Indians are the seventeenth-century ruins of mission churches at Quarai, Abo, and Gran Quivira, which today it is one of three sites that make up the Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument (National Park Service, Salinas Pueblo Missions 2006).

When Gran Quivira became part of the National Monument, the ruins of the mission churches were first excavated and only later were the Pueblo Indians ruins excavated. The order of the excavations shows that the U.S. government and archaeologists initially valued the newer and more powerful Spanish presence much more than the original Indian village. Only with ethnic/racial consciousness since the late 1960s did the appreciation of Indian cultures come to the forefront. The Gran Quivira site shows large apartment complexes and circular kivas -- both are characteristically of southwest Pueblo Indian material culture. The Spanish presence is shown by the two mission churches, convents, and cemetery. The massive size of the churches and convents compared to the Indian dwellings indicates the power of Spanish Catholicism on the Indians (Figure 4-III-21).
Spanish Land Grants and Spanish Settlers

The Spanish Empire in New Spain consisted primarily of single male administrators, soldiers, craftspeople, and the men of Roman Catholic religious orders, but sometimes Spanish families actually settled in areas where they were given land grants. The largest concentrations of these grants, often associated with missions, were in present-day California, New Mexico, and Texas. In New Mexico, the first Spanish-speaking settlers were a group of colonists and Franciscan friars who settled here at the end of the sixteenth century. Most of the colonists were from Spain, or were Spaniards born in Mexico, and they brought with them a blend of Spanish and Spanish-Mexican culture. In 1598, the first, temporary, capital of the Province of New Mexico was established near San Juan Pueblo at the confluence of the Rio Grande and the Chama River.

Isolated on the northern edge of the Spanish empire, the colonists had to be self-sufficient, raising all their own food and making their own clothing. They adapted some of the farming methods they had known in Spain or Mexico and learned new techniques from the Pueblo Indians. They worked together to build and maintain irrigation ditches, harvest crops, and build houses. They fought off attacks by Apache and Comanche Indians.

They religiously practiced their Catholicism in daily life and on religious festival days.

In the nineteenth century, as settlements began to expand beyond the Rio Grande, this traditional settler culture was challenged by new influences. First, Mexico won its independence from Spain in 1821. Second, the Santa Fe Trail brought Anglo-American traders and merchants, some of whom settled permanently in New Mexico and married into Spanish-speaking families. In 1846, New Mexico became part of the United States. On the small subsistence farms, or ranchos, in the valleys of Northern New Mexico, Hispanos, as the early Spanish settlers of New Mexico and their descendants are called, tried to maintain their traditional culture.

Some of the small subsistence ranchos survive in the mountain valleys of the Pecos and Mora rivers. The irrigation ditches that water the fields are regulated by rules dating back centuries. The houses are built of the same adobe used to construct Indian pueblos and Spanish missions. But the houses also feature decorative details based on architectural fashions brought to New Mexico after it became a U.S. territory in 1851 (National Park Service, National Register of Historic Sites, Teaching with Historic Places 2006B). By the 1980s, a majority of Hispanos could only be found in a small area just north of Santa Fe (Nostrand 2004).

Land grants were made to individuals and communities during the Spanish (1598-1821) and Mexican (1821-1846) periods of New Mexico's history (Figure 4-III-29). Communal land grants were also made to Pueblo Indian tribes for the lands they inhabited. In 1846 the United States began its occupation of New Mexico and in 1848 the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo established New Mexico as part of the United States while guaranteeing all the new citizens their earlier property rights.
Spain made several types of land grants to Hispanics and Pueblo Indians. **Private Hispano** grants were made to individuals who owned the entire grant and could sell it after the four-year possession requirement was met. These grants did not include common lands. **Hispano Community** grants were made to a group of Hispanics and included common lands. Settlers received small tracts of private land for their houses and garden plots with the right to use the remaining common lands for pasturing their cattle, gathering firewood and logs for building, hunting wild game, and gathering other resources, such as herbs and stone. Settlers owned their private tracts outright after four years and could sell them. The sale of a private tract by an individual carried with it the right to use the common lands, but the common lands could not be sold because they were owned by the community. Only **Pueblo Community** grants, not private ones, were made to Pueblo Indians (Ebright 2006).

### Chamita: Spanish Settlements in New Mexico

The topographic map of San Juan Pueblo, New Mexico, illustrates Spanish land grants and the resulting rural Hispano settlement forms. The San Juan Pueblo topographic map exercise in Chapter 9 examines land grants and both Hispano and Pueblo rural settlements. **Chamita** in the San Juan Pueblo area lies along the Chama River, a tributary of the Rio Grande River, in northern New Mexico. A good example of Spanish land grants and Hispano settlement patterns are found here. Topographic maps show land grants as red dashes separated by two dots and each grant is named (Figure 4-III-30). Six land grants are shown on the topographic map; the largest being the San Juan Pueblo grant. The Black Mesa and Bartolome Sanchez grants overlap.

![Figure 4-III-29. Spanish land grants in New Mexico. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on Guadalupe County, NM, 2006](image)

![Figure 4-III-30. Land grants and four settlements on the San Juan Pueblo Quad, 1:24,000. Source: Ingolf Vogeler.](image)
At Chamita the long-lot Spanish settlement forms are very evident. Figure 4-III-31 shows the distinctive linear patterns of orchards (green dots), dirt trails (black and purple dashed double lines), and houses (black squares). The boxes in Figure 4-III-31 highlight the orchards, trails (Figure 4-III-32), irrigation ditches (Figure 4-III-33), church (Figure 4-III-34), and cemetery (Figure 4-III-35), and the ordinary houses.

Figure 4-III-31. Topographic close-up of Chamita. The original map dates from 1953 with purple 1977 revisions. Source: San Pueblo, 1:24,000.

Figure 4-III-32. Chamita long lots are expressed by elongated field patterns, irrigation ditches, and trails between farms, shown here. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Figure 4-III-33. In the desert Southwest, Spanish settlements are concentrated along rivers to irrigate fields and orchards, as in Chamita. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.
Figure 4-III-34. Chamita’s Capilla de San Pedro Roman Catholic church is surrounded by a cemetery. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Figure 4-III-35. Unlike the nearby Indian pueblo cemeteries, the Chamita cemetery has no wooden crosses, but is definitely Roman Catholic with its icons and crosses etched in tombstones. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Figure 4-III-36. Floor plan of a traditional Hispano house. Source: Areola and Curtis 1993.

Hispano houses were built of abode around central courtyards, reflecting Spanish architectural traditions found in elite and ordinary houses. Figure 4-III-36 shows an L-shaped floor plan of an eighteenth-century flat-roofed, enclosed courtyard house near Piedras Negras. The walls are 18 inches thick. Two doors open onto the street and the other doors open into the courtyard. The kitchen is centrally located for family and guest dinning. Households traditionally maintained interior spaces for the display and veneration of religious images and saints. More wealthy Hispanos often built private chapels on their properties.
Spanish Missions in Texas
The first land grant in Texas was made to Indians in 1731, somewhere near present-day San Antonio. The largest of these Spanish land grants covered 939 square miles (600,960 acres) in Cameron County, Texas. By 1781, the Spanish had colonized San Antonio and founded 20 towns along the Rio Grande. In Laredo, Texas, for example, land grants were in the shape of long lots, called porciones, each 9/13 of a mile wide along the Rio Grande River by 11 to 16 miles long inland. Each had a rancho settlement of buildings for the owners, landless laborers, and work equipment (Yoder and LaPerriere de Gutierrez 2004).

The presidio (fort) and pueblo (town), the misión (mission) were three forms of settlements the Spanish crown used to extend its borders and consolidate its colonial territories across the Southwest from the seventh to the nineteen centuries. The earliest Spanish land claims in what became Texas was already made in 1540; by 1767, the first Spanish settlers had arrived. The 33 Spanish missions in Texas represented both political and religion institutions. Spanish Catholic Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans spread Christianity to local Indian tribes while Spain secured its frontier. A chain of five missions established along the San Antonio River in the eighteenth century became the largest concentration of Catholic missions in North America. Built primarily to expand Spanish influence northward from Mexico, the missions also served to incorporate native inhabitants into Spanish society. Four of the missions (San Jose, San Juan, Concepcion, and Espada) were originally established in East Texas where drought and French incursions eventually resulted in their relocation to San Antonio. Five (includes the Alamo) of the six Spanish missions in San Antonio have been preserved along the Mission Trail. (Figure 4-III-37. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on National Park Service, San Antonio Missions 2005A).

Mission San Jose in San Antonio
The morphology of the San Jose mission is typical of missions throughout the Spanish Empire and here in Texas. The layouts of missions and of individual Hispanic houses were similar. The courtyard was replaced by a plaza and the surrounding individual rooms by family dwellings. Living areas were separated from working areas. In the walled and gated missions, Spanish functions, such as the church, convent, cemetery, soldiers’ barracks, and granary were at one end while the Indians quarters were on the other sides (Figure 4-III-38).

At its peak the San Jose mission had 350 inhabitants who cultivated extensive fields and raised livestock. In 1749 2,000 cattle and
1,000 sheep were on the mission ranch. San Jose gained a reputation as a major social and cultural center and was already called the “Queen of the Missions” in 1777. The mission pueblo was probably an open village until 1758, but a major change occurred by 1768, when it was converted into an enclosed defensive compound that we see today, probably because of Apache hostility (Figure 4-III-39).

![Figure 4-III-39. San Jose Mission gate and living quarters of the Indian families. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image)

To assure the safety of the inhabitants, the mission plaza was encompassed by four stone walls, each with a gateway. And watchtowers were added on all sides. The Indian quarters, constructed from limestone, consisted of one room and a kitchen and were located mainly along the walls by 1768. The main church has a richly embellished Baroque façade and statuary (Figure 4-III-40).

![Figure 4-III-40. San Jose Mission church. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image)

The stone friary was started in the 1740s, built eastward from the church wall. Other structures included a granary, carpentry shop, blacksmith shop with a dwelling for the smith and his family, and weaving workshop (Figure 4-III-41). A flour mill near the north wall was powered by hydraulic water pressure (Texas State Historical Association Online 2006).

![Figure 4-III-41. San Jose Mission grain and ammunition storage. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image)

**Texas Independence from Mexico**

Prior to Mexican independence in 1821, Texas was part of the Spanish colony of New Spain. With independence Mexico claimed all the
land that Spain had claimed, including Texas, which Mexico opened for colonization. Cheap land prices attracted both U. S. and Europeans settlers to this northern frontier of Mexico which granted vast tracts of land to about 20,000 settlers and Stephen F. Austin in particular began a colony of 300 Anglo families along the Brazos River in present-day Fort Bend and Brazoria counties, Texas.

In 1830, Mexico abolished slavery and passed the Colonization Law which prevented slaves from being imported into Texas by Anglo landowners. Anglo settlers wanted to engage in free trade with the United States and resented Mexican customs laws. In 1833 when Santa Anna was elected President of Mexico, he increased taxes, reduced the power of provincial governments, and passed laws that made settlers hostile to the central Mexican government. Mexico’s new control of Texas was not popular with the Anglo colonists however, who felt themselves to be more economically and culturally linked to the United States than to Mexico and they had grown used to their relative autonomy. Regardless of the reasons given, the settlers, and certainly their leaders, were acting out the Manifest Destiny of the United States while the Mexican government was asserting its control over Texas to head off U.S. westward expansion.

With the Battle of Gonzales on 1 October 1835, the Texan rebels quickly captured Mexican strongholds at La Bahía and San Antonio and Mexico lost control of Texas. Consequently, Santa Anna launched an offensive to put down the rebellion or “Texas Revolution,” as Texans call it. Mexico never recognized the independence of Texas (in 1836) and broke its diplomatic relationship with the United States when the United States admitted Texas to the Union. The U.S. government tried to purchase the areas of New Mexico and California from Mexico, but Mexico refused. Texas wanted to be annexed to the United States, but the issue of slavery in this area had to be clarified before Texas was admitted in 1845.

The Alamo was the scene of several military actions, including most notably the 1836 Battle of the Alamo, one of the pivotal battles between Texas and Mexico. The Alamo was occupied by Mexican forces almost continuously until December 1835, when it was surrendered to Texan forces. Two months later, on 23 February 1836, Colonel William B. Travis took the Alamo with about 187 men. With 5,000 Mexican soldiers General Santa Anna laid siege to the fortress for 13 days which climaxned on March 6 and resulted in the death all of the Texan defenders, among the most famous was to become Davy Crockett. About 183-250 Texans, both Anglos and Tejanos, and 300-400 Mexicans died in the battle. The defeat at the Alamo stirred a cry for revenge throughout Texas. Texas independence was finalized at the Battle of San Jacinto with the battle cry, “Remember the Alamo!” (Figure 4-III-42).

Figure 4-III-42. The Alamo, the icon of Texan and U.S. fight for freedom. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

The Alamo feeds the myth that the United States values freedom more than life itself, especially if ordinary soldiers can be convinced to fight and die for wars while their political and economic leaders reap the benefits in safety. Certainly Mexico was as justified to reclaim its territory at the Alamo as later the North was justified to keep the union together during the Civil War with 620,000 deaths, one third from battles and two-thirds from diseases.

Texas had declared independence on March 2 when delegates elected David G. Burnet as Provisional President and Lorenzo de Zavala as Vice-President. The men inside the Alamo likely never knew this event had occurred. When the United States annexed Texas after 10 years of independence on 29 December 1845, Texans this time did not resist, but welcomed, outside political and economic authorities. In fact, both newly arrived Anglo settlers and old-time Tejano settlers supported Texas independence from Mexico. Ironically, once Texas became independent the Tejano population was viewed and treated like Mexicans. By 1845, over one million acres of Tejano land had been taken, often forcibly, from land-rich Tejano families.

Today the Alamo is the most widely known of the missions in Texas, and probably in the United States thanks to the film “The Alamo,”
first in 1959 with John Wayne and later versions with one as late as 2004. The Alamo was the first mission built (1718) between the missions that had already been established in East Texas and in Mexico. Although the missions of San Jose, San Juan, Concepcion, and Espada are active parishes, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio cooperates with the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park of the National Park Service for them to administer and maintain these missions today. But the Alamo is the only mission operated by the Daughters of the Republic of Texas who since 1905 have preserved the Alamo as a “sacred memorial to the Alamo Defenders” as “the cradle of Texas Liberty.” Among their specific goals are 1) to perpetuate the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved and maintained the independence of Texas, 2) to promote the celebration of March 2 (Independence Day), and 3) to secure hallow historic spots by erecting monuments thereon; and to cherish and preserve the Unity of Texas, as achieved and established by the fathers and mothers of the Texas Revolution [italics added] (Daughters of the Republic of Texas 2006). Despite their proclamations, Texas is no longer an independent country and gladly joined the United States. In most other countries, promoting and celebrating a one-sided perspective of historic independence would be considered treasonous but in Texas, at least, it is an expression of liberty and freedom and certainly does not foster honest relationships between Mexicans and U.S. people regardless of which side of the border they live.

U.S.-Mexican War and the U.S. Annexation of Northern Mexico

U.S. President James Polk (1845-1849) favored U.S. territorial expansion and was committed to the nation's "Manifest Destiny." He promised to move the historical Texas-Mexico border at the Nueces River 150 miles south to the Rio Grande provided Texas agreed to join the union, even though the U.S. government had recognized that the border with Mexico at the Nueces River (Schefler 2006).

An armed clash between Mexican and U.S. troops along the Rio Grande River in 1846 provided the impetus for the U.S. government's declaration of war against Mexico. In 1848, U.S. marines occupied Mexico City and forced Mexico to sign over half its northern territories, more than a million square miles, to the United States. While U.S. historians call it "The Mexican War," Mexicans label it "The U.S. Invasion." After the invasion of Mexico by the USA, the New York Herald announced that "We believe it is a part of our destiny [Manifest Destiny] to civilize that beautiful country" (Zinn 2005). The Mexican American War lasted from 1846-1848 and resulted in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo (1848) which transferred one million square miles of Mexican land (equivalent to western Europe), absorbed 100,000 Mexican citizen, 200,000 Native Americans, and all or part of ten states: California, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Kansas, southern Colorado, Oklahoma, and Texas to the United States (Figure 4-III-43). Others parts of the Southwestern United States were purchased from Mexico.

The U.S. annexation of Mexican territory was about land, not the Mexicans who lived on it. But there were too many of them to be exterminated or placed on reservations as the U.S. government had done with the Indians. And as with the abolition of slavery after the Civil War, Congress did no give the ex-slaves the same resources (especially land) and liberties as Whites because planters retained their land holdings and their liberties, despite their treason. The United States has always wanted land without the people who where attached to it.

Figure 4-III-43. Lose of Mexican lands to the United States. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on maps from University of Texas, Map Collection. 2006.

Within the newly acquired territories, the conquered people were mistreated especially where they were perceived as a threat to “national
Displacement of Chicanos from their Land

The governments of Spain and Mexico had granted common land grants to communities. These community grants contained tracts of individual land for housing sites and gardens with the remainder of the land being used in common by the community for forestry and grazing. These common properties grants were the equivalent of the Mexican ejidos.

After the Mexican-U.S. War, Mexican Americans in New Mexico and southern Colorado began to lose their land to Anglos even though the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo guaranteed the new citizens the security of their properties. Article 8 of the treaty stated that "property of every kind now belonging to Mexicans now established there shall be inviolably respected" (New Mexico Commission of Public Records 2006). Although the pace of dispossession varied from state to state, the general trend was consistent everywhere. Mexican Americans lost their land holdings to Anglos by various means: land sales which brought on economic distress, land seizures, fraud, and force. For example, without compensation, the U.S. National Forest Service took millions of acres from northern villages for national forests. Chicanos were forced to pay grazing fees on land that once belonged to their villages. Lawsuits in Vallecitos, NM, and the San Luis Valley in southern Colorado demand that these common lands be returned to local Chicano communities for their economic and cultural survival. The dispossession from the land depleted the economic base of Chicanos and put them in an even less favorable position to exercise their influence over local and national political institutions. Without a land base, Chicanos like Blacks increasingly turned to wage labor in agricultural, industrial, and service jobs (Barrera 1979, Center for Land Grant Studies 2006, and Ebright 1995).

Deportation of Mexicans Americans

In March 1929, the U.S. government passed the Deportation Act that gave counties the power to send Mexicans to Mexico with the assumptions that Mexicans living in the United States were neither citizens nor legal immigrants. Government officials thought this would solve the unemployment of the Great Depression. County officials in Los Angeles, California, organized "deportation trains" and the Immigration Bureau made "sweeps" in the San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles, arresting anyone who "looked" Mexican (i.e., short, brown-colored skin, and black hair), regardless of whether or not they were citizens or in the United States legally. Today this is called racial profiling, but better labeled racist profiling. Many of those sent to Mexico were native-born United States citizens and had never been to Mexico. The numbers of Mexicans deported during this so-called "voluntary repatriation" was larger than the Native American removals of the nineteenth century and greater than the Japanese-American relocations during World War II. Except for slavery, this was the largest involuntary migration in the U.S. history. From 1929 to 1935 at least 450,000 Mexicans and Mexican Americans were sent to Mexico. Some estimates go as high as a million (Ryan 2006).

Spanish Cultural and Physical Place Names

Spanish-language cultural and physical place names are one of the lasting impacts of the Spanish Empire on the U.S. side of the Border. The U.S. Geographic Names Information System (GNIS 2006) was used to search for Spanish-language cultural and physical place names. GNIS allows place names to be searched for all place names, regardless of kind (e.g., lake, dam, well, cemetery, park, windmill, post office, church, school) and for populated places (i.e., townships, villages, towns, and cities). Roman Catholics of whatever national origin commonly called their initial settlements by Saint names; colonial Spaniards were no exception. The English word for Saint becomes “Santa” in Spanish. An analysis of all place names and populated places (settlements) with Santa as a prefix in the United States shows that the four Southwestern states account for 79 percent and 74 percent, respectively, with California having the highest of both percentages and Texas having the second highest concentration of Santa named settlements (Table 4-III-1). The major concentrations
The male noun for Saint in Spanish is “Santo(s)” which only appears six times in the United States, five in Arizona and Texas, and one in Florida. Santo(s) is usually shortened to “San.” The maximum number of place names that GNIS shows for any one word search is 2,000, resulting in an incomplete analysis. In this case, the 2,000 place names with “San” included only the first six alphabetical states. The analysis for San names was therefore restricted to populated places only. A comparison of Table 4-III-1 and Table 4-III-2 shows that the distribution of populated places with San and Santa in the Southwestern States is very similar. Interestingly, the former Spanish colony of Florida registers eight percent of all San names in the United States. The importance of Catholicism in South Texas is underscored by the celebration of the Day of the Dead, a Mexican holiday when families honor their dead family members by decorating grave sites profusely with flowers, especially marigolds and chrysanthemums, religious amulets, food, cigarettes, and alcoholic beverages.

Table 4-III-1 “Santa” Place Names in U.S. Southwestern States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>All Place Names</th>
<th>Populated Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 State Total</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ingolf Vogeler, data from GNIS 2006.

Table 4-III-2 “San” Place Names in U.S. Southwestern States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Populated Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 State Total</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Total</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ingolf Vogeler, data from GNIS 2006.

Other common Spanish words were also examined for cultural place names. Pueblo (village) appears 397 times and is very concentrated in northern New Mexico (Figure 4-III-45), whereas Hacienda (farm) with 298 occurrences does not have a very interesting pattern: small concentrations around the San Francisco Bay area and Los Angeles. The Spanish term “Plaza” has become so Anglicized that places with this name do not capture the Spanish meaning of a town square and spatial extent of Spanish settlements.
A few common Spanish words for physical features were also examined. *Mesa* (table top) place names are probably the largest number of Spanish physical terms but GNIS (2006) could only list the first 2,000. A restricted search of *Mesa* place names in the four Border States shows very heavily concentrated in northern New Mexico and Arizona and far fewer occurrences in south Texas along the border and in southern California (Figure 4-III-46). The place name *Arroyo* (stream) with 1,465 occurrences reveals a particularly good pattern of Spanish influence. Arroyo is concentrated in the Rio Grande River drainage basin from south Texas to northern New Mexico and along coastal California (Figure 4-III-47). *Rio* (river) is another common physical term, appearing 1,167 times essentially only in northern New Mexico’s Hispanoland. The 499 *Agua* (water) place names are found again in south Texas, northern New Mexico, southern Arizona, and throughout coastal California.

When all the Spanish cultural and physical place names discussed here are mapped, they show very pronounced patterns of Spanish influences and historic settlements (Figure 4-III-48).
Roman Catholic Pilgrimage Sites

Arreola (2002, pp. 176-182) argues that sacred sites and pilgrimages are more common in Texas than in the rest of the U.S. Borderland yet pilgrimage sites, official and unofficial, are found throughout the Southwest and northern Mexico (Nolan 1973). Texas has two well-known shrines at Falfurrias and San Juan. The pilgrimage site at Falfurrias, Texas, is famous throughout South Texas. The walls of the chapel are covered with crutches of pilgrims whose lameness apparently vanished. The shrine is dedicated to Don Pedrito, who was a folk saint but is not a canonical saint of the Roman Catholic Church. He was born in Mexico in 1829 and when his mother got sick, he asked God to heal her, pledging that, if his mother were not healed, he would leave Mexico. After his mother died, Pedrito crossed into Texas in 1881. He became famous for his many cures with mud and water.

Near McAllen, Texas, San Juan is the home to the Basilica of Our Lady of San Juan Del Valle National Shrine, which draws thousands of Roman Catholic pilgrims each year from across Latin America.

New Mexico has two pilgrimage sites: Santuario de Chimayo and Santuario de Guadalupe. The church at Santuario de Guadalupe was completed by Franciscan missionaries in 1795 and is the oldest shrine in the United States dedicated to Our Lady of Guadalupe, patron saint of Mexico. The Santuario is now an art and history museum (New Mexico Tourism Department 2006).

El Santuario de Chimayo, located 40 miles south of Taos and 24 miles northeast of Santa Fe, is the most visited church in New Mexico, attracting over 300,000 people to this sacred site every year. The crucifix which began the original shrine still resides on the chapel alter, but its curative powers have been transferred to El Posito, the "sacred sand pit." Each year during Holy Week thousands of people make a pilgrimage to Chimayo to visit the Sanctuary and take away a bit of the sacred dirt. Pilgrims walk a few yards or a hundred miles. Many claim to have been cured there of diseases, infirmities and unhappiness. The walls of the sanctuary are hung with discarded crutches and before-and-after photographs as evidence of healing (Figure 4-III-49).

Fifty miles south of Nogales, Arizona, Magdalena de Kino, Mexico, is the site of an October 4 religious fiesta. This important pilgrimage event attracts thousands of people to the mission town in the in the Mexican portion of the Sonoran Desert. Many walk 60 or more miles as an act of devotion. The Fiesta de San Francisco in Magdalena is a very visible expression of Spanish-Mexican Catholicism in this region. Mexico, of course, has many pilgrimage sites, small and large, official and unofficial. Mary Lee Nolan (1973) identified 33 major ones, all concentrated in central and southern Mexico. Many smaller, less-known shrines exist in border towns, such as La Santisima Muerte (Most Holy Death) shrine in Nuevo Laredo just before the so-called NFTA highway crosses the World Trade Bridge to Laredo, Texas.

Although many of the U.S. Borderland features discussed so far are found throughout the four Southwestern States, South Texas is a particular important place in this national region. The border counties of southern Texas exemplify the most developed and extensive socio-economic characteristics and cultural landscape features of the Borderland on the U.S. side.
Texas Borderlands: Past and Present

Daniel Arreola (2002, pp. 94-95) identifies enduring characteristics of Mexican places in South Texas: ranchos, plazas, barrios, and colonias. Ranchos were an early frontier settlement form brought from northern Mexico with its similar climate, terrain, and cattle ranching. By 1900, Texas Mexican ranchos were being replaced by Anglo farms, and today, ranchos no longer exist.

Plazas reflect Spanish urban designs and are, therefore, distinctive of the most densely settled Spanish areas in Mexico which includes South Texas now. Ideally Spanish and later Mexican towns incorporated plazas within the layout of settlements. The large concentration of Mexican American population is related to towns with plazas. San Antonio has three original plazas while other towns in South Texas such as La Grulla and Kingsville added plazas after they were founded. Arreola (1992) identified 14 plaza towns in South Texas (Figure 4-III-50). Most of South Texas plaza towns were founded after 1836, when Texas, not Spain or Mexico, were in control of this area. Which explains why only 21 percent of the plazas are centrally located in their respective towns; the rest are peripheral to the main business districts.

Plazas are distinguished by the landscape features that appear in and around them. All of the plazas in South Texas had kioscos, bandstands, which are set among walkways, ornamental plants, benches, and lamp posts. But even in South Texas, plazas play a decreasing role as social spaces for locals (e.g., San Diego, TX) but are increasingly important for tourists (e.g., Santa Fe, TX), or have even been built-up (e.g., San Antonio’s three plazas). Other plaza features were fountains (22 percent) and churches (71 percent) (Arreola 1992).

Colonias and barrios are the consequence of Anglo-American invasion of Mexican areas in the U.S. Borderland. Both terms refer to spatial segregation of Mexican Americans to separate parts of predominately Anglo settlements, resulting in dual towns. Barrios constitute Mexican American concentrations in neighborhoods within built-up and incorporated cities. The term barrio is used throughout the USA for such communities.
The formation of barrios represents the clash of power: while Anglo governments spatially restricted Latino settlements to undesirable locations, Latinos created homelands reflecting their own cultural traditions and tastes; thus, turning impersonal ghetto spaces into culturally relevant places. By the 1950s, barrios had formed in cities like Los Angeles, El Paso, Tucson, and San Diego. A classic example of turning an undesirable place into a place of cultural pride is Chicano Park in San Diego (Figure 4-III-51). Through civil disobedience and political organizing, the land under the Coronado Bridge, which had been planned for the California Highway Patrol as a substation and parking lot, was turned into one of the most well-known Chicano spaces in the United States. The naked highway support pillars are covered with 40 colorful Mexican images and messages (the world's largest collection of outdoor murals) and Chicano festivals are held here throughout the year.

Colonias in Spanish originally meant simply neighborhoods within a city but along the U.S. border, colonias refer to primarily Mexican settlements located in subdivisions on the outskirts of Texas towns, Colinas lie beyond the incorporated limits of cities; hence, they lack water, sewer, paved roads, and sometimes, even electricity. In the rest of the U.S. Borderland, Mexican colonization pressures are not as great and they are not tolerated; hence, colonias are rather uncommon throughout the rest of the Southwest. In Mexico, colonias are commonly illegal squatter settlements but in Texas they are legal because land is purchased on contracts for deeds. By 1990, Texas had at least 872 colonia subdivisions; by 1992, 1,471; and by 1996, more than 1,400 colonias. In the 1990s, New Mexico had 14, and Arizona and California had none (Pepin 1989). With high unemployment and low incomes in South Texas, probably about half a million people live in colonias (True 1996). In many colonias on either side of the border, untreated sewage often seeps into wells, requiring that people get their fresh water delivered by trucks. Since these neighborhoods are much less affluent than Anglo or mixed neighborhoods, the word connotes poverty and substandard housing. Mexican American housescapes are another distinctive set of landscape features in Texas, as elsewhere in the Borderland, and indeed, the rest of the USA. Daniel Arreola (1988) surveyed Mexican American neighborhoods in several Southwestern cities. In Tucson, Arizona, 62 percent of the houses in all the Mexican neighborhoods were enclosed by some type of fences, particularly by enclosed front-yard chain-link wire fences (Figure 4-III-52). As the percent of...
course, Spanish surnames on mail boxes are an obvious clue to barrio neighborhoods.

Figure 4-III-53. A front-yard wall-fence and gated driveway in the San Diego barrio. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

The second most common housescape feature is color. Shades of bright blue, apple green, orange, and pink are associated the exterior house colors in Mexican American neighborhoods. In a survey of over 1,000 houses in the San Antonio barrio almost 50 percent of the houses had brightly painted exteriors, even if only the house trim was so painted (Arreola 1988).

Roman Catholic yard shrines are the third and least common housescape feature in the barrio, called nichos (niches) in Tucson, capillas (little chapels) in San Antonio, and grutas (grottoes) in Los Angeles. In the West Side of San Antonio, almost 200 separate examples were documented, mostly dedicated to the Virgin of San Juan de los Lagos also known as the Virgin of Northern Mexico and of South Texas. Yet the frequency of shrines by census tract in the San Antonio barrio was less than one percent. Eighty percent of the almost 400 shrines in Tucson were located in census tracts with Mexican American majorities. Arreola found that 30 percent of the shrine owners were born in Mexico and 65 percent came from rural areas. These nichos were dedicated to Saint Jude in appreciation for material gain (Arreola 1988).

Mexican Foods in Texas
Wilbur Zelinsky (1985) documented that Mexican eateries are the dominant ethnic restaurants in metropolitan areas in the Southwestern Border States, from California to Texas. San Antonio, TX, has 362 Mexican restaurants alone, of which 85 use the term “taco” in their names (Arreola 2002).

The taco-burrito and taco-barbecue lines distinguish the South Texas Tejano region from the rest of the U.S. Borderland to the west (from Dryden to Ozona) and north (from Sinton to San Antonio), respectively. In South Texas, tacos are wheat tortillas; outside this region, tacos are made of corn and wheat and tortillas are called burritos and burros, respectively (Arreola 2002). Likewise, wheat tortillas are more commonly consumed in northern Mexico than in the rest of the country, where corn tortillas dominate. Not surprisingly food is used as a nick name for the Mexican-U.S. border, the Tortilla Curtain. In contrast, during the Cold War the ideological boundaries in Southeast Asia were called the Bamboo Curtain and in Eastern Europe, the Iron Curtain.

Tex-Mex cuisine is unique cultural fusion contribution of the Texas border culture that has spread to the rest of the United States. Tex-Mex is characterized by meat (particularly beef), beans, and spices. Nachos, crispy tacos, crispy chalupas, chili con queso, chili con carne, chili gravy, and fajitas are all Tex-Mex inventions. Serving tortilla chips and a hot sauce or salsa as an appetizer is also an original Tex-Mex combination (Walsh 2004). This border cuisine spread northward first wherever large numbers of Mexicans lived and then by the 1970s to upscale and gourmet restaurants in northern cities.

Like the fusion of Mexican and Texas foods, a distinctive form of music evolved in Texas, Tejano music. The most famous performer of this music was Selena Quintanilla Perez, who was born in Lake Jackson, Texas. Tejano music blends German music traditions and instruments, particularly the accordion, from the German Hill Country of Texas with Mexican-Spanish music traditions. Even today, Tejano music is still spatially restricted to the Texas borderlands, and not popular elsewhere in the United States, except in Mexican communities from the Border in northern cities, and not in the interior of Mexico.

Socio-Economic Characteristics of Border Mexicans
Mexican families are larger and younger on average than U.S. national families. The average “Hispanic” family is larger than the national U.S. average: 3.87 persons per Hispanic family versus 3.19 persons for all families. California’s fertility rate was 2.6 children per woman in 2003, down from 3.4 children in 1990. Ironically, the fertility rate in Mexico was actually lower, 2.1 children (Population Research Institute 2006). The median age in the four-county Rio Grande Valley was 28 years in 2000 and
in Texas, 32.3 and the U.S., 35.3 (Figure 4-III-54). The age-sex pyramid for the Mexican immigrant population in the United States is disproportionately concentrated in the 20-year and 30-year olds (Figure 4-III-55). Grocery stores in U.S. border cities reflect the concentration of poorer, larger Mexican American families. A high density of smaller food stores sell “family size” products of detergent, ice cream, and 50-pound sacks of rice. Religious items are ubiquitous in stores, reflecting the importance of Catholicism in people’s lives.

The many retirement communities in the Southwest, particularly in Arizona, have very different demographic profiles. The age-sex pyramid for Sun City, Arizona, contrasts dramatically with that of the one for U.S. Latinos (Figure 4-III-56).

Figure 4-III-54. The age-sex pyramid the Latino and U.S. populations. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on U.S. Census 1990.

Figure 4-III-55. The age-sex pyramid for US. Mexican immigrants. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on U.S. Census 1990.

Figure 4-III-56. The age-sex pyramid for Sun City, Arizona. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on U.S. Census 1990.
On the U.S. side of major international border crossings, trucking companies and warehouses are concentrated particularly since the passage of NAFTA. At Tecate, California, just east of the San Diego-Tijuana border crossing, manufactured parts are collected in U.S. warehouses before being moved to assembly factories in Mexico. Tecate is also a major truck crossing, delivering parts to maquiladoras (Figure 4-III-57). And assembled products from Mexico are collected in warehouses on the U.S. side before being shipped to markets cross the United States (Figure 4-III-58).

Near major U.S. interstate border crossings into Mexico, a whole array of distinctive retail businesses and land uses are concentrated. Drivers going to Mexico get auto insurance (U.S. insurance policies do not apply in Mexico but they do in Canada) and change dollars to pesos. Some tourists park their cars on the U.S. side and walk across the border to Mexican border towns. Going in the opposite direction, Mexican shoppers buy at outlet shopping centers for products that are less expensive and/or less available in Mexico.

Murals with Indian, Mexican, Roman Catholic, and political themes identify the barrios along the border and in the interior of the United State. Large metropolitan areas, such Los Angeles and Chicago are particularly rich in murals (Figure 4-III-59).

Near major U.S. interstate border crossings into Mexico, a whole array of distinctive retail businesses and land uses are concentrated. Drivers going to Mexico get auto insurance (U.S. insurance policies do not apply in Mexico but they do in Canada) and change dollars to pesos. Some tourists park their cars on the U.S. side and walk across the border to Mexican border towns. Going in the opposite direction, Mexican shoppers buy at outlet shopping centers for products that are less expensive and/or less available in Mexico.

Murals with Indian, Mexican, Roman Catholic, and political themes identify the barrios along the border and in the interior of the United State. Large metropolitan areas, such Los Angeles and Chicago are particularly rich in murals (Figure 4-III-59).
features, such as bright house colors, Roman Catholic shrines, lawn
ornaments, country-origin flags, and wire-fenced front yards. The
distinctive Latino housescapes are found in all northern barrios, whether in
Denver, Kansas City, St. Paul, Chicago, or Cleveland.

On the Mexican Side of the Border: La Frontera

In the northern frontier of Mexico, or La Frontera, border towns
have played distinctive roles ever since the southern U.S. border was
established (Figure 4-III-60) and have developed their own landscape
morphology and personality of place (Curtis and Areola 1993). These
border cities perform distinctive economic functions for both U.S. tourists
and corporations and for migrants from the interior of Mexico and farther
south in Central America.

Maquiladora employment increased from 120,000 workers to 1.3
million between 1980 and its peak in 2000. In 1980, about 94 percent of
maquiladora employment was in the border states of northern Mexico. By
2005, the share had slipped to 76 percent, but the northern states still
dominated. In 2004, 2,810 operating plants accounted for about 9 percent of
formal employment in Mexico. Maquiladoras accounted for 45 percent of
Mexico’s exports in 2005. Most are located immediately south of the
international border because this minimizes transportation costs to get
finished products back to U.S. markets (Figure 4-III-62).
Maquiladoras are particularly concentrated in the Mexican border cities of Ciudad Juarez, Reynosa, and Matamoros (Table 4-III-3). Families from poorer, interior areas of Mexico are drawn to the border cities for work and foreign companies build assembly plants here because of low wages. When the official minimum wage in Mexico was $3.40 per day, it was $5.15 per hour in the United States; hence, hourly compensation costs for production workers in manufacturing were $1.21 in Mexico and $17.70 in the U.S. (Corpwatch 2006).

Table 4-III-3. High-low maquiladora employment in six Mexico cities along the Texas Border from 2000 to 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mexican Cities</th>
<th>Workers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Juarez</td>
<td>262,550-189,530</td>
<td>49.2-62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciudad Acuna</td>
<td>37,512-33,541</td>
<td>7-11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedras Negras</td>
<td>15,222-10,939</td>
<td>2.9-3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Laredo</td>
<td>22,915-17,171</td>
<td>4.3-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynosa</td>
<td>96,925-NA</td>
<td>18.2-NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matamoros</td>
<td>98,413-51,900</td>
<td>18.4-17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>533,537-303,081</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Low wages assures that most workers lack personal transportation, so the maquiladoras provide (school) buses to transport their workers between their homes and work (Figure 4-III-63).

In response to these new employment opportunities, Mexican families need housing which takes the form of colonias, slums, and government-built subdivisions (Figure 4-III-64 and 65).
Mexicans build their own homes, usually in stages as they save enough money to buy the necessary supplies (Figure 4-III-66). Cement-block and cement walls are stuccoed and painted with pastel colors. In this dry climate, flat roofs are the norm.

The wealthy in Mexican border cities live in large, walled or fenced-in houses with all the amenities of U.S. middle-class families, including many cars. Many Mexicans have well-paying jobs in the Maquiladora sector as managers, accounts, and engineers (Figure 4-III-67).

In contrast to wealthy residential neighborhoods, the newest arrivals in the Mexican border cities, like Tijuana, resort to living in
shanties built out of whatever materials are freely available or extremely cheap (Figure 4-III-68). Large, young families characterize the Mexican border cities in contrast to the much older, often retired, population on the U.S. side of the border. Border Mexicans, *frontierizos*, are different from their counterparts in the interior of Mexico because they are more likely to be bilingual and bicultural (Martinez 1994).

**Figure 4-III-68. Colonia in Tijuana, Mexico. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.**

Mexicans from poor interior regions are attracted to the border cities for work, legal and illegal, and for crossing the border for work in the U.S. Rapid population growth has fueled illegal activities, such as prostitution, drug smuggling and “coyotes” (who smuggle people illegally across the U.S. border). Tijuana is an excellent example of rapid growth rates in Mexican border cities, averaging from 5 to 10 percent each decade (Herzog 1989). Along the border, poor Mexicans buy less expensive health care insurance in the United States, using Mexican for routine care and the United States for serious medical problems.

**Tourists** continue to be attracted by the distinctive souvenir shops, restaurants, bars, and bull-fighting (in Tijuana), while some come for illegal drugs and prostitution. “Partying” south of the border is a rite of passage for many young men after high school graduation, especially in San Diego, but also in Texas border cities. As many as 12,000 young people from San Diego cross the border into Tijuana on a normal weekend (Curtis and Arreola 1989). Young people under 21 are the fastest growth of border tourists because the legal drinking age in Mexico is 18 years and rarely enforced whereas in Texas and California, it is 21 years.

More than 9 million people from the United States cross the international border each year just to shop. **Tijuana’s** high concentration of tourist-orientated shops on *Avenida Revolucion* is only a 10-minute walk or a five-minute cab ride from the California border at San Ysidro in San Diego, where the first metal barriers were built in the early 1990s. Next to the 2.8 million San Diego metropolitan area, Tijuana is the single most popular tourist destination in Mexico. U.S. tourists are so prevalent in Tijuana that U.S. dollars are freely used throughout the city; the reverse, of course, is not the case in San Diego where no businesses accept pesos. Already by 1989, 19 million tourists spent $700 million in the local economy (Curtis and Arreola 1989). Mexican government studies indicate that “tourist” usually stay six to eight hours in Ciudad Juarez, Texas, probably because they are visiting Mexican relatives and friends, and less than four hours in Tijuana, Mexico. In either case, visitors come from close to the border; few come from the interior of the United States and hardly any foreign tourists seek out border cities.

**Figure 4-III-69. Tourist shops in downtown Tijuana. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.**

The most widely sought out tourist functions are usually concentrated closest to the border, e.g., curio shops, leather and clothing stores, restaurants, and bars (Figure 4-III-69). Tourists seek out what they think are distinctive Mexican cultural expressions: *serapes*, sombreros, mounted bull horns, tequila and rum, Mexican foods, and entertainment of music, dance, horse and dog racing, and bullfights. All Mexican cities have street vendors selling food, colored-shaved ice, and prepared fruits but in tourist areas, vendors specialize in curios (Figure 4-III-70). The most
Visually prominent and enduring cliche of Tijuana’s tourism (for at least over 30 years) is tourists with large sombreros and serapes sitting on a wooden-platform with a burro painted with black strips to look like a zebra -- only the year gets changed (Figure 4-III-71). More specialized tourist functions, such as dental and medical offices, beauty saloons, and bakeries, are located in side streets, off the main strips. Risqué and illegal tourist activities are provided in bars, nightclubs, sex shows with animal acts, and brothels on the margins of the tourist areas.

Mexican border cities also provide important, indeed vital, medical services to people from the United States. With the rising cost of medical costs in the United States in the last few decades and fewer people having medical insurance, medical tourists come to Mexican border towns for affordable dental and medical care, prescriptions drugs, and elective surgery. Newspapers report that bus loads of seniors from San Diego across the border to Tijuana (just south of San Diego) and Nogales (an hour south of Tucson) to get their medical prescriptions filled. Up to $2 billion of drug prescription per year are bought by U.S. consumers in Mexico. Going to Mexico border towns to get dental care, ranging from routine dental procedures to the removal of all teeth and fitted with dentures, is becoming increasingly popular, especially for lower income, and commonly older retired individuals (Figure 4-III-72). Nuevo Progreso and Los Algodones specialize in “dental oases,” attracting chartered flights of patients from Minnesota and California in search of affordable dental care.

The International Border Itself
The international border is itself a formable sub-region within the
boarder U.S. Borderland. The barriers along the border were built and are maintained and controlled by the U.S. government. Except for checkpoints at highway border crossings, the Mexican government does not control its side of the border, after all it does not oppose its people from going to the U.S. and sending money back to their families in the Mexico, but the U.S. government does oppose illegal immigration.

The U.S.-Mexican border is 1,951 miles long, running through wilderness, farming areas, small towns, and large metropolitan areas (Figure 4-III-73). Along the border, the Border Patrol uses fences, dirt roads, infra-red cameras, seismic sensors, and helicopters to keep undocumented people out of the United States. Only four percent of the border was fenced in 2006; but in 2006, a homeland security bill authorized funds for 700 miles of fencing. By 2011, about 33 percent is now fenced. Ironically, the very company, Golden Gate Fence, that was contracted to build part of the wall agreed to pay $5 million in fines for hiring illegal workers, who, according to U.S. Attorney Carol Lam, represented about a third of the company’s workforce. By the end of 2008, about 670 miles of fencing had been erected; half of the barrier keeps everything bigger than small animals out, the other half lets people through but stops vehicles. The Border Patrol increased from fewer than 6,000 officers in 1996 to more than 18,000 by 2009. The pressure to cross the border continues unabated, shifting only to less controlled parts of the international borer. In Figure 4-III-74, the yellow diamond-shaped pedestrian signs show the spot on the San Diego-Tijuana border where people cross the four-lane highway to wait in the shade of the trees until nightfall when a group “drops” into the United States trying to evade the Border Patrol whose dirt surveillance road is visible in the bottom, right-hand corner. Metal plates are often 17 feet high and extend 10 feet below the surface to prevent tunneling.

Historically, the U.S. government did not maintain and enforce its own anti-immigration laws. Mexicans moved freely across the border, as Figure 4-III-75 from the 1980s shows, even though the Border Patrols in their vehicles watched with their binoculars from higher elevations along the border for illegals.

![Figure 4-III-73. Topographic map along the San Diego-Tijuana border. Mexicans cross the border illegally every night where the highway touches the border -- see Figure 4-III-74. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image)

![Figure 4-III-74. One of several illegal Tijuana-San Diego border crossings. Mexico is on the left; San Diego is to the right, below the wall and beyond the metal fence. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image)
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Figure 4-III-75. San Diego border fence in the 1989. Tijuana is on the left; San Diego is on the right. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

About 700,000 Mexicans cross legally into the United States each day to work and shop, returning at night to Mexico. Much smaller border crossings are illegal. Illegal immigration represents only about 0.5 percent of all south-north border crossings. Of the 11-12 million undocumented immigrants, or as the U.S. calls them “illegal aliens,” about 60 percent are from Mexico. The number of border crossings varied substantially from one state to another. California border crossings accounted for 75 to 50 percent of all border crossings from 1985 to 1991. Texas accounted for 20 to 35 percent and Arizona for less than 10 percent. Since 1991, Texas crossings have increased to about 60 percent while California’s has decreased to 35 percent and Arizona’s has remained below 10 percent (Orrenius 2001).

Border patrol apprehensions increased from about 21,000 in 1960 to more than 1.5 million from 1999 (Figure 4-III-76). In El Paso, McAllen-Laredo, and Del Rio-Marfa border apprehensions were rather minor (less than 50,000) until the early 1970s and then peaked (300,000) in all three cities by 1987. With enhanced enforcement at El Paso, apprehensions dropped dramatically there (to only about 100,000) but increased rapidly at McAllen-Laredo (about 400,000) and somewhat (170,000) at Del Rio-Marfa (Orrenius 2001). For every would-be entrant picked up without proper documents, anywhere from two to ten others successfully slip through the border. Attempted illegal crossings and border arrests correlate with the health of the Mexican economy. From 1993-1994 at El Paso, Texas, the number of arrests dropped by 72 percent, but in the first quarter of 1995, after the collapse of the Mexican peso, it bounced up to a third.

A comparison of the border apprehensions in the first six months of 1994 and 1995 shows that as border security increases at some border crossings, illegals use other points to cross the border (Figure 4-III-77). From 1994 to 2000, the number of apprehensions around San Diego dropped by two-thirds.

Figure 4-III-76. Illegal immigration and border apprehensions, 1960-1999. Source: Modified from Orrenius 2001.

Altar, Mexico, illustrates the social geography of crossing The Border. In this town of 18,000 people, from 500,000 to 800,000 Mexicans, Central and South Americans tried to enter the United States illegally each year for at least the last five years (Figure 4-I-III-76B). Migrants come from the poorest regions of southern Mexico, Central and South American countries predominate. In Altar, they buy supplies for the border crossing, find a place to sleep, and arrange with “coyotes” to take them to “El Norte.” Chicken herders (“polleros” also called “coyotes”) take the migrants (called chickens, “pollos”) by vans, sometimes as many as 60 a day, to the town of Sasabe, which sits right on to The Border or “La Linea.” Fifteen miles south of Sasabe, the Mexican border patrol counts all the passengers and signs warn about high desert temperatures and venomous creatures. From here, coyotes and their pollos walk from 10 to 60 miles, or up to two days, through the Sonoran Desert, which can reach temperatures of 115 in the summer and be freezing cold in the winter. On the U.S. side, another group of coyotes take those who survived the ordeal by van to stash houses in border cities like Tucson or Phoenix. These contact points are littered with the migrants’ old stuff: thousands of pack packs, empty bottles of water, clothing of all sorts, and other personal belongings. Coyotes provide “American” clothing to look “normal.” Depending on what the migrants
paid, they might be delivered to northern cities such as Chicago or New York City. All this crossing activities in Sasabe provides cover for the drug traffickers, whose large, new houses are evidence of their prosperity. All the people in the people and drug smuggling businesses are from outside Altar.

Forty miles north of Sasabe in the U.S., members of the Minutemen try to enforce the U.S. immigrants patrol the border areas for “illegals” and along the border itself, the U.S. Border Patrol looks for footprints in the dirt track created by the Patrol to find people heading north. Migrants have created 320 miles of trails as they cross the border in the 185-square mile Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge. The Border Patrol agents catch more illegal migrants along the 262-mile Tucson Sector of the border than any other section, more than 400,000 in fiscal 2005-2006. Since 2000 along this section of the border, 1,137 bodies have been found trying to cross the Arizona desert.

Push factors from the country of origin play a far greater role in immigration, particularly illegal, for poor people than pull factors from the country to which immigrants are going. For professionals like computer programmers and medical doctors the pull factors of more and/or better paid jobs are more important than push factors since they are already are better off then most of the people in their home countries. Almost half of all illegal immigrants entering the United States go to Los Angeles. Less than half of the city’s 641,000 school children speak English fluently.

Figure 4-III-76B. An illustrated example of the social geography of crossing the Mexican-U.S. border. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on information from several sources, particularly Mennonite Weekly Review 2004 and Bowden 2006.
Fencing and patrols have intensified in recent years where the border intersects major metropolitan areas. The most fortified part of the border is now **San Diego-Tijuana**. The U.S. border at Tecate, California, just east of San Diego, consists of two "walls." 1) A 47-mile long **steel-plate wall** was constructed from steel landing mats used in the first Gulf War in the deserts of Kuwait and Iraq to divide San Diego-Tijuana (Figure 4-III-78). Instead of placing the mats vertically into the ground to reduce the likelihood of them being used as ladders, they were placed horizontally, facilitating easy climbing over the fence (Figure 4-III-79)! 2) A few hundred feet parallel of the exiting steel-plate wall runs a **wire-fence** with several large openings through which the Border Patrol drives its surveillance vehicles. The new fence consists of 18-foot concrete pilings topped with titled metal mesh screens (Figure 4-III-80). The fence has six-miles of stadium lights, 1,200 underground seismic pressure sensors, many infrared sensors used to detect people in the dark, and lots of helicopters (Dunn 1996). Ironically, neither the fence nor wall has razor wire on the top; yet, apartments and factories in Mexico have razor wires around their properties! How serious is the U.S. government really in keeping illegals out?

![Figure 4-III-78. The San Diego border wire fence (left) and steel-plate wall (right) at Tecate, California in 2005. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image1)

![Figure 4-III-79. Horizontal corrugated metal wall with apartments in Mexico at Tecate, California. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.](image2)

![Figure 4-III-77. Percent change in border patrol apprehensions in the first six months of 1995 compared with a year earlier. Source: Ingolf Vogeler, based on Economist 1995.](image3)
Aside from high-tech sensors, the Border Patrol still uses groomed dirt roads to detect footprints of illegal immigrants crossing into the U.S (Figure 4-III-76). All along the East German border during the Cold War, a wide strip of plowed land was used for the same purpose, except to keep people in, not out as in the U.S. case. What a difference the direction of excluding people makes in judging whether or not border controls are unacceptable or acceptable, illegal or legal, unjust or just.

Figure 4-III-80. Wire meshed fence at the Tecate border crossing. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

Figure 4-III-81. A Border Patrol dirt detection road near Del Rio, Texas. Photo: Ingolf Vogeler.

U.S. Border Policies and Practices

Present U.S. immigration laws do not reflect U.S. history, low-wage employment realities in Mexico and the United States, and human rights issues. The U.S. economy is creating far more low-end jobs than U.S. workers can fill. The proportion of native-born dropping out of high school has fallen from half in 1960 to just 10 percent today. Entire industries -- agriculture, food-processing, construction, restaurants, and hotels -- rely on cheap immigrant labor throughout much of the United States. As early as 1996 in southern California, for example, 95 percent of agricultural labor and 87 percent of hotel workers were foreign and overwhelming from Mexico, mostly illegal. But U.S. yearly quotas are far too small to satisfy the needs of companies. The U.S. government has spent billions of dollars trying to tighten up its borders only to see the situation get worse. Closing the border is impossible without some sort of legalization for the 12 millions “illegal aliens” as the U.S. government calls them. Mass deportation would do irreparable harm to the U.S. economy, its traditions as an immigrant-friendly nation, its relations with Mexico, and the deported individuals.

President George W. Bush increased funding for border security by 66 percent and the number of Border Patrol agents has tripled since 1986 and their budget has risen tenfold. The President has even promised to send up to 6,000 National Guard members to the southern border, even though state governors control their respective Guards. Yet the flow of illegal immigrants has not decreased overall. In fact as people cross remote desert areas which are less guarded, the death totals mounts. Raquel Rubio-Goldsmith of the University of Arizona estimates that 125 people died trying to cross the desert in the 1990s. Since 2000 the death toll has been more than 1,000. By contrast, fewer than 300 people died attempting to cross the Berlin Wall in its 28-year history. When women can make 10 times more money cleaning hotel rooms in Florida ($1,000 per month) than in Mexico, immigrants will try to cross the border, legally or illegally. At the day labor markets, for example, in North County San Diego (Figure 4-III-82) and along D Street in North Las Vegas, immigrant workers, legal and illegal,
are valued for their low cost, quality, and punctionality. Middle-class and particularly the wealthy reply on lots of cheap Mexican, legal and illegal, workers to clean their houses, take care of their children, tend the gardens and lawns, and construct their homes (Figure 4-III-83). The quality of life for the middle classes along the border is enhanced by Mexican-operated vegetable and flower markets (Figure 4-III-84).

The black economy of illegal immigrant labor is pervasive in the United States. Hotel owners, for example, may have hired illegal immigrants. Valet-parkers may have paid $2,000 to be smuggled across the border by a criminal gang. Several of his friends may have died trying to get to the United States. In 2004, 200 immigrants died in the Arizona desert alone. A criminal gang may have engaged in shoot-outs with immigration officials or rival gangs and used the money from smuggling humans across the border to subsidize drug-smuggling (Economist 2005A).

Although hiring undocumented immigrants is illegal, the Immigration Naturalization Service (INS) regularly tracks down and deports illegal immigrants but only, and then rarely, does the INS fine employers. This reveals the hypocrisy of U.S. immigration policies: breaking the law is only a problem of the foreign immigrants but not for U.S. employers, only three of which were fined for hiring illegal aliens in 2005! Similarly and not surprisingly until very recently, police arrested prostitutes but not their customers. As long as large wage differentials persist between the United States and Mexico and the border is not militarily patrolled, illegal immigration will continue regardless of the number of staff and amount of resources spent. Yet polls show that 75 percent of the U.S. population and 87 percent of Republicans think more should be done to keep illegals out of the country (Economist 2005D). Vigilante groups like the Minutemen patrol...
the Arizona border to stop illegals from entering the United States. At the same time, human rights, faith and student activists in Arizona are assisting illegal immigrants with water, food, and medical care, if needed. In the last decade, upwards of 2,000 individuals have died traversing the desert.

Borders can be controlled but only violently. The East German, North Korean, and Israeli governments controlled/control their borders through massive defensive structures such as walls, “dead man’s zones,” and dog and military patrols but at great human costs to their own population in the first two cases and to the Palestinians in the Israeli case. Is the U.S. government willing to build concrete walls, use land mines along the border, and use the military to shoot intruders, as the East German government did during the Cold War for which it was criticized by the U.S.? Unless massive barriers and violence are used against illegal immigrants, the border will remain porous.

In response to the anti-immigrant legislation being considered by Congress in April 2006, the National Human Rights Commission, a Mexican government-funded agency with independent powers, has said it would distribute at least 70,000 maps showing dangerous border areas, highways, rescue beacons, terrain, cell-phone coverage, and water stations set up by U.S. charity groups in the Arizona desert (USA Today 2006).

About 350,000 illegal immigrants across the U.S. border from the Mexico each year by comparison 800,000 illegals enter the European Union each year. In 2004, a record 464 people died crossing from Mexico into the United States by comparison about 2,000 drowned in the Mediterranean Sea from Africa to Europe (Economist 2005C). Although Europe also has emerging anti-immigrant movements, the greater magnitude of illegal immigration has not had proportional response.

The 1,961-mile border is crossed legally by 350 million people a year, the busiest border in the world. About 12 million illegals, mostly from Mexico and elsewhere from the Americas, live in the United States and nearly 15 percent of the Mexican workforce lives in the United States now. This past and present, legal and illegal, migration will influence both countries, but particularly the United States, more than the war on terrorism.

**Summary: Cross Border Influences in the U.S. and Mexico**

Areas of the Southwestern United States and northern Mexico adjacent to the international border have developed into a very distinctive unified cultural region, yet distinctive from the rest of their respective countries. Historical and modern events, both foreign and domestic, have shaped the cultural landscape of the border itself and Borderlands on either side of the boundary. Just as the Spanish Empire and Mexico influenced what became Borderlands, the United States created the international border and then influenced the Mexican Borderland. Figure 4-III-85 summarizes the profound influences that each country has had on each other, creating ironically a unified cultural region with international political division. Most of the people on both sides of the border share the same historical and contemporary culture, familial relations, and cultural places yet are kept apart and separated by U.S. geo-politics expressed by the international barrier.

*Figure 4-III-85. Cross Border Influences in the United State and Mexico. Source: Ingolf Vogeler.*
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