

7-12-2014

Out of Time: Temporal Colonization and the Writing of Mexican American Subjectivity

Erin Murrah-Mandril

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Murrah-Mandril, Erin. "Out of Time: Temporal Colonization and the Writing of Mexican American Subjectivity." (2014).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/engl_etds/27

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Language and Literature ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Erin Murrah-Mandril

Candidate

English

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Jesse Alemán, Chairperson

Gary Harrison

Pamela Cheek

Marissa López

**Out of Time: Temporal Colonization and the Writing of Mexican
American Subjectivity**

by

ERIN MURRAH-MANDRIL

B.A., History, University of New Mexico, 2005
M.A., English, University of New Mexico, 2008

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy
English**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May, 2014

DEDICATION

To my mother, Mickey, my husband, Christopher, and my son, Sam. Your time, patience and love carried me through this project and taught me more than any book ever could.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Jesse Alemán, my mentor, advisor and dissertation chair who has guided my intellectual development for the past eight years. Your advice has laid the foundation for every accomplishment I've experienced in graduate school, including this dissertation.

I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Gary Harrison, Dr. Pamela Cheek, and Dr. Marissa López, for their comments and advice concerning my project.

Other faculty members in the UNM English department have also provided advice and moral support throughout my writing process. I would like to thank Dr. Anita Obermeier, Dr. Gail Houston and Dr. Marissa Greenberg. Though not members of my committee, their mentorship helped me balance the roles of scholar, teacher and mother that I performed while writing the dissertation. I also want to thank Dr. Hector Torres—I do not say the late Professor Torres because his tragic and untimely death was, in fact, far too early. I can only hope that the specter of my friend and mentor will inhabit the pages of my dissertation as he continues to influence my thoughts and scholarship.

This dissertation could not have been completed without financial support from the Center For Regional Studies Hector Torres Fellowship. The UNM Feminist Research Institute also funded my archival research for chapter four.

Four of my colleagues read and commented on multiple chapter drafts. Their scholarly insight and friendship were invaluable throughout the writing process. Thank you Leigh Johnson, Noreen Rivera, Robin Runia, and Bernadine Hernandez.

Lastly, I want to thank my family. Mom, you have inspired me from time immemorial. Thank you for your love and support, which makes seemingly insurmountable tasks less daunting. Chris, you are my rock. Thank you for celebrating my successes and helping me up after my failures. Sam, even though you're only three you've taught me more about time than anyone could ever imagine, and your influence is written across this dissertation and across my heart. Noah, I look forward to meeting you, and in your own little way, you too have helped me complete this dissertation.

**OUT OF TIME: TEMPOAL COLONIZATION AND THE WRITING OF
MEXICAN AMERICAN SUBJECTIVITY**

by

Erin Murrah-Mandril

B.A., History, University of New Mexico, 2005

M.A., English, University of New Mexico, 2008

Ph.D., English, University of New Mexico, 2014

ABSTRACT

My dissertation studies the ways that Mexican Americans experienced time as a colonizing force in the US Southwest between 1848 and 1940. I argue that Mexican American writing of this period exposes oppressive iterations of time within US modernity and often points toward possibilities of decolonizing time. The project focuses on political and economic constructions of US progress, which denied Mexican Americans presence within US temporal imaginings. My analysis moves from material to ideological temporal constructions as I analyze forms of time concerning wage labor, railroad operations, investment capitalism, judicial processes, congressional proceedings, Manifest Destiny, commodity fetishism, intellectual production, historical narrative, and sociological discourse. I historically situate Mexican American experiences of US time through María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's depiction of capitalist forms of time in *The Squatter and the Don* and Miguel Antonio Otero's dependence on the rhetoric of progress in his three-volume autobiography. They expose the way US forms of time like Manifest

Destiny, free market capitalism and judicial proceedings depend upon the production of underdevelopment and inequity while championing the virtues of progress and development. The first two chapters also position the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as a source of colonized time because it initiated a system of retroactive law and placed former Mexican citizens in a liminal “mean time” of delayed political enfranchisement in order to dispossess Mexican Americans of their land and social standing. I go on to argue that Mexican American literature moves differentially across multiple forms of time to critique temporal domination by drawing on the scholarship of Chela Sandoval and Mikhail Bakhtin in my analysis of Jovita González and Margaret Eimer’s *Caballero*. Throughout the dissertation, I explore the ways that literary recovery of Mexican American texts both participates in and rejects dominant forms of linear progressive time. The final chapter engages this issue through a close analysis of Adina De Zavala’s *History and Legends of the Alamo* as a model for decolonizing time through practices of recovery and archivization that engage Derridian specters through intertextual dialogue with the past.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Getting Railroaded: Colonizing Time in <i>The Squatter and the Don</i>	33
Chapter 2: “In the Mean Time”: Progress as Presence in the Writing of Miguel Antonio Otero.....	67
Chapter 3: Moving across Modernity and Tradition: Differential Time Consciousness in <i>Caballero</i>	101
Chapter 4: Specters of Recovery: Economies of Debt and Responsibility in Adina De Zavala’s <i>History and Legends of the Alamo and other Missions in and around San Antonio</i>	137
Conclusion	175
Works Cited.....	181

If the readability of a legacy were given, natural, transparent, univocal, if it did not call out for and at the same time defy interpretation, we would never have anything to inherit from it.

-Jacques Derrida *Specters of Marx*

Introduction

The genesis of this project started several years ago while I was reading Genaro Padilla's *My History Not Yours*. In his analysis of late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century Mexican American autobiography, he explains that these narratives display an "articulatory schizophrenia," and that "they must articulate ambivalence and divided loyalty because they occupy the historical site where divided subjectivity is formed" (44-45). The fragmented, fractured, self-contradictory narratives that he discussed were fascinating to me because their disjunction seemed to represent lived experience—something about subjectivity that I could not yet put my finger on but that I found very meaningful. They were neither the product of a post-modern, highbrow aesthetic of much contemporary literature nor the celebration of Protestant, Anglo American progress found in so many nineteenth-century American novels. They were neither assimilationist nor overtly contestatory. But what exactly was this "articulatory schizophrenia" that made the texts so fascinating? Frederic Jameson, taking a cue from Lacan, explains that schizophrenia is a breakdown in the signifying chain, more specifically in the temporal unity of this chain where past and future connect with and anchor our sense of the present

both linguistically and psychologically (1991, 26-27). Thus, schizophrenia is a breakdown in temporal cohesion. Again though, early Mexican American texts were not a product of the post-modern condition that Jameson analyzes, and they certainly weren't caused by a psychological disorder on the part of their authors. They were produced in the context of colonization. That context is the origin of their disjointed, non-linear narrative form, not only because it created ambivalence and divided loyalty, but also, and more fundamentally, because it fractured the temporal structure of the US Southwest for Mexican American subjects.

US subjectivity and temporality are interdependent. In 1839, John O'Sullivan, famous for coining the phrase Manifest Destiny, published "The Great Nation of Futurity" in *The Democratic Review*.¹ Unlike his other treatises on territorial expansion, "Futurity" shores up the fact that US imperialism is not only a spatial project, but also a temporal one. He writes, "The expansive future is our arena, and for our history. We are entering on its untrodden space with the Truths of God in our mind [...] and with a clear conscience unsullied by the past. [...] The far-reaching, the boundless future will be the era of American greatness" (1839, 428). Whatever its spatial configuration, the nation's ultimate goal is to colonize the future. In fact, during the nineteenth century, the US's temporal colonization was three-fold, encompassing the future, the past, and the present in a variety of ways. The United States created a "conscience, unsullied by the past" through its historical erasure and containment of dissenting voices, effectively colonizing history (O'Sullivan 1839, 428). It also colonized the present by altering the lived

¹ I first learned of this O'Sullivan piece in Thomas Allen's *A Republic in Time*, which has a cogent analysis of the US's desire to conquer the future.

temporality of its citizens and subjects.² Between 1880 and 1920, for instance, the US solidified its control of time through monumental transformations in timekeeping. In the 1880s, US railroads instituted the nation's time zones. By 1918, the Standard Time Act codified these time zones and created daylight savings time.³ Thus, during the period of Mexican American writing that I explore, the US was undergoing a temporal revolution that effectively homogenized time, making it a mechanized tool of science, capitalism, and progress and divorcing it from the heterogeneous local, spiritual, and "organic" practices of timekeeping that existed before the 1880s. Changes in timekeeping disproportionately affected rural and working class people throughout the nation, and the colonization of history targeted racial others in the US who were excluded from the nation's racialized narrative of Anglo Saxon progress and supremacy. For many Mexican Americans, these were especially drastic changes. The rise of homogenous,

² While the ideals of American Exceptionalism propound that the US does not have imperial subjects but rather incorporates all residents into a US democracy, this ideology is false. Even after the Fourteenth Amendment ruled that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States" were citizens, Mexican Americans, African Americans, Native Americans and women did not have equal access to voting or equal protection under the law. For this reason, I do not refer to all people living within the borders of the United States as citizens, regardless of US legal rhetoric.

³ Daylight savings time was a controversial plan to save energy during WWI. It was repealed and then re-established during WWII. In 1996, the US hegemony of time extended to Mexico as that nation began observing daylight savings time to correspond with the US practice after NAFTA reshaped economic relations within North America. The changed fragmented Mexico's temporality as northern states wanted to match US daylight savings time calendars and other southern states wanted to shorten daylight savings time. In 2001, Mexican president Vicente Fox split the nation's daylight savings time practice so that northern and southern Mexico made the switch at different times. An article in *The Economist* about NAFTA's disruption of Mexican time displays the ontological othering of Mexicans still present in US representation of Mexican temporality. It says "Time has never been a precise concept in Mexico. To be punctual for an appointment is rare, and to be at a party at the stated hour is considered almost bad manners. Now a surreal row over daylight saving time is threatening to shatter this already fragile notion of time into several different, and competing, pieces" ("A Change of Tiempo" 1).

mechanical time did affect working-class Anglos' ability to shape their schedules of work and leisure (in fact, mechanical time is what defined ideas of work and leisure as separate), but this sector of the population retained an ideological position within the US imaginary of progress and development. Anglo industrial and agricultural workers could find stability in the "imaginary relationship [...] to their real conditions of existence"—to quote Althusser (162)—via the positive values of US progress and superiority, even if that ideological relationship gave them little effectual power within the nation. In contrast, Mexican Americans lost the ability to shape the temporal structure of their daily activities at the same time that they were excluded from US national constructions of history and progress. Both their lived temporality and their ideological relation to time were under threat by US colonization.

The second half of the nineteenth-century, then, was a period of national imagining about progress and destiny that projected a falsely unified history back into time in order to make way for an exclusionary future of white supremacy. At the same time, the systematic dispossession of Mexican Americans after the US-Mexico War took place largely during the nation's revolution in time keeping, threatening even elite Mexican-Americans with poverty and pushing them into the economic classes most affected by shifts in American time consciousness. Lastly, Mexican Americans were frequently depicted in US literature and popular culture as a people outside of time, separate from the temporal flow of US progress. Thus, for Mexican Americans experiencing US colonization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, time was literally out of joint.

I explore these issues through the work of elite Mexican Americans who wrote between 1880 and 1945 because these authors had access to multiple discourses of power during a period of temporal transformation within the US. It is also important to note how their privileged social position troubled later recovery of their work. The temporalities of the texts collected in this dissertation run counter to the US's process of temporal homogenization. The novels, autobiography, folklore and historical accounts I analyze reflect a disjointed time underlying the US's attempts to construct a unified, hegemonic temporality. The narratives are neither fluid nor linear. They disclose and often deconstruct the interconnection of progress and colonization. Their forms of time serve a contestatory purpose, revealing that the United States' construction of progress, national triumph, social evolution, economy, and exceptionalism is a facade for domination and injustice. In addition, however, their temporal heterogeneity opens the possibility for new forms of time, for radical temporal alterity. My reading here is influenced by Jacques Derrida, for whom the radical alterity of the other signifies not just sexual or racial difference, but temporal difference. Only by being open to this other—*these others*, actually, since they defy unity and presence—can we imagine the possibility of justice. Derrida writes:

No justice [...] seems possible or thinkable without the principle of some *responsibility*, beyond all living present within that which disjoins the living present, before the ghosts of those who are not yet born or those who are already dead, be they victims of wars, political or other kinds of violence, nationalist, colonialist, or other kinds of exterminations, victims of the oppression of

capitalist imperialism or any other forms of totalitarianism. (*italics original 2006, xviii*)

The constellation of texts I explore, by María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, Miguel Antonio Otero, Adina De Zavala, and Jovita González, speak to the past and the future, the ghosts of the dead and the yet-to-be-born. Their narratives are not unproblematic. Each author is the bearer of class privilege, and they are not, in and of themselves, open to the “radical alterity of the other.” While arguing against capitalist domination and racism, these authors maintain their own class and race-based prejudices. Despite this, their texts are key to imagining a new kind of justice because they imagine time from both inside and outside of colonial temporal formation; they recognize that time is out of joint; and they look to an unknowable future-to-come for possible change. In doing so, they point toward a way out of modernity’s totalizing temporality and out of dialectic epistemology that can only imagine justice through a temporal economy of retribution and restitution.

Time itself is a social construction of language and narration that allows people to create meaning by ordering the world through everything from the basic syntax of sentences to complex narratives of cultural belonging. Forms of time are as diverse and multifaceted as the peoples who shape them and, in fact, a single individual usually exists within multiple social constructions of time. The specific forms of time that I focus on in this dissertation correspond to Mexican American narratives of political and social belonging in the face of US colonization. Even for Anglo Americans, experiences of time were multivalent and sometimes conflicting as modernity and industrialization shifted people’s relation to family, work, religion and nature. For colonized peoples, however, temporal shifts were more drastic and more violent. A number of scholars are

beginning to explore the temporal colonization of native peoples by European powers. For example, Giordano Nanni explores time “as a locus of power and resistance” when British settler colonists imposed Western forms of time on indigenous populations in Victoria, Australia. Likewise, Cheryl A. Wells analyzes the affects of temporal colonization on native peoples of North America. Decolonial scholarship has long viewed temporal colonization as an important aspect of the modernity/coloniality system.⁴ My work draws from this conversation but shifts the focus to examine the displacement of one colonial temporality by another. Within the US Southwest, Spain had already imposed European conceptions of time on native populations almost three centuries before US colonization, mainly through the mission system. Thus, when Anglo Americans arrived in the region, time was already complexly layered through the imposition of, first, Spanish colonial time and then Mexican and other nationalist conceptions of time.⁵ As one power structure replaced another, one Euro-American temporality imposed itself on another. However, the differences cannot be reduced to British versus Spanish conceptions of time nor can the mestizo culture of Mexican America be collapsed into indigenous sensibilities about time. Instead, the region was riddled with traces of multiple colonialities and nationalities that each left their imprint on temporality.

⁴ Decolonial scholars explore the colonization of time/space because the two are inextricably intertwined and were equally affected in the epistemological transformation caused by colonization. Of particular interest to my dissertation are Jodi Byrd’s *The Transit of Empire* and Patrick Wolfe’s *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*.

⁵ While California, New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas were all a part of Mexico before the US invasion, some of these regions also had alternative national imaginings as Northern California and Texas both rebelled against Mexico in attempts to form separate nations.

Benedict Anderson has argued that the imagined community of nationhood and the formal structure of novels and newspapers each depend on a “homogenous, empty time” in which disparate events are linked through their coincidence (in the sense that they *coincide*) within a shared, uniform conception of time.⁶ He writes, “the idea of a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogenous, empty time is a precise analogue of the idea of the nation” (26). However, national time is neither empty nor homogenous. Homogenous, empty time is, instead, the product of industrial capitalism and its mechanization of labor and production.⁷ Thomas M. Allen cogently demonstrates that “[a]s a reified and fetishized object of consumption, mechanical time makes it possible to internalize the abstract logic of the market itself” (14). While the rise of the nation and the rise of capitalism are deeply interconnected components of modernity, they need not, and do not, share the same temporal logic. Homogenous, measured clock time is fundamental to the workings of capitalism because it regulates labor, but it constitutes only one of myriad temporalities in national experiences of time. Anderson’s homogenous, empty time is a useful analysis of one form of time, but it is in no way the singular, or always the dominant temporality of national belonging. I draw from Allen’s *A Republic in Time* for my understanding of national time:

The shared network or web of timing activities links people together, but because timing is an active process, the network as a whole is constructed out of the various uses individuals make of time. [...] heterogeneous temporalities are not marginal or resistant to the nation, nor do they represent forms of collective

⁶ Anderson actually borrows the term from Walter Benjamin.

⁷ E. P. Thompson in “Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism” describes the ways that industrial capitalism regulates time and encourages workers to internalize mechanized time.

affiliation that will emerge after the demise of the nation. Rather, they are themselves the threads out of which the fabric of national belonging has long been woven. (11)

While Allen's analysis of US time is insightful and nuanced in its cultural materialist reading of multiple temporalities within the nation, it also fails to adequately address issues of colonization. Although multiple forms of time *do* coexist within the nation, through the process of colonization, some are privileged, some are merely tolerated, and some are marginalized and denigrated. The act of layering or *timing* different temporalities within a nation, in fact, structures power relations when certain temporalities come to dominate a region or people.

Though not the only form of time within a nation, the concept of empty, homogenous time is one of the most privileged forms of time and is integral to colonization in its deployment as a hegemonic ideology of development and progress. So, homogenous time is both scientific and social. Scientific discourse views time as an undifferentiated continuum, a fourth dimension that replicates the homogenous emptiness of the three dimensions of Cartesian space. The scientific use of empty, homogenous time naturalizes it as *real* time, existing outside of social constructions. On the other hand, homogenous time is the basis for social systems of coloniality that work to categorize groups of people within a hierarchy. Peter Osborne explains "in the context of colonial experience" cultures that exist at the same historical moment "are ordered diachronically to produce a scale of development which defines 'progress' in terms of the projection of certain people's presents as other people's futures, at the level of [historical development] as a whole" (16-17). This is the form of time that Frederic Jackson Turner

uses when he claims that, “[t]he United States lies like a huge page in the history of society. Line by line as we read this continental page from West to East we find the record of social evolution” (66). Though Turner ignores Mexican Americans and the US-Mexico War altogether, his spatialization of progressive time projects far-western territories acquired during the war as the least socially evolved region of the US

As Turner’s thesis reminds us, time and space are inextricably linked concepts. To speak of one necessarily invokes the other. After the US-Mexico War, the Southwest was construed as a place with a particular kind of time, a land of *poco tiempo*, as Charles Lummis put it. Many of the European imperialist perceptions of “native time” that are being explored, and countered, by scholars like Wells and Nanni—the absence of time, lack of temporal awareness, or static timelessness—were brought to bear on the peoples of the US Southwest.⁸ When they lived outside the national border of the United States, Mexicans were thought to function outside the national network of time. Mary Pat Brady explains that:

National borders utilize the fantasy that a nation on one side of the border exists in one phase of temporal development while the nation on the other side functions at a different stage. Moreover, borders simultaneously produce and elide this difference between nations, implicitly suggesting that a person can be formed in one temporality but when he or she crosses a border that person transmogrifies, as it were, into someone either more or less advanced, more or less modern, more or

⁸ These concepts of “native time” are also part of the long tradition of “anthropological time.” Cheryl Wells has published primarily about time temporality in the US Civil War, but she is beginning a project that explores temporality of Native American groups at the time of European and US colonization.

less sophisticated. [...] the border exceeds understanding as a mapped geographic terrain. (50-51)

Yet, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo that ended the US-Mexico War in 1848 literally moved the border—the “mapped geographic terrain”—across tens of thousands of Mexican citizens. Brady’s discussion of temporality along the US-Mexico border describes the US projection of Mexicans as living in a less advanced, alien temporality that renders them “ontologically impossible, outside the real and the human”(50). How, then, did the US incorporate “ontologically impossible” people into its national imaginary after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ostensibly brought Mexicans into the fold of US citizenry? Mexican Americans’ presence—in the present—was a problem for an Anglo American racial imaginary that placed them in the sociological, if not the literal, past. The US addressed the “ontological impossibility” of Mexican Americans by denying them presence—cultural presence, political presence, economic presence, and rhetorical presence.

In fact, the problem of Mexican American presence is embedded in the Treaty itself, a document that, in many ways, created Mexican Americans as a people within the US. Article IX of the treaty originally stated that Mexicans choosing to remain in the new US territories would be “admitted as soon as possible [...] to the enjoyment of all the rights of the US citizens of the United States” (Griswold del Castillo 179). However, when the US Senate consented to ratify the treaty, it altered Article IX removing “as soon as possible” and inserting “shall be [...] admitted *at the proper time* (to be judged by the Congress of the United States) to the enjoyment of all the rights of the US citizens of the United States” (italics mine, Griswold del Castillo 190). Both versions of the article

stated that “in the mean time” former Mexicans would be “maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and their property” (Griswold del Castillo 190). The revision to Article IX deferred Mexican American citizenship in the US and placed Mexican Americans in a temporal limbo of “in the mean time.” This deferral was especially significant for Nuevomexicanos whose territory was denied statehood for over fifty years despite numerous appeals to congress. Even Mexican Americans residing in states like California and Texas, which were admitted to the Union quickly, rarely enjoyed equal rights as US citizens. It would seem that *the proper time* never actually arrived for Mexican Americans who, *in the mean time*, seem to have existed in an *improper* time, outside the domain of modernist concepts like historical or industrial progress.⁹ The moment of political presence, of inclusion and incorporation, has been continually deferred for Mexican Americans in the US.

Denied a voice in the present, many Mexican American authors looked toward the past and the future in order to deal with the disjointed time in which they were living. The United States’ temporal colonization pushed people of the region toward what Derrida would call spectrality. Neither present nor absent, spectrality goes “beyond the living present in general and beyond its simple negative reversal” (2006, xix). Within deconstruction, spectrality is reminiscent of concepts of the absent presence, the trace, or *différance*. However, I utilize it instead of these terms because spectrality is more

⁹ Interestingly, before the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was ratified by the US and Mexico, the Mexican minister of foreign relations and the American commissioners drafted The Protocol of Querétaro in order to clarify the US Senate’s revisions to the treaty. The Protocol of Querétaro states that the revisions “did not intend to diminish in any way what was agreed upon by the aforesaid [original] article,” essentially nullifying the Senate’s changes. However, “the protocol was not included with the treaty papers sent to Congress” when it was ratified and it later became a major point of debate in the treaty’s interpretation. (Griswold del Castillo 53-54)

frequently associated with justice, humanity and inheritance by Derrida, unlike the other terms, which are primarily associated with structures of language (though all of these concepts are certainly intertwined). In his Exordium to *Specters of Marx*, Derrida writes that “learning to live” amounts to learning to live with ghosts, “[a]nd this being-with specters would also be, not only but also, a *politics* of memory, of inheritance, and of generations” (italics original 2006, xviii). The concept of spectrality helps account for the complex, multivalent aspects of early Mexican American literature that have occasionally been troubling for modern scholars working to interpret it. The disjointed temporality of these texts makes it difficult to fit them into paradigms of recovery based on linear narratives of cause and effect. They trouble the very *history* of literary history. For example, Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita originally recovered Ruiz de Burton’s *The Squatter and the Don* as a contestatory novel that interpellates a contemporary Chicana/o readership needing to “slay the monster who has not ceased to be victorious” (1992, 48). Yet, José Aranda later used Ruiz de Burton as a paradigmatic figure to “challenge the usefulness of resistance theory when applied to writers who preceded the Chicano Movement” (1998, 553). Or, even more paradoxically, the co-recoverers of Jovita González and Margaret Eimer’s *Caballero* appear to have opposing views about González’s place in Chicana/o history. While José Limón had earlier described González as “a disorganicized intellectual won over to the side of domination” (1994, 61), María Cotera describes her as “a precursor [...] to writers like Ana Castillo, Cherrie Moraga, and Gloria Anzaldua” whose writing “is an early and important attempt to give voice to the Chicana speaking subject” (1996, 339). Thus, just as early Mexican American authors grapple with their threatened inheritance and an uncertain future-to-come in the

face of US colonization, so to do contemporary inheritors of Mexican American literature. The Derridian concept of spectrality is ideal for analyzing early Mexican American literature because of its focus on the irreducible heterogeneity of inheritance. For Mexican American literature, the irreducible heterogeneity of inheritance is a function of the disjointed, colonized time from which specters emerge. Through colonization, Mexican Americans physically and intellectually experience the Derridian specter's assertion that "the time is out of joint" when they are excluded from US constructions of the sociological, economic, and political present (Derrida 2006, 25).

I should note that while some might criticize my use of Derrida, a late-twentieth-century French theorist, to explore nineteenth-century Mexican American texts, casting it as anachronistic and culturally inappropriate, I'd like to adopt what Rafael Pérez-Torres says of postmodernity. He writes, it "is not to say that Chicanos have formed a postmodern culture *avant la lettre*. It is to say that Chicanos have lived and survived (which is a form of triumph over) the disparities made plain by the critical light of postmodernism" (4). The same could be said about deconstruction. While the paradigm of decentered meaning coalesced in the late-twentieth-century as an intellectual methodology, colonized subjects were experiencing the effects of decentered, disjointed meaning and subjectivity long before a descriptive apparatus was developed. Juan Nepomucino Seguín, former governor of San Antonio who fought in both the Texas Revolution and the US-Mexico War, famously epitomized disjointed subjectivity in 1858 when he described himself as "a foreigner in my native land" (107). His statement aptly describes the spatial disjunction of Mexican Americans experiencing decentered subjectivity in the mid-nineteenth century. As Chela Sandoval explains, "colonized

Western citizen-subjects [...] have been forced to experience the so-called aesthetics of “postmodern” globalization [for which deconstruction is a tactic of analysis] as a precondition for survival” (8).

Furthermore, the context of the narratives I examine stems from the period of their recovery as well as the time of their composition. Mexican American literature was, in many ways, a latecomer to the recovery movements of the latter third of the twentieth century. While a number of scholars began individual work in the 1980s to find and disseminate information about Mexican American writing from before the Chicano Movement, their work did not effect major changes within the cannon of Chicano literature or the broader field of American literature.¹⁰ The recovery movement, which includes Mexican American, Cuban American, Puerto Rican, and other US Latino literatures, became solidified and highly organized in the early 1990s by the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage project. The project was founded as a segment of Arte Público Press under director Nicolás Kanellos and brought together a large number of scholars invested in recovering the literary history of Hispano authors writing in the US. This means that Mexican American literary recovery came to fruition at an important time within the field of Chicana/o Studies, a time shortly after the literary cannon of the Chicano movement had been scrutinized and transformed by a number of

¹⁰ This is not to say that individual scholars were not working on recovering Mexican-American authored texts. Indeed, Genaro Padilla began work on *My History Not Yours*, which recovers a number of Mexican American autobiographies, in 1985 and compiled and edited a collection of Fray Angélico Chávez’s short stories in 1987. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita were already working on recovering *The Squatter and the Don* before the Recovery Project’s inception. These and other scholars who were already working on individual projects of historical recovery came together within the Recovering the US Hispanic Literary Heritage to make a collective impact on Chicana/o scholarship. At the same time, the University of New Mexico Press began its Pasó Por Aquí series, which focuses specifically on recovering New Mexican Historical texts.

new influences including the emergence of a new group of trained literary scholars, new technological innovations, large-scale investments in creating and preserving Chicano cultural production, and the theoretical critique of Chicana feminism.

The lessons of Chicana feminism, in particular, and its critique of both ethnic studies and women studies were imbedded as part of the structure of the recovery project.¹¹ This is evident in the first volume of *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*, a series that publishes collected essays produced by the project. As scholars worked to define the project in this volume, many of the contributors explicitly referenced Chicana feminism. For example, Charles Tatum writes, “it is important to be guided by Chicana feminist literary critics” who recognize that women’s writing is often excluded from the canon because it is categorized as ‘non-literary’ (202-3). María Herrera-Sobek analyzes the history of a number of national canon formations as cautionary examples of what the Recovery Project should avoid. She uses Chicana literature to exemplify the kinds of texts the project should include writing, “New norms and aesthetic criteria need to be applied to these texts” (217). She goes on to say, “We need to rescue those texts that have been marginalized, neglected or disdained by previous literary canons. [...] Once we have accomplished this task it will be up to future generations to evaluate and revise” (218). In their dual responsibility, towards both the

¹¹ Indeed, the Recovery Project was a product of all the influences mentioned in the previous paragraph. The Recovery Project was funded in large part by the Rockefeller Foundation as well as the National Endowment for the Arts, the Lila Wallace-Reader’s Digest Fund and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The Project also planned the creation of an online database during its first meeting and has now produced two series of the database *Arte Público Hispanic Historical Collection* in cooperation with EBSCOHost. And, from inception to the present, the Recovery Project has been influenced an influx of pos-movement Chicana/o scholars who have worked to push the bounds of Chicana/o scholarship beyond the bounds of contestation paradigms into new areas like transnationalism, queer theory, and hemispheric studies.

past and the future, founders of the Recovery Project were careful to recognize the limits of the kinds of knowledge they were creating. On the one hand, the fact that Chicana/o Studies had recently undergone major epistemological shifts led scholars to recognize that future recipients of their work might have radically different ways of thinking about texts. On the other hand, founders recognized that the works they would be recovering had been the object of historical erasure and would not fit into standard generic or aesthetic categories. Recovering these items would require a new openness to peoples and texts from the past and the future. Such openness constitutes a spectral moment, “a moment that no longer belongs to time, if one understands by that word the linking of modalized presents” (Derrida 2006, xiv). In being open to the specters of recovery, Project founders worked to avoid imagining the past of their recovered texts or the future of textual scholarship as a projection of their own intellectual moment. Ironically, what they created was a textual past and a future for recovery that were each oriented toward that very same openness and heterogeneity of the project’s historical context when Chicana/o Studies was undergoing major epistemological shifts and literary studies were strongly influenced by literary theory. This is not to say that every work of recovery by the project or by other institutions since the project’s inception has been sensitive to the “other” of the past or the future, but many have, and most importantly, the potential remains imbedded in the project’s design.

Why does the context of recovery matter so much? Many of the recovered texts were written with an eye to future readerships either because their expected audience at the time of publication was small, or because the audience they did reach either couldn’t or wouldn’t effect the changes necessary to give Mexican Americans a voice within the

body politic of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century America. Because Mexican Americans were denied presence by US power structures, their narratives look toward the future. This means that, in some ways, the texts were written to be recovered. For example, Otero writes in his autobiography that he “owed it to the coming generations to allow them to read first hand [his] early experiences” (1935, 287). Like Otero’s autobiography, González’s and De Zavala’s work is a preservation of past and present culture for both a contemporaneous audience and a future one. These texts move non-linearly towards both future and past, exhibiting a responsibility to specters of the dead and the yet to be born, to draw on Derrida again. In addition, no text is an island unto itself. The scholarly apparatus of introductions, postscripts, and footnotes, not to mention the intellectual conversations that take place about recovered texts in academic journals and monographs, literally change the shape of the original text by changing its intertextual situation and multiplying the temporalities across which a text moves. Thus Ruiz de Burton’s, *The Squatter and the Don: A Novel of Contemporary Occurrences in California* written 1885 is no longer the same novel read by scholars today. Even though the words in the text remain the same, the “contemporary occurrences” that work to situate the text are different. Because of this, the disjointed time of early Mexican American literature that I analyze is not solely the domain of the originally published (or unpublished) works, or the product of their later recovery. Instead, the disjuncture of time exists at the nexus of composition and recovery.

My focus on temporality is an intervention in recent trends within Chicana/o studies that focus on spatial representation. For example, notable books like Mary Pat Brady’s *Extinct Lands Temporal Geographies*, Raúl Homero Villa’s *Barrio Logos*, and

even earlier texts like Juan Bruce-Novoa's *Retrospace*, all use paradigms of space—albeit in very different ways—to explore meaning in Chicana/o culture and literature. Critical analysis through mapping spaces has become a fundamental methodology of Chicana/o literary studies, and even texts that give substantial weight to temporal domination, like Emma Pérez's *The Decolonial Imaginary*, privilege spatial metaphors (third *space* feminism). The theory and analysis that has sprung from Chicana/o Studies over the past few decades is known for its complex spatial dimensions. Indeed, as José Aranda noted in 2003, the Chicano/a Studies paradigm of “borderlands,” through its “embrace of multiplicity, nonlinearity, discontinuous narrative, transnationalism, and colonial history have put it more at the center of academic discourse than ever before” (2003, 35). The importance of spatiality is understandable and, in fact, critical for examining the history of a colonized people who have been denied presence within a hegemonic narrative of US progress. It is also an apt form for exploring the physical dispossession and displacement of people within and across borders. The emphasis on space in Chicano/a Studies draws from and contributes to a broader trend in spatial analysis that sees space as dynamic rather than static—producing and produced by social relations.¹²

However, I see a problem in replacing temporal meaning with spatial meaning. Fredric Jameson played a key role in this shift when his *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* claimed that postmodernity caused a “crisis in historicity” and,

¹² It is interesting that Henri Lefebvre's *The Production of Space* was published in 1991, the same year as Frederic Jameson's *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capital*. Though each author views space very differently, both contribute to a turn toward space as a field of analysis and both are utilized significantly by Chicana/o scholars.

thus, a displacement of time because contemporary culture is unable to imagine diachronic relations and meaning. He claims, “the subject has lost its capacity to actively extend its pro-tensions and re-tensions across the temporal manifold and to organize its past and future into coherent experiences” (1991, 218). He believes that, as time is flattened out, subjects look toward spatialization to orient themselves. Thus Jameson focuses on cognitive mapping as a strategy for coping with postmodernity. As Chéla Sandoval explains, Jameson’s cultural lamentation over postmodernity is, in fact, a eulogy for the lost modernist “centered and legitimated bourgeois citizen-subject” (26). She writes that in postmodernity “then, the first world subject enters the kind of psychic terrain formerly inhabited by the historically decentered citizen-subject: the colonized, the outsider, the queer, the subaltern, the marginalized” (Sandoval 26). But the historically decentered, disjointed time experienced by colonized subjects does not create the lack of temporal awareness or an inability to imagine diachronic relations that Jameson ascribes to postmodern subjects. Instead colonized peoples create alternative temporal imaginaries that do not depend solely on chronology for meaning. Sandoval argues that the experiences of colonized subjects give them an oppositional consciousness that can move “across and through cultural spaces: it is a mobile, flexible, diasporic force that migrates between contending ideological systems” (30). While her statement focuses again on spatiality as a response to Jameson’s call for cognitive mapping, the same could be said of Mexican Americans’ ability to move across time. In fact, Sandoval’s differential consciousness does have a temporal component in that it moves beyond a dialectical progression from “equal rights” to “revolutionary” and then from “supremacist” to “separatist” consciousness in the historical narrative of

oppositional politics. Instead, Sandoval's differential consciousness draws from multiple oppositional tactics at any time and in no particular order.¹³ Likewise, early Mexican American authors move through and across different ideological formations of time often eschewing chronology or the linear time of dialectical resolution. Their temporal adroitness should not be read in the negative connotation of schizophrenia—a term utilized by numerous scholars to describe Mexican American narratives—nor should it be displaced by an overemphasis on space.¹⁴ Instead differential time consciousness is a strategy for survival and a move toward decolonizing time.

Chicana/o and Latina/o literary history have been rightly suspicious of chronology and periodization for decades. At the inception of the Recovery Project, Charles Tatum “question[ed] the usefulness of relying on, even on a temporary basis, fixed dates and the periods they encompass” (206). In 2003, Manuel Martín-Rodríguez argued that chronology and periodization in Mexican American literary history “has resulted in a sort of methodological inertia that has outlived its usefulness and that, in turn demands the experimentation with newer approaches” (142). More recently, in her review of the *Norton Anthology of Latino Literature*, Kirsten Silva Gruesz asserts that the volume belies “confusion over how periods and canons work together” (339). She writes:

¹³ This is no surprise as *differánc*e, a key influence on Sandoval's differential consciousness, is a verb with a slippery temporality. Derrida's discussion of the verb's temporization explores it as a “middle verb” that is neither active nor passive, and that though it defers presence it does not denote absence either.

¹⁴ In addition to Genaro Padilla's references to early Mexican American autobiographies as schizophrenic, a number of other scholars have used this term to describe Mexican Americans and/or their writing. For example, Leonard Pitt has an entire chapter on Californios' “Schizoid Heritage” in his 1966 *The Decline of the Californios*. More recently Alicia Gaspar de Alba describes the cultural schizophrenia that Chicano artists navigate in her 1998 book *Chicano Art Inside Outside the Master's House: Cultural Politics and the CARA Exhibition*.

NALL occupies the unusual position of presenting an authoritative canon for a body of literature that doesn't yet have a literary history. [...] To some degree this is a chicken-and-egg question: periodicity and canonicity have in most cases evolved alongside each other. But in the case of Latino literature, all we have is the egg.

(336)

While issues of periodicity are much more complex and problematic for the vastly heterogeneous group that composes “Latina/o” subjectivity in the US and its corresponding literary canon, the more specific field of Mexican American literature appears no less besought by problems of temporal organization. Even authors who utilize systems of periodization extensively qualify their use of linear development in Mexican American literature. For example, Louis Gerard Mendoza writes in *Historia: The Literary Making of Chicana & Chicano History*, “Although the generational schema serves as an organizational framework for this study, the goal is not to affirm the framework but to illustrate its limitations” (23). The problem of creating meaning through chronology in Chicana/o historiography is a function of the very works that make up the current canon of early Mexican American literature. These texts are difficult to periodize because they exist at the intersection of so many temporal constructions. The point here is not to trace Chicana/o/Mexican American problems with time through history as a successive or causal relationship—indeed that would only (re)produce an equally problematic linear narrative. Instead, I wish to demonstrate that the future and the past are not so clearly delineated, and that it is actually fallacious to untangle past and future in order to create a smooth narrative of development. Derrida is again useful here as he writes, “*One does not know* if the expectation prepares the coming of the future-to-

come or if it recalls the repetition of the same, of the same thing as a ghost [...] one can never distinguish between the future-to-come and the coming-back of a specter” (2006, 44-5, 46). This is especially true for a people who have had to (re)construct their past through the process of recovery.

To demonstrate this entanglement and Mexican American literature’s openness to the future/specter, I focus on narrative form. More specifically, I examine the interplay among multiple forms of time within each of the texts I explore. Discourses of nostalgia, progress, destiny, capitalist expansion, and political process each have their own temporal logic. As these discourses come into contact within early Mexican American literature, time is refracted so that no single form of time constitutes a stable anchor as “real” time from which to view the others. In *Qualified Hope*, Mitchum Huehls describes the “time-knowledge paradox,” explaining that “[t]hings are easy to know when removed from time, but removing them from time ignores a crucial component of their existence and thus circumscribes our knowledge” (2). This paradox makes it difficult to discuss time purely through theoretical discourse that is focused on knowledge itself. Huehls writes, “Meta-epistemology’s iterative structure requires that the object of knowledge remain static and removed from both its own temporality and the temporality of our encounter with it, thereby ensuring postmodernism’s inability to account for temporal experience” (14). However, engaging with literary form is one way out of the paradox because literature “need not adhere to the linear forms of temporal experience that make time and knowledge so antagonistic and mutually exclusive” (Huehls 4). Huehls makes a path out of the time-knowledge paradox by exploring the phenomenological process of reading, “examining how the unique temporalities of innovative literary forms shape a reader’s

experience of the text” (20). In contrast, I explore how texts themselves move across and between temporalities through their narrative form and through the hermeneutics of textual recovery that binds past and future together. To do so, I draw from Chéla Sandoval’s concept of differential consciousness, but apply it specifically to time consciousness. While there is no way to step outside of time in order to examine temporality, there is the possibility of moving among and between different ideological constructions of time in order to explore their various structures and social ramifications. I contend that early Mexican American authors do just that.

My dissertation looks specifically at texts that engage historical narrative and narratives of capitalist modernization because they tug at the seams of linear time and highlight the disunity of temporal experience for Mexican Americans in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. For example, Ruiz de Burton’s quip about how US law works to “unsettle” California (1992, 84), Otero’s rewriting of Anglo Western heroes as savage impediments to progress, *Caballero*’s narrative digressions into a violent future anterior, and De Zavala’s push to save the Alamo from “capitalist syndicates” (1996, 46) each reconstitute time as something other than linear progression into a (better) future. Each of these texts has a dual focus on history (the past) and progress (the future). Each author also engaged with US political structures during their life and in their work. Ruiz de Burton and Miguel Otero leveled a strong critique of Washington politics, while Adina De Zavala and Jovita González were involved in local politics particularly through their participation in historical preservation and education reform, respectively. These two Tejana authors also interrogate the relation between patriarchy and patriotism, a relation that would return to haunt their position within the

project of textual recovery. As I mentioned earlier, the point of my project is not to map out a historiography of early Mexican American literature to describe the development of its temporal structure over time. Instead, I wish to highlight the interrelation of temporal structures and the ways that these texts engage time in order to show how they exist in a disjointed time—a time of colonization. The texts I explore are written by authors who have been “recovered” either by the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage Project or by other scholars and presses over the last two decades. In my conclusion, I propose that the temporal heterogeneity and multiplicity of these texts brings us into contact with temporal others, with the specters of the past and the future-to-come, in a way that models differential movement across multiple ideological formations of time. This differential movement is accessible through recovery and as recovery, particularly when recovery projects exceed the bounds of a contestation paradigm and begin to explore the multiple registers and social positions of the texts and people they recover. Working with recovered texts not as objects of analysis but as spectral subjects engaged in multiple inter-subjective relationships both in and outside of linear time, scholars may be able to move toward a decolonization of time.

I open my analysis with an exploration of Ruiz de Burton’s *The Squatter and the Don* in order to historically situate the temporal colonization of Mexican America through the capitalist expansion of the railroads and their homogenization of US time. This text is especially adept in its expression of the material colonization of time by US political and industrial institutions. Its novelistic heteroglossia displays and interrogates a number of temporal constructions. For example, Californio land loss is presented in the light of both naturalistic decline and capitalist design. Likewise, various social

constructions of time through ideas of destiny, progress, evolution, faith, and tradition come into contact as squatters, Californios, and monopoly and investment capitalists interact. The novel's focus on economy and its initial recovery as a tale of economic dispossession and contestation make it an important foundational text for the project of Mexican American literary recovery and, thus, for my own critical project. The fundamental problem with homogenous empty time is its complicity in a kind of temporal economy. When time is abstract and homogenous, it enters into the capitalist system of commodities. As such, time is money, and people are expected to spend it in specific ways. As the Californios become worth less financially, their time becomes less valuable as well. The economy of time extends beyond capitalist discourse, though, as it is represented in legalistic discourse throughout the novel. *The Squatter and the Don* exposes the failure of this legal system when it becomes entangled in the capitalist economy where money can buy votes and court rulings. I argue that the novel goes beyond critiquing the specific system of US laws to critique the fundamental premise of a temporal economy. While the text clearly has specific designs on the future by imagining it through a particular raced and classed lens, it nonetheless defers justice into an unknown and unknowable future time. This deferral disrupts a temporal economy that calls for restitution in the present.

The Squatter and the Don's initial recovery by Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita as a contestatory novel likewise situates it in a temporal economy of justice. In this system, cultural and literary recovery attempts to restore what was lost in the colonial process of historical erasure. Recovered texts contest the social, political and economic domination of their historical context as recovery projects contest the same types of

domination in the period of recovery. However, recovered texts are never univocal or purely contestatory. *The Squatter and the Don* is a paradigmatic text for the problems of recovery. It was composed by an elite Californiana who had significant social and political influence and who was clearly invested in classifying Californios as racially white. Scholars like José Aranda and Jesse Alemán have done much to trouble the idea of Ruiz de Burton's work as subaltern or anticipating a proletarian Chicana/o subject. Their scholarship exposes the heterogeneity of literary inheritance, which, I suggest, is grounded in temporal heterogeneity, a multiplicity of specters that defy the idea of unified, linear time.

Chapter two moves to the temporal politics of turn-of-the-century New Mexico as I analyze the writing and political career of Miguel Antonio Otero, the first Nuevomexicano governor of New Mexico Territory under US rule. In this chapter, I use Otero's writing and the cultural context of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century New Mexico to explore the entanglement of past and future and the way that discourses of progress and history leave Mexican Americans little opportunity for a voice in the present. Unlike Ruiz de Burton, Otero never criticized the rhetoric of progress. Instead, he utilized the rhetoric of progress extensively in his political career, but shifted it ever so slightly to focus on the contributions of the Otero family to New Mexico's progress. His three-volume autobiography rewrites the history of Western expansion to make Otero and his family the heroes who tamed the Wild West. As a politician, he focused on technological modernization and attracting outside investment to the territory in an attempt to bring it into the fold of US modernity so that New Mexico could attain statehood and the democratic participation it entailed. Like Ruiz de Burton, he was

openly critical of Washington politics, and his writing reveals the nation's intentional exclusion of territorial holdings like New Mexico from participating in modern government. New Mexico's exclusion from democratic government in turn retarded its ability to participate in US economic development. Yet Otero's critique does not extend to the United States' recent acquisition of territories in the Spanish-American War nor to its treatment of Native Americans or African Americans. His writing is problematic in that it primarily works within rather than against US discourses of power in an attempt to include New Mexico in US modernist time without critiquing the underlying ideological formation of that temporality.

Otero did, however, work to undermine a strain of nostalgia present in both Nuevomexicano and Anglo writings that focus on Spanish culture and tradition in the region. Texts like Charles Lummis's *Land of Poco Tiempo* (1879) portray New Mexico as a land that time forgot, a place devoid of progress and temporal movement into the future. This book posits New Mexico as a place where Anglo Americans can escape from the stresses of modernity into the world of a simpler, slower past. Many Nuevomexicano authors used nostalgic writing in a very different way—to contest the Anglo domination they were experiencing in the present. Genaro Padilla writes that these authors “exhibit an almost obsessive nostalgic tendency to recreate ‘los días pasados,’ as a means of divesting the second half of the nineteenth century of its absurdity” calling this writing, “a strategic narrative activity [...] for restoring order, sanity, [and] social purpose in the face of political, social and economic dispossession” (11). However, the double voice of this contestatory nostalgia was unrecognizable to most Anglo readers, and thus it often contributed to Anglo fantasies of a timeless land. John Nieto-Phillips

explains, “[b]y sublimating the romantic past and subverting the abysmal present, the Spanish ethos served as a discursive tool of Anglo American romantics, tourists, and Hispanophiles; *these* individuals, it would seem, were the real beneficiaries of New Mexico’s Spanish enchantment” (7). Otero’s turn away from the Spanish past has been read (perhaps rightly) as a denigration of *Nuevomexicano* history. At the same time, his rhetoric of progress worked to bring Anglo capital and influence to the region, which also furthered the physical and temporal dispossession of Nuevomexicanos. While he should be credited for New Mexico’s eventual achievement of statehood, it is unclear how and to what degree the state has been able to participate in other forms of US modernity. For this reason, it is Otero’s temporal play, his ability to manipulate and deploy different ideological formations of time for his own political benefit, that makes him a source for practices of decolonizing time.

My third chapter addresses the work of Jovita González as it moves through and across time. In this movement, her writing creates space for multiple and divergent voices. In doing she enacts a temporal version of Chéla Sandoval’s differential consciousness. Her co-authored historical novel, *Caballero*, mines the temporal rupture of Anglo colonization to open up new possibilities for decolonial time. *Caballero* demonstrates that both Tejano patriarchal tradition and Anglo US modernity are exclusionary, linear constructions of time. While the authors disrupt the ideology of tradition in their account of Rancho La Palma’s foundation, they disrupt the ideology of US Manifest Destiny in a future anterior account of the failure of US progress. The novel also utilizes dialogic formations of memory that undermine hegemonic constructions of collective memory to support a reifying cultural identity based in a shared past. Instead,

memory functions more fruitfully in the text to create intersubjective moments capable of drawing on multiple formations of the past and inheritance. As such, the text demonstrates that the decolonial practices of differential consciousness and third space feminism are, in fact, temporal practices. These temporal practices place Mexican Americans, not outside of US modernity, but always moving across multiple iterations of modernity and other formations of time in a way that exposes time's ideological implications.

Both Jovita González and Adina De Zavala, the author in my final chapter, have been the subjects of reductive interpretation in their initial historical recovery. Both Tejanas have been criticized for being complicit in the Anglo domination of Texas, and both have been—at least to a degree—psychoanalyzed by the male scholars recovering their work. José Limón, in addition to classifying Jovita González as “won over to the side of domination,” describes her work as “not free of repressed contradictory elements” (1994, 61, 62). Limón was later instrumental in the recovery of González's co-authored novel *Caballero*, which he reads in the context of Américo Paredes's—the patriarch of Chicano letters—intellectual and literary production. Richard Flores, who recovered and introduced Adina De Zavala's *History and Legends*, writes that her work should “be evaluated in terms of personal repression arising from ethnic hostility and racism” (1996, xlvii). These recovery narratives of repression miss the opportunity for openness to temporal others, to specters of the past, by closing off interpretation in an attempt to solve the problems of history. Unlike the Freudian return of the repressed—a haunting specter that must be discovered and exorcized—the Derridian specter calls for interpretive

openness where scholars do not inscribe their own cultural expectations on voices and texts from the past.

I, thus, close with an account of Adina De Zavala's early-twentieth-century archival work. Her work speaks to the temporal heterogeneity discussed in each of the preceding chapters. In this chapter, I delve more deeply into the idea of the specter as an openness to temporal alterity outside the formation of linear history. De Zavala's historical preservation brought her into the realm of local politics as she pushed for issues like the retention of Spanish street names in San Antonio and state funding to mark and preserve historical sites like the Spanish missions and Spanish Governor's Palace. In addition to the lasting imprint De Zavala left on San Antonio through her preservation of historic landmarks, she also bequeathed a collection of historical documents to the Dolph Briscoe Center for American History and Incarnate Word College, and she penned *History and Legends of the Alamo and Other Missions in and Around San Antonio*. This book acts as a mini-archive through its compendium of lists, maps, photographs, letters, poems, long excerpts from missionary accounts, local legends, and religious plays. Its temporality is not linear or even fully narrative. The content of Adina De Zavala's work implicates her in the historical erasure of subaltern voices; in particular, her representation of Indian neophytes in the Spanish missions is reductive and colonialist. At the same time, her form and methodology demonstrate the same differential movement across time that appears in my project's other narratives. Like all preservationists, she was forced to engage in the capitalist exchange of relics and monuments in order to acquire and promote the material she wished to preserve. Yet through a constant emphasis on both the material specificity and communal inheritance of

San Antonio's past, she disrupts the homogeneity of time upon which capitalist value depends and creates an intersubjective relation to the past that undermines the linear flow of modernist historical time.

In all of my chapters, I focus on the temporalities that early Mexican American texts express and embody. In doing so, I answer Martín Rodríguez's demand for newer approaches to analyzing Chicano literary production that move beyond periodization and chronological organization. Like him, I see that texts have shifting meaning and relevance that are as much about contemporary literary needs as they are about the context of authorship. More than this, though, I argue that early Mexican American texts are an expression of the Chicana/o/Mexican American ability to navigate different forms of time and to perceive time's ideological construction in order to survive the oppressive power structures of Anglo American progress and modernity. Dispossessed of presence in the nineteenth century, Mexican American authors discovered that, as Walter D. Mignolo explains, "[c]olonization of being is nothing else than producing the idea that certain people do not belong to history—that they are non-beings" (4). Early Mexican American texts work to reinsert Mexican Americans into history, but more importantly they recognize that the chronology, progress, and causality of history are constructions to be manipulated and remade to suit the needs of oppressed people in the US. If contemporary readers and recoverers understand the way that Mexican American authors bend time, if we can remain open to their temporal alterity and draw from their differential movement across ideological formations of time, then perhaps we can exit the temporal economy of progress and resolution to create new forms of time through a de-colonial practice.

[W]e can never say what time is. Instead we can only ask what kinds of worlds different forms of time make possible, and what interests are served by the creation of such worlds.

-Thomas M. Allen *A Republic in Time*

Chapter 1

Getting Railroaded: Colonizing Time in *The Squatter and the Don*

Before 1872, the year in which María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *The Squatter and the Don* opens, the US had no standardized time system. Towns and counties throughout the country kept time according to their solar meridian. As James W. Carey describes, "Michigan had twenty-seven time zones; Indiana twenty-three; Wisconsin thirty-nine; Illinois, twenty-seven. The clocks in New York, Boston and Philadelphia, today on identical time, were several minutes apart" (320). However, in 1872, US railroad systems tentatively accepted a proposal by Charles Dowd that created standardized time zones in order to more effectively coordinate train schedules. During this transitional phase, railroad standard time coexisted with local time, and railroads created indexes so that passengers could convert their various local times to railroad time and back again. Thus, just as *The Squatter and the Don* begins its narrative, time is literally in flux throughout the nation.

By the time of the novel's publication in 1885, however, a second revision to the time zones successfully replaced the Dowd plan. With the second plan, the railroads did not provide conversion indexes for passengers. Carey explains that this plan's author, William Frederick Allen, "recommended that the railroads abandon the practice of

providing a minute index and that they simply adopt standard time for regulating their schedules and allow communities and institutions to adjust to the new time in any manner they chose” (322). While there were some noted protests, the new system of time was adopted across the US within months. By becoming invisible, railroad time became American time.¹⁵

The Squatter and the Don is embedded in the historical context of this monumental transformation in US timekeeping, and its narrative pushes against the colonization and homogenization of time by US industries and the political system that supported them. Indeed the book’s subtitle, *A Novel of Contemporary Occurrences in California*, doubly emphasizes temporality where “contemporary” indicates co-temporality, and “occurrence” structures our understanding of temporal flow and causality. We might consider the subtitle’s contemporary occurrences as designating multiple presences because “occurrence”—*something that happens*—shapes our relation to ideas about duration and about what and when, exactly, the “contemporary” is. Representations of time within the novel reveal that temporal experiences are multiple and heterogeneous. Various characters experience and portray different forms of time and the homogenous, empty time of the market appears both cold and false in contrast to organic or familial/social experiences of time. The narrative’s critique of capitalism is, in many ways, a critique of capitalist time, of the way that capitalism produces time as empty and homogenous in order to assign it a market value that can be manipulated, regulated and predicted. Underlying the text, then, is the suspicion of a temporal

¹⁵ Dowd’s time zones ignored geography and convention entirely by following an exact grid. The revision by William Frederick Allen allowed for divergence from the grid up to 100 miles. US Congress did not officially adopt the railroad’s time system until 1918.

economy that figures exchange values, not just for material goods, but also for people's lived experience, social and political interactions. The text's suspicion of homogenous time and the temporal economy it produces (and is produced by) opens the possibility for a future that cannot be predicted or regulated, for a time that is wholly 'other.' This is precisely what makes the novel so intriguing as an artifact of textual recovery. It's not just the characters that depict multiple forms of time; the narrative structure of the novel is itself fractured by its contrasting romantic resolution and social invective. For this reason, the novel's recovery by scholars of the 1990s and 2000s was highly contested. The real problem is that the novel calls for the discontinuation of linear progressive time; neither social integration nor social uprising adequately address the temporal colonization of Californios by US business and politics because both possibilities perpetuate a linear progressive time that acts through dialectic resolution. For this same reason, the novel cannot be smoothly integrated into contemporary critical paradigms. Instead, it is the novel's *irresolution* that creates the possibility for a different kind of time.

While the novel is frequently read as a protest against US colonization of California land,¹⁶ it should also be read as an attempt to grapple with the US colonization of time. The industrial capitalist construction of a temporality that appears to be natural and external is fundamentally an attempt to predict and thus control the future—from train schedules to labor productivity and market fluctuations. Yet, the American desire to conquer time and the future predates the industrial boom of the nineteenth century and has proven even more enduring than the US conquest of land. Numerous scholars have

¹⁶ See Sánchez and Pita's introduction to the novel. The novel is also almost always contextualized through the 1851 California Land Act, referenced repeatedly in the text. The law opened all Spanish and Mexican land grants to litigation and was the primary cause of the dispossession of landed Californios after US colonization.

discussed the paradox of American Exceptionalism, the problem of a “free” republic engaged in imperial conquest where a postcolonial nation becomes a colonial power. I take it for granted that—whatever the finer points of US expansion, republicanism and democracy are—the United States’ indefinite expansion across a continent creates a paradox for the country’s ideals about its spatial configuration, particularly when that expansion confronts another nation-state. Writing specifically about literature of the US-Mexico War, Jaime Javier Rodríguez explains, “the presence of Mexico in the agonistic sphere of the Americas counteracts the mechanisms of existential nationalist coherence in the United States” (2012, xii). According to Thomas M. Allen, US authors looked for a resolution to the paradox of an expanding, colonizing democracy through nationalist writing about time and history. He explains that:

throughout American history, much of the rhetoric of national expansion has made space itself the tropic medium for explorations of time, the ‘representational form’ through which Americans make tangible the pursuit of a more abstract but also more ideologically palatable quest: the colonization of the future (26).

The trope of the US as a nation of the future has persisted from early texts of the republic through the nineteenth-century rise of Manifest Destiny and into contemporary neocolonial pursuits.¹⁷

John O’Sullivan’s 1839 “The Great Nation of Futurity” describes America as fully divorced from the past, writing “our national birth was the beginning of a new

¹⁷ This trajectory makes President John F. Kennedy’s 1960 Democratic nomination speech about “The New Frontier” less surprising and adds to Richard Slotkin’s analysis famous analysis of that trope in the introduction to *Gun Fighter Nation* by showing that the frontier has always been a stand-in for America’s future—a metaphor for time as much as space (Slotkin 1-2).

history, the formation and progress of an untried political system, which separates us from the past and connects us with the future only” (426). This sentiment is certainly not unique to O’Sullivan, and like others—from Jefferson to Emerson and beyond—he implores Americans to stop imitating European examples because their Old World ideas are merely a hindrance to US growth and development. This ideology of the US as a nation of futurity works to erase the history of US colonization even as it happens by making America a past-less place imbued with ever-present newness. Within *The Squatter and the Don*, William Darrell signifies this mindset when he fails to heed his wife’s warning about repeating the past as he locates on the Alamar land grant. As Allen writes, “the very effort to resolve the paradox implicit in an ‘empire of liberty’ [...] set the stage for the translation of political affiliation away from space and toward time, toward a utopian horizon in the future where the nation’s contradictions would resolve themselves into a coherent republic” (23). But, I argue, the progressive, future-focused temporality offered by numerous US political, philosophical, and popular texts is itself a paradox—a disjuncture in time. The perpetually new America is an iteration of the modern temporality that Peter Osborne describes in *The Politics of Time*. He writes, “Modernity is a form of historical time which valorizes the new as the product of a constantly self-negating temporal dynamic” (Osborne xii). Osborne explains that modernity oscillates between two important definitions: a discrete epoch periodized as Modernity, and a description of ‘modern’ cultural practices that denote present time in contrast to old or previous time. The conundrum of perpetual newness within modernity and its unique permutation in US history and politics creates a number of temporal disjunctures, particularly if we understand modernity as a form of temporal colonization.

Indeed, the concept of Manifest Destiny is itself a future-focused temporal sleight of hand that places conquered peoples in the past at the same time that it tries to erase its past (and present) of violent conquest. Manifest Destiny is an important part of US ideology that works to make the future (Destiny) present (Manifest). While the ideology of Manifest Destiny promoted US colonization of what is now the western United States, it also erased the material reality of that colonization by making it a divinely ordained imperative rather than the result of social and political design. Writing about modernity's temporal construction of history as a linear progression of events, Walter Mignolo writes:

Of course history is based on what happened and not on what could have happened. Philosophy, though, is based on possible worlds and on always asking about the alternatives that have been left out by that which "really happened." In other words, "historical reality" is not only what happened but also the possibilities that the facts of what happened negate. (29)

Mignolo's critique of Modernity's linear progressive time as an exclusionary construction that disavows alternate possibilities is particularly interesting if we apply it to the US's ideology of Manifest Destiny, which excludes alternate possibilities for the future, not just the past. Manifest Destiny makes the future present by imagining future events as having already happened; indeed John O'Sullivan uses the word "already" nine times in "Annexation," the article that introduced the term Manifest Destiny, when he imagines both Texas and California as *already* "ours" in August of 1845 (5, 9).¹⁸ By constructing

¹⁸ As an alternative to Modernity's linear progressive time, Mignolo imagines history through structural, conceptual nodes. He writes, "Once you get out of the natural belief that history is a chronological succession of events progressing toward modernity and bring into the picture the spatiality and violence of colonialism, then modernity becomes entangled forever with coloniality in a spatial distribution of nodes whose place in history

the United States as always already new, nineteenth-century Anglo American authors make it the epitome of modernity. The linearity of modern time makes this US temporality both homogenous and exclusionary. The US progresses forever into the future as the newness of modernity's present is projected onto a future newness—the present of US Manifest Destiny onto a future of perpetual growth and expansion.

Cultures that do not share modernity's temporal consciousness are excluded from both the present and the future. This is the basis for social systems of coloniality that hierarchically categorize groups of people. Osborne writes, “in the context of colonial experience” cultures that exist at the same historical moment “are ordered diachronically to produce a scale of development which project[s] certain people's presents as other people's futures, at the level of [historical development] as a whole” (16-17). From Thomas Jefferson to Frederic Jackson Turner, Anglo Americans used anthropological theories of development to link geography and temporality through a narrative of development from a savage West to a civilized East. In an 1824 letter to William Ludlow, Jefferson described the United States as containing bands of progress from “the savages of the Rocky Mountains,” to “our own semi-barbarous citizens, the pioneers,” to “as yet, [the] most improved state in our seaport towns” explaining that “This, in fact, is equivalent to a survey, in time, of the progress of man from the infancy of creation to

is 'structural' rather than 'linear.' Further, since modernity and coloniality are two sides of the same coin, each node in addition to being structural and not linear, is heterogeneous and not homogenous” (48). Mignolo's temporal nodes are important for exploring the colonial ideology of linear progressive time, but I am not ready to commit to them as the sole or even the primary way to conceptualize time because they emphasize spatiality as the preferred way to conceptualize time and because I'm not certain there is a “best” way to imagine time and temporality. Instead, I use Mignolo's ideas about time as yet another vantage point from which to critique the linear, progressive, homogenous time of coloniality.

present day” (qtd. in Allen 40-1). Frederic Jackson Turner only solidified this idea in his 1893 Frontier Thesis when he claimed that the United States was “a huge page in the history of society” in which, “from West to East, we find the record of social evolution” (66). The popular nineteenth-century spatio-temporal hierarchy of races and cultures excludes colonized peoples from the US’s progressive, future-focused self-image by disavowing their existence, at least on a sociological level, in the present, much less the future.

The Squatter and the Don makes visible the material and the ideological processes of temporal colonization in late-nineteenth century California. The 1851 California Land Act worked to “unsettle” Californio land grants, as Ruiz de Burton puts it, so that the newly acquired territory could be “legally” colonized by white settlers. But this landscape of white settlers and accompanying industry also brought new conceptions of time to the region. While the railroads and other capitalist industries work to make time invisible and thus ubiquitous, Ruiz de Burton’s novelistic form highlights the constructed nature of time as it narrates a history of Californio decline. John-Michael Rivera has described Ruiz de Burton as “the first Mexican in the United States to write an English language novel” (2006, 82). This is important because it indicates Ruiz de Burton’s relation to US power structures as a writer in both English and Spanish, but also because the novel itself is a unique form with a unique ability to express time. Mikhail Bakhtin writes about forms of time in the novel, explaining that “Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible” (84). Bakhtin names these forms of time in the novel chronotopes, and while they combine time and space in a single image, he writes that “in literature the primary category in the chronotope is time” (85). By deploying

multiple forms of time in its narrative, Ruiz de Burton's novel is able to move across different ideological formations of time and explore their relations to political and economic power in the United States.

The novel also works to undermine hegemonic ideas of homogenous, empty time altogether. Just as towns throughout the US maintained distinct times based on their local solar meridians in the 1870s, the Alamars maintain a locally distinct temporality. Their temporality might be considered a network of times rather than a single hegemonic form of time. In this way, the Alamars are able to move across different ideological constructions of time in late-nineteenth-century California. To varying degrees members of the Alamar family construct time as spiritual, organic, and commercial. Measured, mechanical time had long been used in Spanish California by the mission system where mission bells were used to strictly regulate Indian labor. The bells were rung to signal prayer time, mealtime, and times set for various types of labor. Eulalia Pérez, an overseer at Mission San Gabriel, described her supervision of soap making, olive oil production, saddle making, sewing, and food distribution for neophytes in an 1877 interview with historian Thomas Savage (Beebe and Senkewicz 100-1). She outlined the schedule of Indian labor according to clock time explaining that girls at the mission would go to Mass and breakfast, then unload *carretas* until 11 o'clock, eat lunch at 1 o'clock, and work until sunset (Beebe and Senkewicz 107-8). Her description aptly characterizes the interconnection of spiritual time, organic time, and clock time because tasks were regulated by the clock but ended at sunset and included time specifically reserved for worship. Mission bells that dictated Indian activity were regulated by mechanical clocks, and the bells could be heard from a distance, creating a temporality

that was communal even for the *gente de razón* who were not subject to the mission's schedule but nonetheless heard its bells.¹⁹ The church calendar also created a temporality that was “full” in contrast to the scientific/industrial conception of “empty” time. The Catholic calendar of saint's days, as well as the Lenten season, Advent and Ordinary Time, creates a temporality of remembrance and connection across time where days are filled with spiritual and historical meaning. Likewise, Don Mariano's economic impulses stem from an understanding of the soil and climate that he has gained over time. He advises the newly arrived squatters to plant vineyards, olives and oranges—crops formerly grown by the missions—instead of wheat.

In addition to this already multiple, full, and communal time, Don Mariano embraces the individualistic mechanical time of US capitalism by wearing a watch. He examines it only once in the novel, during a snowstorm, and the events of this scene disclose a great deal about capitalism and mechanical time. Clarence Darrell has purchased the Alamars' cattle to keep them from being shot by Anglo American homesteaders attempting to “squat” on the Alamars' land. But, when some of the cattle wander back to the Alamar rancho, Don Mariano, Victoriano, and their vaqueros try to drive the cattle back to Clarence's mining operation where they will be used to feed the miners. In the middle of the night, a snowstorm envelops the men and the cattle they are driving. Don Mariano “sat up and looked around, but saw nothing. [...] He struck a light to look at his watch, for he had no idea what the hour might be. By the light he saw that

¹⁹ In *Telling Identities*, Rosaura Sánchez discusses the California missions as heterotopias that, through their multiple spaces, are “linked to all the other sites and yet outside of all places” because they “contained, countered, inverted, and represented all the other sites” (51). These multiple spaces were actually multiple time-spaces or chronotopes if we want to apply Bakhtin's literary term to lived experience. Even after secularization, the missions continued to structure the time-space of California.

his blankets seemed covered with flour” (278). The snow has obscured everything including Don Mariano’s sense of time. His spatial awareness is likewise affected when, the next day, he needs a pocket compass to find his way home (279). This scientific instrumentation is necessary because Don Mariano and his men have no natural cues to guide them. The snow creates a time-space that is blank and uniform. But, unlike the celebrated time of scientific and national progress, the blankness of the snow signals disorientation and devastation for a colonized people trying to embrace capitalist economies on uneven ground with their Anglo American colonizers. Don Mariano catches pneumonia, Victoriano’s legs are paralyzed, and most of the cattle die. While Don Mariano’s watch is a symbol of his status, it also signals the loss of other traditional temporal markers. The personal timepiece signifies a disconnection from communal and natural time and is only necessary in an alienating, blank landscape.

The squatters on the Alamars’ land also operate within a number of temporal constructions. They, too, depend on the land for their livelihood, but their form of time, like their crop system, is imported. As the harbingers of Manifest Destiny, the squatters epitomize the (erroneous) American desire to colonize the future. William Darrell exclaims in the opening chapter, “I had better take time by the forelock and get a good lot of land in the Alamar grant” (57). Darrell wants to control time by rushing headlong into the future where he projects himself as a prosperous farmer. This future focus impoverishes his understanding of the past as his genteel wife explains. Darrell had already staked claims on land in the Napa and Sonoma Valleys, putting a great deal of labor into a homestead only to have his claims rejected when the land under dispute was awarded to its original Californio owner. William tells his wife, “No use in crying over

spilt milk eh?” but she corrects him, “let us cry for the *spilt milk* by all means, if by doing so we can learn how to avoid spilling any more. [...] Much wisdom is learnt through tears, but none by forgetting our lessons” (italics original 55). But William Darrell cannot meaningfully remember the past because he believes there is no profit in it. His future focus is an economically motivated tool of colonization.

Later in the novel, Darrell becomes embroiled in the schemes of his fellow squatters to oust the Alamars from their land. The rest of the Darrell family is friendly with the Alamars and prefer to purchase the Alamar land outright. They call the room where William Darrell meets with fellow squatters “the colony [...] because the talk there is always about locating, or surveying, or fencing land—always land—as it would be in a new colony” (215). As the family becomes concerned with Darrell’s behavior, William Darrell himself becomes internally conflicted, yet he remains too proud to amend his behavior. As Darrell becomes more entrenched in his squatter behavior, mechanical time comes to disrupt his social interactions. Instead of spending time with his family, he smokes outside “like an overturned locomotive which had run off its track,” capturing the mechanical, though derailed motion of overturned progress in this moment. Later, unable to interact with his son Clarence, William Darrell responds by “not looking at anyone’s face excepting that of the clock on the chimney mantel” (216). While mechanistic time disrupts communal relations in this moment by replacing the faces of Darrell’s family with the clock’s face, its placement on the mantel also works to structure the domestic space by internalizing a national temporal economy within the family. Mantle clocks help coordinate family activities within (and subordinate them to) the frame of economic and nationalist temporalities.

Despite the Alamars' and the squatters' different networks of time, there is a sense in the novel that the two groups can coexist, especially if the squatters take Don Alamars' advice about planting different crops. As long as the squatters stop shooting the Alamars' cattle, their economic systems will be compatible, which is perhaps why Sánchez and Pita collapse both the squatters and the Don under the rubric of "Individual Entrepreneur" in their schema for the novel (1992, 27). Though adaptable and innovative, the Don's and the squatters' economic prosperity depends on the land and its corresponding rhythms of planting and cattle raising. Likewise, all of the San Diegans whose livelihood is dependent on land suffer at the hands of the railroad, the entity that, in contrast to William Darrell, really does control time within the novel.

Unlike *hacendados* and settlers, the Central Pacific Railroad is able to fully divorce its existence from organic time. It exists in the measured homogenous time of clocks. The temporality of the railroad is made up of "empty time" that can be scheduled and regulated like the empty pages of a date book. Maureen Perkins' discussion of British calendar reform is relevant to changing forms of time in the US. She writes:

In contrast with [...] earlier calendars, the modern calendar became increasingly a blank slate, representing the future rather than the past. It is this Lockean promise of a future onto which any intentions may be inscribed that is key to understanding changes in the role of calendars during the nineteenth century (29).

Forms of reckoning time like almanacs and books of saint's days that were filled with content from the past were slowly replaced by calendars with empty, blank space for

recording and coordinating future plans and schedules.²⁰ The railroad system's future focus also reveals its investment in the idea of progress and its emphasis on forward motion. The hegemony of railroad time is most apparent in the novel when Don Mariano, Mr. Holman, and Mr. Mechlin go to San Francisco to speak with Governor Stanford about the possibility of a rail line extending to San Diego. After forcing the visitors to wait two hours, Stanford tells them, "I [...] can only give you half an hour." When Stanford finally responds clearly to the men's question, he tells them, "No, perhaps for the present San Diego will *not* have a railroad," and they ask him, "What do you call *for the present?* How long?" (italics original 291). These actions demonstrate that Stanford, and by extension the railroad, is in control of time. He defines the time of their interaction and the very structure of the present for San Diegans. Stanford also repeatedly looks at his watch during the meeting. As he regulates and controls time, Stanford looks to an external chronometer, as if his watch is actually the regulatory device ticking away and dictating his schedule. These moves shore up both the irony and the hegemony of railroad time, particularly when we remember that Stanford's watch is set to a standardized time implemented by the railroad company itself. The duration of the "present" in which Stanford denies San Diego a rail line is actually forever. This eternal present parallels and inverts the perpetual newness of modernity for Californios. The scene indicates that Stanford controls duration—"How long?"—at the same time that it demonstrates the way Californios were denied presence within a US industrial economy.

²⁰ Blank calendars were and still are often distributed by commercial industries and include advertisements in the margins, which encourage people to spend their money as they contemplate how to spend their time.

The railroad's temporality is made possible by its economic disconnection from any religious, natural, or cyclical time. At one point, Stanford tells Mr. Holman, "you see we are not engaged in the fruit growing business. We build railroads to transport freight and passengers. We do not care what or who makes the freights we carry" (290). Even Stanford's grammatical privileging of the word "what" before "who" in this last sentence emphasizes that the economy of the railroad is reified and mechanized. It all runs on standard time. Forced into this homogenous, measured form of time, Mr. Holman later responds, "much as we would like to await your pleasure, we cannot arrest the march of time. Time goes on, and as it slips by, ruin approaches us" (292). In this way, the US railroad monopolists' economic colonization of California depends as much on their control of time as it does on their control of space. Whereas in the older economic system, Mariano and his Anglo neighbors might have weathered difficult financial times by awaiting the next season, when their crops would be better or their cattle more plentiful, the constant forward movement of time within the new industrial capitalist system allows them no recovery. It is, in fact, their heavy investment *in land* that damns them because their land is worthless in a capitalist economy without the presence of a railroad.

The Squatter and the Don works to disrupt the spatio-temporal sociological grid of the United States by emphasizing the physical and the temporal presence of Californios in 1870s and 80s California. Though *The Squatter and the Don* has been described repeatedly as a historical novel, Ruiz de Burton's "Novel of Contemporary Occurrences in California" is so contemporary that it discusses texts published in the very

year of the novel's own publication.²¹ Set 1872-1877, it also references letters exchanged between Collis Huntington and David Colton that detail how the big four railroad magnates bribed Washington politicians during the 1870s, which only came to light during a lawsuit that lasted from 1883-1885.²² While highlighting Californio actions and experiences in the present, *The Squatter and the Don* also unravels the temporal chicanery of Manifest Destiny by holding Anglo Americans and the US Congress accountable for their actions in the present.

The novel narrates a history of US injustice against Californios in what Lene M. Johannessen calls “a pedagogical subtext” that “targets an Anglo American audience” (73). This subtext reveals the inner workings of Manifest Destiny's temporal logic. After a lengthy discussion with Clarence about the abuse of land laws that has led to the dispossession of Californio elites, Don Mariano says:

I am afraid there is no remedy for us native Californians. We must sadly fade and pass away. The weak and helpless are always trampled in the throng. We must sink, go under, never to rise. If Americans had been friendly to us, and helped us

²¹ Sánchez and Pita describe the novel as a historical romance on the first page of their introduction to the 1992 republication. So too does Ana Castillo in her introduction to her introduction to the 2004 Modern Library Edition of the book. Anne Goldman also calls the novel a historical romance in her article about Ruiz de Burton's other novel *Who Would Have Thought It?* While *The Squatter and the Don* ends in 1877, 8 years before its publication date, its emphasis on “Contemporary Events” places it, in my opinion, outside the genre of historical romance. Instead, I believe twentieth and twenty-first-century scholars are reading it as a historical romance for their own time. The novel is thus not Ruiz de Burton's historical romance, but Chicana/o Studies' historical romance.

²² These letters were published in a pamphlet titled *How Congressmen are Bribed, The Colton Letters: Declaration of Huntington that Congressmen are for Sale*. The publication date and the printer are unknown, but it was published near the end of the nineteenth-century, sometime after 1888. A full, digitized copy is available through the *California Digital Library*.

with good, protective laws, our fate would have been different. But to legislate us into poverty is to legislate us into our graves. (165)

The beginning of this statement parallels Anglo American imperialist nostalgia.²³ The temporal logic of imperialist nostalgia, like modernist scales of social evolution, places a colonized group of people so far in the past that they figuratively disappear from the present. And, as with Manifest Destiny, imperialist nostalgia imagines a colonized people's demise as fated and imminent. This form of representation was, again, most frequently used in nineteenth-century American literature to describe Indians, but it is part of a larger trope that positions conquered peoples as belonging to the past and conquering Anglo Americans or Western Europeans as harbingers of the future.

As the “weak and helpless” Californios sink, “never to rise again,” Don Mariano plays to the trope of imperialist nostalgia by softening an image of social Darwinism through the romance of loss. Rhetorically, imperialist nostalgia absolves colonizers of their responsibility for the violence of colonization by depicting the demise of colonized people as natural and fated, ignoring the realities of genocide and political and economic oppression. The second half of Don Mariano's statement, however, exposes the workings of imperialist nostalgia by squarely placing the blame for Mexican American disenfranchisement on US legislators. It is not Californios' manifest destiny to disappear in the wake of US colonization, but rather, the specific design of US law to dispossess Californios of their land and force them into poverty. Don Mariano's discourse

²³ I draw on Renato Rosaldo's notion of imperialist nostalgia here and apply it to late nineteenth-century US writings of the Southwest. One of the best examples is perhaps Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona*, with which *The Squatter and the Don* has been compared repeatedly. See Jesse Alemán (2002), Anne Goldman, John Morán González (2010), Margaret D. Jacobs, and David Luis-Brown.

simultaneously acknowledges and refutes the rhetoric of US Western expansion. He revokes the epistemology of US Manifest Destiny as a fated, divinely ordained process, and places the process of US Western Expansion squarely in the realm of human political action. More importantly, these actions occur not in the past or in the divinely ordained future, but in the present with very real, physical and material consequences for Californios. The pedagogical element works to correct the devastating temporal disjuncture by demonstrating that the “destined” Californio demise was, and still is, preventable.

The real problem for Californios is the marriage of Manifest Destiny’s social ideology with capitalist production’s manipulation of time. Indeed, as Perkins explains, “progress, particularly in its technological form, is constantly held up in society as the justification for the advancement of capitalism” (4). The novel details capitalism’s commodification of all realms of life and its transformation of time—including the time of social or political interaction—into an exchange value that can be manipulated by political and economic powers even as it is held up as an external and equalizing resource (i.e. everyone has the same number of hours in a day). Interestingly, this capitalist hegemony is most visible in the novel’s apparent hero. Clarence Darrell, the character most adept at using capitalist financial structures to his own advantage, is able to profit from empty homogenous time, not by creating it, but by manipulating it. In contrast to the squatters, the Alamars and the Mechlins, Clarence Darrell’s economic transactions leave him unscathed by the homogenous, empty time that railroads helped to create and which they symbolize in the novel. Clarence thrives in a global financial economy by dominating the stock market. He succeeds by, literally, trading in futures. While the

railroad is able to divest the Alamars' and the squatters' land of its value by excluding them from the circuit of transportation and exchange of goods, Clarence manages to bypass this problem by focusing on the exchange value of goods, rather than their more spatially dependent use value.

In "Technology and Ideology: The Case of the Telegraph," James W. Carey describes how telegraphs reorganized commodity markets and altered "the ways in which time and space were understood in ordinary human affairs" (312). Capitalist trade was originally based on arbitrage—buying goods in one place, transporting them, and then selling in a place where prices were higher. If the resale profit was greater than the cost of transportation, then the arbitrage trader made a profit. As Carey points out, arbitrage is based in space because prices depend on location and transportation. The railroads equalized this trade system by making transportation fast and cheap, reducing the difference in regional prices throughout the nation. In *The Squatter and the Don*, the railroad controls this system entirely by reshaping space through the access it grants or denies to different regions—hence San Diego's investment in building the Texas Pacific Railroad in the first place. But, while the railroad reduces regional price differences, it still operates in a system of trade dependent on space. In contrast, communication technologies like the telegraph make communication virtually instantaneous and thus, as Carey writes, "It shifts speculation from space to time, from arbitrage to futures" (315). He goes on to say, "In a certain sense, the telegraph invented the future as a new zone of uncertainty and a new region of practical action" (Carey 316). The shift to an economy based in time rather than space corresponds to the rise of investment capitalism made

possible by new communication technology.²⁴ Clarence makes the correlation apparent as he utilizes the telegraph to communicate with his broker Hubert Haverly, who likewise utilizes the telegraph to trade Clarence's money.

While futures trading existed before the invention of the telegraph, Carey's point is that the futures market expanded exponentially after the telegraph's arrival because the new technology allowed "symbols to move independently of geography and physical identity" (313). Trading in stock futures contributes to the separation of a good's monetary value from its use value, from its location, and from its physical existence altogether. The temporality of Clarence's economic exchange is both dependent on and exterior to the homogenous progressive time created by railroad monopolists. His trading is marked by simultaneity in which the future exists for speculation in the present and actions are often non-linear—where, as Carey writes, "The futures trader often sells before he buys or buys and sells simultaneously" (317). This is the financial realm in which Clarence acts and in which he makes his millions. Unlike William Darrell, who erroneously imagines his future prosperity without understanding the past, Clarence's economic system calls for a consideration of multiple temporal networks at once. This is what makes Clarence paradoxically both the liberator and the oppressor of the novel. He is able to move across different temporalities, but he uses that ability for personal financial gain. His speculation is the ultimate commodification of time. By the novel's close, every significant character has become dependent on Clarence and his money.

Mercedes Alamar marries Clarence, and they bring her mother and sisters to San

²⁴ The communications-based economy becomes even more prevalent with the use of the telephone, a device that does not exist in the time of the novel, but which the narrator references in chapter II, imagining a telephone wire connecting Don Mariano's house with Darrell's Alameda house where both men were discussing the Alamars' land.

Francisco with them. Gabriel, Victoriano, and George all depend on Clarence's plan to open a bank in San Francisco where they will work as tellers, and Clarence purchases the Alamars' land and the Darrells' Alameda homestead.

As the key to *The Squatter and the Don*'s romantic resolution, Clarence Darrell is both seductive and dangerous. Jesse Alemán points out that, "the immateriality of Clarence's material possessions highlights perhaps the most profound form of narrative amnesia: the novel tries to forget that Clarence is an Anglo profiting from Manifest Destiny" (2002, 69). In the end, Clarence buys all of the Alamars' land for four dollars an acre, even though it is "a high price for land in this country" because he can afford to wait for land prices to rise and "double the price paid" (332). The money from this sale will allow Gabriel Alamar to invest in Clarence's San Francisco bank as a partner. Thus Clarence profits doubly from San Diego's decline as Gabriel basically reinvests Clarence's money back into their bank venture. Clarence's ability to work outside the realm of linear progressive time, or, more accurately, his ability to make linear progressive time work on his behalf, sets him up as a possible avatar, a projection of Ruiz de Burton's own desire for capitalist financial gain. After all, the Burtons did participate in capitalist ventures, and after her husband's death, Ruiz de Burton continued to seek investment capital for the development of her land in Baja California (though she was not particularly successful). In *Conflicts of Interest*, Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita explain, "the nineteenth century opened up new venues [to amass wealth], like speculation [...] and an increase in the circulation of fictive capital [...] In their own small way, the Burtons accessed this world of speculation" (2001, 223). Thus Clarence's financial success may symbolize what the author could have achieved if not

for gender and racial constraints. Clarence's business savvy within the novel indicates Ruiz de Burton's own economic adroitness and, more importantly, her capacity to think and move outside of linear progressive time.

On the other hand, Clarence's manipulation of linear time signifies something more sinister in the way that it produces economic dependence for the Alamars. In 1962, Ernest Mandel reexamined Marx's theories of economic development from precapitalist to semi-capitalist to capitalist society in order to account for the uneven global economic development produced through Western imperialism. He explains that:

Capitalism itself produces under-development (of countries, regions, economic and industrial sectors). ... The development of capitalism is also the development of under-development. Capitalism is the dialectical unity of development and under-development, in which one necessarily determines the other. (Mandel trans. and qtd. in Stutje 181)²⁵

In this way, economic development becomes the material counterpart to theoretical models of social development. While ideas like Manifest Destiny relegate colonized peoples to the sociological past, capitalist "development" relegates them to poverty in the present. Though Sánchez and Pita discuss three modes of economy in their introduction to the 1992 edition of *The Squatter and the Don*—the feudal aristocracy of pre-1848 California, the individual capitalism of the squatters/settlers, and the monopoly capitalism of the railroad—it is important to imagine Clarence Darrell as marking the emergence of late capitalism. Even though he is a character of the 1880s, he signifies an international

²⁵ Mandel's *Traité d'économie marxiste*, was translated into English in its entirety in 1968 by Brian Pearce, but I especially like Stutje's translation of this passage from the original French version, which is why I use it instead.

flow of capital through his investment in the stock market and his travels to Mexico, South American and Europe. Late capitalism is also a neo-colonial form of economy, hence its production of economic dependence and underdevelopment.²⁶ While the railroad monopoly produces an underdeveloped San Diego as the inadvertent result of its market hoarding, Clarence's financial growth *depends* on that underdevelopment. The impoverished land value in San Diego allows him to buy large tracts and the impoverished Californios become his "partners," both economically and romantically.

I should emphasize that even though the temporality of late capitalism posits a non-linear simultaneity of stock purchase and speculation in contrast to the linear, progressive time of industrial capitalism, it does require temporal homogeneity. Futures speculation necessitates a standardized and abstracted sense of time in order to make predictions about the market. Discussing forms of time in market fluctuation and growth, William H. Sewell explains that, "[n]o other institutional complex in the history of the world has pivoted so much on a process of universal abstraction as has capitalism" (533). While railroads may have created standardized time zones to avoid train wrecks, stock markets were equally dependent on this synchronized time system to coordinate financial speculation and futures trading. Clarence's capitalist transactions deepen, rather than overturn the grip of homogenous time on social structures within the novel. Again Sewell cogently explains the capitalist logic of expansion: "there is a clear secular tendency for capitalist logics to spread over an ever wider range of activities and to ever-greater psychic depths of social existence. The imagination, the personality, the family

²⁶ Other markers of late capitalism are government intervenient in economic development, international arms trade, increasingly globalized markets, multinational corporations, and the fluid movement of capital.

and affective relations are increasingly subjected to capitalist logics” (523). This expansion created a temporal economy in which people were valued according to the way that they spent their time: morally, financially, physically, socially, and so on. According to *The Squatter and the Don*, however, the transcendental signifier for the US was money, and the abstraction of the market put a price on both political influence and human life.

One of the most overt threats of colonization in the novel is Gabriel Alamar’s descent into wage labor. While Clarence is absent, Gabriel loses his position as a teller at a San Francisco bank (not the bank Clarence proposes they open together). Gabriel is unable to find more “gentlemanly work” because of prejudice against “Spanish Californians” and works as a bricklayer for \$2 a day. Thus, his body and its labor-power become regulated by mechanical time. His reification and commodification come to a head when he is crushed by a hod full of bricks. While traveling to the hospital, Gabriel must wait for a procession of wealthy socialites to pass on their way to a reception in Nob Hill. Unknowingly, George and Clarence comment on the scene from a carriage on the other side of the procession telling their driver that the sick passenger they see should be allowed to pass the procession; ““Yes sir; but he is a hod carrier who fell down and hurt himself. I suppose he’ll die before he gets to the hospital’ said the driver indifferently as if a hod carrier was more or less of no consequence. ‘The [socialites’] carriages must pass first the police says’” (321). The scene discredits any egalitarian representations of homogenous time—the idea that we all have the same twenty-four hours in a day—to show that the commodification of time supports and structures inequality, a situation where the minutes it takes for a wealthy socialite to cross the street are valued above the

minutes needed to save a day laborer's fleeting life. The scene at the intersection is, in fact, an intersection of different temporalities. While the socialites' time halts both Clarence and Gabriel's movement, Gabriel is stuck inside this stasis whereas Clarence's stasis is a moment of observation. He is looking and commenting during the traffic stop, and as soon as he recognizes Lizzie and Gabriel, he commences motion by leaving his carriage and walking over to Gabriel. Also important is the fact that the police, the symbol par excellence of state authority, enforce the temporal differential between laborer and capitalist. The fear of Californio proletarianization that the novel belies is a fear of falling into a particular temporality where economic manipulation devalues both their land and their time.

Equally dangerous is capitalism's infiltration of the political sphere. The novel incorporates a number of legal documents into its presentation of California history, including the 1851 Land Law and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, as well as court evidence from the Colton case mentioned earlier. It also creates fictional legal documents in a tragicomic episode where corrupt lawyer, Peter Roper, and squatter, John Gasbang, buy a false land claim from Charles Hogsden and take over the Mechlin house. Jesse Alemán notes that the use of legal documents in the novel works dialogically: "In the process of legitimating the narrative's historical critique, it de-legitimizes the social function of legal rhetoric in general by emphasizing its pliability as a fictional discourse" (2000, 45). This pliability is specifically a temporal pliability. Just as Clarence's economy involves bending time, (like selling stock before buying it), legal actions throughout the novel remake the past for the sake of Anglo American profit. Don

Mariano and Clarence both refer to the 1851 Land Act as “retroactive” law (65, 97).²⁷ Speaking to George Mechlin, Don Mariano says “How could Mexico have foreseen then that when scarcely half a dozen years should have elapsed, the trusted conquerors would, ‘*In Congress Assembled,*’ pass laws which were to be retroactive upon the defenseless helpless conquered people in order to despoil them (65). Likewise, Gasbang and Roper steal the Mechlin house by claiming that it was part of a claim staked by Charles Hogsden and they “deny that in the year of 1873, or at any other time before of after that date [...] the said James Mechlin ever purchased [...] the aforesaid property [...] ever built a house, or planted trees or resided on said property” (313).

These legal actions undermine the US justice system by exposing the failure of its temporal economy. The temporal structure, or temporal economy, of the US legal system works through a process of dialectical resolution, where past injustices are corrected by new laws, where unlawful action is addressed with retribution (punishment) or restitution (financial compensation), and where social justice increases over time as a form of progress that mirrors the technological progress of private industry. *The Squatter and the Don* exposes the failure of this legal system as it becomes entangled in the capitalist economy where money can buy votes and court rulings, but it also goes beyond critiquing the specific system of US laws to critique the fundamental premise of a temporal economy. It brings into question the possibility of justice in a linear time of judicial progress, because law does not act linearly. In the case of Californios, it acts

²⁷ The 1851 Land Act forced Californios to legitimate their land holdings in US courts, where long-standing ownership was often not recognized, or lengthy litigation process drained Californio land owners of their financial resources, forcing them to mortgage their land anyway.

retroactively, not just to take their land but to claim that it was never Californio land in the first place.

The novel emphasizes the inadequacy of US social justice by invoking Herbert Spencer, the late-nineteenth-century philosopher, sociologist and political theorist, as a counter to laissez faire capitalism of the railroad barons and their political puppets.²⁸ This move may seem odd because Spencer is frequently associated with ideas of social Darwinism and is perhaps best known for coining the phrase “survival of the fittest.” But, in the nineteenth century, he was equally known for theorizing the greatest good for the most people, and in the novel, the temporality of his ethics undermines and corrects the ever-expanding homogeneity of unchecked capitalism. In the latter half of the nineteenth century “more than any one else, it was Spencer who was associated with the idea that evolution was an intrinsically moral force; it was he who advanced perhaps the most influential nineteenth-century system of evolutionary ethics” (Moore 4). Spencer believed that biological evolution continued as social evolution where humans adapted to complex social environments to produce the greatest good for the most people. He explained that social evolution would reach an end point where the “ideally moral man” would achieve “equal freedom and eternal piece, upheld by harmonious cooperation of all members of a society,” where “organic and moral behavior are one and the same thing” (Moore 5). Not only is social justice quantifiable as the *most* good, but also progress is teleological with a specific end point of total social harmony. For Spencer

²⁸ Characters also repeatedly invoke Carlyle and even Emerson is mentioned in the conclusion. Carlyle seems to be relevant for the text mostly due to his theory of heroes. These references highlight Ruiz de Burton’s engagement in multiple social philosophical discourses and again reveal both her privileged socioeconomic and her ability to move across different discourses and their corresponding ideological formations.

and for the moral characters of *The Squatter and the Don*, progress must lead to something, to an end point that signals the arrival of justice. In contrast, capitalism has an open temporality where its only aim is to reproduce itself indefinitely. This self-perpetuation is likewise reflected in US ideas of national progress. Maureen Perkins explains, “there is no real contradiction between a nation obsessed with the future and one quite sure that the future would resemble nothing so much as the present” (39). But Spencer’s ideal is a failure within the novel. The US projection of progress through linear homogenous time is a cover for the way that political and economic systems manipulate abstract homogenous time to make it anything but linear, with retroactive laws and a development of underdevelopment.

The Spencerian conception of evolution also shapes the novel’s Naturalist tendencies. It would seem, perhaps, that Californios *are* biologically determined to decline in the novel, as the Alamar men suffer repeatedly from death and injury, unable to adapt to the new Anglo American social system. However, the Alamar men suffer, not from their own inability to adapt, but from the moral devolution of monopoly capitalism—the failure of Spencerian evolution as a theory of social development. In their meeting with Gov. Stanford, Mr. Mechlin says:

Mr. Herbert Spencer also, in elucidating his principles, reminds us of the fact that ‘Misery is the highway to *death*, while happiness is added life, and the giver of life.’ Think of this Governor. Surely, you do not wish to make us so miserable that you cause *death*! Yes, death from poverty and despair. [...] (296)

But Don Alamar does die from poverty and despair, making Spencer a false profit rather than a practicable guide.

Allegorically, Clarence's wealth and union with Mercedes represents one possible Californio response to the US colonization of California. While the novel contests the material loss of Californio land, it also argues for the continuation of Californio status through its insistence that Californio elites are racially white. As Alemán writes, "the novel ultimately argues for a new Californio coloniality, one that consolidates Californio whiteness with the whiteness of refined Northerners" (2002, 67). A number of scholars have discussed the problematics of Ruiz de Burton's insistence on Californio whiteness, particularly in relation to the novel's initial recovery as a resistance text.²⁹ However, even as the novel makes a claim for Californio whiteness, it recognizes the historical impossibility of successful consolidation. Elvira Alamar's husband George Mechlin is shot in the hip by a squatter; Lizzie Mechlin's husband, Gabriel Alamar, is crushed by a hod full of bricks; and Alice Darrell's sweetheart, Victoriano Alamar, loses the use of his legs during the snow storm. The three men in these allegorical consolidations of Anglo and Californio whiteness live, but all are crippled. John Morán González reads their relation to Clarence's banking business as a permutation of Californios' claim to whiteness, explaining:

if by the novel's close Gabriel Alamar no longer can claim the patriarchal inheritance of the rancho as the eldest son of Don Mariano, as a banker he no longer must work as a hod carrier either. [...] Gabriel is able to convert a renewed class status into "whiteness," and "whiteness" into "white-collar." (2010, 100)

But again, Clarence creates a system of dependence, as he alone becomes the path to whiteness and white-collar existence for all the Alamars. Even though the Alamar men

²⁹ See, for example, José Aranda (1998), John Morán González (2010), and Jesse Alemán (2002)

escape the kind of wage labor time-scheme that Gabriel faced, as members of the white-collar, professional class they will form a deeply internalized sense of empty homogenous time that must be scheduled and regulated. Their proximity to Clarence's wealth as bank tellers will not grant them access to his form of economy or his temporality. Within the system of debt peonage that Californio elites had controlled before the US invasion, Mexican patriarchs largely dictated the activities and thus the temporality of their families and their *peones* described as "Indians" in the novel. The inheritance that Gabriel loses, then, is more than land and money. It is the ability to maintain his own sense of time and to control others'.

Instead, the new Anglo American economy leaves Californios crushed by time just as Gabriel is crushed by his hod full of bricks. The novel's recovery has emphasized Ruiz de Burton's narrative interjection "In that hod full of bricks not only his own sad experience was represented, but the *entire history* of the native Californians of *Spanish descent* was epitomized" (italics original 325). If the hod represents history, then it is history that crushes elite Californios, namely the history created by Anglo Americans who "[say] that the native Spaniards are lazy and stupid and thriftless" (Ruiz de Burton 1992, 325). Excluded from the temporality of American progress, Californios are forced to inhabit the temporality assigned to them by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, "in the mean time." While the treaty claimed that "in the mean time" Mexican Americans would be "maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and their property," Gabriel Alamar exposes what this temporality actually meant for Californios (Griswold del Castillo 190). Lizzie repeatedly urges Gabriel to stop working as a mason because Clarence will come for them soon, but he tells her, "Yes, but *in the mean time* I

must earn enough to pay our board” (italics mine 320). Their existence *in the mean time* excludes Californios from US linear progress, but it also situates them outside of US time and thus in a position to critique it and imagine alternate possibilities even if—unlike Clarence and George at the intersection of carriages—they cannot fully act out those alternate possibilities.

Unable to counter the temporal colonization of California in the time of the novel, Californios’ only recourse is to wait. The last lines of the novel’s conclusion tell us that as long as legislators ignore the will of those they legislate, “we shall—as Channing said—‘kiss the foot that tramples us!’ and ‘in anguish of spirit’ must wait for a Redeemer who will emancipate the white slaves of California” (344). Despite Clarence’s appearance in the text as the Alamar’s rescuer, the novel’s closing comments indicate that he (and his corresponding temporality) is not, after all, the Redeemer that Californios need. While the text clearly has specific designs on the future by imagining it through a particular raced and classed lens, it nonetheless defers justice into an unknown and unknowable future time. This future is not merely a projection of the present, a ‘future present,’ so to speak, but a radically different time, outside the bounds of linear progress, which disrupts a temporal economy of restitution in the present.

This disruption has also been a disruption of textual recovery. *The Squatter and the Don*’s initial recovery by Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita as a contestatory novel works to situate the text in a similar temporal economy of justice where the novel’s recovery works to restore what was lost in the colonial process of historical erasure. Sánchez and Pita express this succinctly in their introduction to the novel when they write, “The exclusionary dynamics of hegemonic culture erase minority discourses,

silence denunciatory voices and leave tremendous lacunae in the history of marginalized groups that recovery projects and research are today compelled to fill” (1992, 48). The problem is that recovered texts are never univocal or purely contestatory. Ruiz de Burton was an elite Californiana who had significant social and political influence and who was clearly invested in classifying Californios as racially white. Indeed, Sánchez and Pita enacted their own interesting form of temporal manipulation when they recovered Ruiz de Burton’s second novel, *The Squatter and the Don*, before her first novel, *Who Would have Thought It?*, which is a much more problematic novel for literary recovery aimed at finding texts that ‘interpolate today’s readers’ (Sánchez and Pita 1992, 49).³⁰

In fact, the recovery of *The Squatter and the Don* was not just a recovery of the novel but also a recovery of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton’s personage. Though Sánchez and Pita went on to recover Ruiz de Burton’s first novel and her personal correspondence, *The Squatter and the Don* structured academic conversations about the author because it was the text through which scholars initially read her. When Ruiz de Burton’s first novel, *Who Would Have Thought It?* was recovered in 1995, it was necessarily contextualized by the second novel. Even though scholars clearly recognized that *The Squatter and the Don*, published thirteen years after *Who Would Have Thought It?*, could not have shaped the first novel, their own critical conversation was already

³⁰ *Who Would Have Thought It?* is set in New England during the Civil War. That novel’s Mexican American heroine, Lola Medina, is surrounded and overshadowed by the New Englanders who both rescue her and try to steal her inheritance. Mexican American whiteness, is also even more important for that text than for *The Squatter and the Don* as Lola’s skin is dyed black by Indian captors and slowly fades throughout the narrative. The novel’s main thrust is a critique of US politics through various characters’ involvement in the Civil War and the New Englanders’ greedy attempts to steal Lola’s money.

shaped by the novels' reverse recovery.³¹ Scholars like José Aranda and Jesse Alemán have done much to trouble Sánchez and Pita's assessment that situates Ruiz de Burton's work as subaltern or anticipatory of a proletarian Chicana/o subject in the introduction to *The Squatter and the Don*. Aranda writes, "Ruiz de Burton serves as an object lesson in the complexities and contradictions in reconstructing literary history" and he instead attempts to recover "the complexities and idiosyncrasies of her text" (1998, 554). Nevertheless, later scholars' critique of an anachronistic subaltern Chicana paradigm for Ruiz de Burton and *The Squatter and the Don* cannot reverse the order of textual recovery and the way that it structured critical reception of Ruiz de Burton's work.

These complexities and idiosyncrasies of *The Squatter and the Don* stem, in part, from the heterogeneous literary inheritance that Ruiz de Burton has left us and from the disjointed time of her texts' construction. Writing about Jovita González's novel *Caballero*, Marissa López asks readers to consider "What constitutes a resistant narrative and how is it different from a narrative of resistance?" (121). Though Ruiz de Burton's novel is at times a narrative of resistance—in its narrative digressions lambasting Congress' political corruption and railroad capitalists' moral bankruptcy—it is also and more fundamentally a resistant narrative. Its narrative form disrupts the ideology of linear progressive time, which is consequently the very temporality that shapes

³¹ There is an interesting error on the back cover of Arté Publico's recovered edition of *Who Would Have Thought It?* The cover reads, "As in her first novel, *The Squatter and the Don* (1885), Ruiz de Burton reserves critical barbs for corruption in government and United states expansion" ... "However, it is in the recasting of the conventional novel of domesticity that *Who Would Have Thought It?* also addresses the disenfranchisement of women." The mistake of calling *The Squatter and the Don* her first novel is notable, but so too is the logical structure of "However" that takes the *Squatter and the Don* as the critical starting point for analysis of *Who Would Have Thought It?* I would like to thank Jesse Alemán for pointing out this interesting error to me.

contestation within modern paradigms of reparation, restitution, and historical revision.

This form of time is perhaps “the monster who has not ceased to be victorious” that holds sway over *contemporary* readers of all periods in US modernity’s colonized time

(Sánchez and Pita 1992, 49).

[Invention] reflects the critical perspective of those who have been left behind, who are expected to follow the ascending progress of a history to which they have the feeling of not belonging.

Colonization of being is nothing else than producing the idea that certain people do not belong to history—that they are non-beings.

-Walter Dignolo *The Idea of Latin America*

Chapter 2

“In the Mean Time”: Progress as Presence in the Writing of Miguel Antonio Otero

In many ways, Miguel Antonio Otero, Nuevomexicano governor from 1897-1906, embodies the political and economic enfranchisement that the Alamars of *The Squatter and the Don* seek throughout Ruiz de Burton’s novel. He was a socialite and a politician, the son of an elite Nuevomexicano and a Southern belle, and his father was successful in bringing the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad to New Mexico. His family’s business and political success rested on the kind of racial and power consolidation between elite Hispanos and Anglos that the Mechlins and Alamars are unable to enact in *The Squatter and the Don*. Through him, we might imagine what Gabriel and Lizzie’s life could have been had the railroad arrived in San Diego. In his literary and political writing, Otero emphasized New Mexico’s participation in US modernity, and he presented himself as a key figure in modernizing the territory. Yet Otero was also a strong critic of the US federal government and its territorial system. As the first Nuevomexicano governor appointed to New Mexico territory, he was faced with

addressing the political disenfranchisement of thousands of people who had been denied statehood for over sixty years. Throughout his governorship, he relied heavily on the rhetoric of progress, which should come as no surprise since much of his appointment was during what has come to be known as the Progressive Era in American politics. Like Ruiz de Burton, Otero's writing demonstrates an understanding of the oppressive colonial nature of US progress and modernity. But, instead of directly contesting the dominant US rhetoric of political and economic progress, Otero's writing refashions and deploys the language of progress to disrupt US spatial and sociological hierarchies of development. Reading the temporal dimensions of his work reveals the interplay of the US's conquest of time and Otero's own politics of progress and modernity. Both his writing and his politics fought to assert the presence of Nuevomexicanos and thus their national belonging within US forms of time. Yet he was never fully able to place New Mexico within US modernity because, despite the United States' changing spatial orientation, its temporality continued to structurally exclude colonized ethnic subjects from participating in progress.

The nation's spatio-temporal structure was undergoing change during Otero's political career, and this reconfiguration was important to his own constructions of time for New Mexico. The massive Western (spatial) expansion of the nineteenth century was coming to an end, and the US practice of empire building was also undergoing change. If, as Thomas M. Allen asserts, spatial expansion was a trope for US expansion into the future in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, then the end of that spatial expansion forced a reworking of tropes about US progress. New tropes of progress stressed a restructuring of the present rather than unchecked expansion into the future. Frederic

Jackson Turner's 1893 Frontier Thesis described US historical development across space as a map of sociological progress from West to East, but it also signaled the end of that spatio-temporal construction since Turner began by declaring the frontier "closed." At this time, US political focus shifted to incorporating western territory into the national body politic via industrialization and the political participation of statehood. This process was complementary to the Progressive Era's wide variety of diverse social and political movements focused on the systematic organization and bureaucratization of government, which entailed increased federal and state regulation. In this way, *progress* was refigured as reform rather than expansion.

This transition appeared as an opportunity to Otero. His spatial position as a Nuevomexicano in conquered Mexican territory excluded him from participation in progress as expansion. However, Progressive Era politics gave him a platform for espousing the rhetoric of reform as a means of progress for New Mexico and the US.³² Otero's first speech in New Mexico after his appointment as governor promised his "earnest effort to have a sound, honest, and firm business administration," which signaled his goal to reform political corruption in the territory (1939, 300). In his second inaugural speech, Otero boasted of his first term, "Each year shows a decided improvement and advance" (1940, 387). His emphasis on forward movement and improvement through time led him to optimistically predict the incorporation of New Mexico as a state before the end of his second term in the same speech. As his second

³² Otero *does* present himself as a settler of the West in volume one of his autobiography, and thus a participant in US expansion to some degree, but his participation is rhetorical rather than literal. For a more thorough description of his literary maneuvers in that text see: Juan Bruce-Novoa, "Offshoring the American Dream;" and Erin Murrah-Mandril, "Autobiographical Politics in the Contact Zone: Miguel Antonio Otero's *My Life on the Frontier*."

term continued without New Mexico's admission, however, Otero began to see US progress as a practice of exclusion rather than a strategy of advancement for New Mexico.

In fact, the Progressive Era's reform marked a re-figuration of modernity's colonial temporality rather than a transformation of its oppressive and racist uses of time. Peter Osborne distinguishes modernity, modernization, and modernism as three distinct yet interrelated concepts with their own ideological underpinnings. *Modernity* is a "category of historical periodization [...] the first and only age that understood itself as an epoch and, in so doing, simultaneously created the other epochs" (Osborne 9, 11). Modernity is specifically and paradoxically an epoch of the present.³³ *Modernization*, in contrast, is a process of development with roots in European and Euro-American economic and sociological expectations. For Osborne, modernization "provide[s] a content to fill the form of the modern, to give it something more than an abstract temporal determinacy" (17). *Modernism* is the "affirmative," and I would add, often celebratory "cultural self-consciousness" of modernity as well as "an aesthetization of modernity" (Osborne 23, 12). In this system, Otero's attempts to *modernize* New Mexico in order to meet Anglo American social and economic demands never admitted him or New Mexico into the fold of US *modernity*. US political and literary representations of New Mexico and Nuevomexicanos continued to place them outside both the present and presence conferred on modern subjects.

Progressive Era reform was, in many ways, a repetition (with a difference) of the

³³ Modernity remains an epoch of the present that has not been superseded by post-modernity. Instead, post-modernity merely highlights the irony of modernity's self-referential temporality.

mid-nineteenth-century's colonial conquest of temporality. It marked a consolidation of power through the systemization and bureaucratization of government that was purported to help end political corruption. The power of the executive branch increased dramatically under Theodore Roosevelt who exercised his ability to regulate corporations and reserve federal land more than any previous president. At the same time, the US witnessed a consolidation of economic power. Lewis L. Gould explains, "for the seven years after 1897, more than 4,200 companies in the United States turned into 257 corporations" (25). While some of the period's social reform benefited industrial workers by restricting work hours, regulating child labor, and improving sanitation and food safety, many Progressive politicians, especially Roosevelt, were "conservative [...] at heart" and "wanted to provide gradual change to stave off more sweeping alterations in the nation's order" (Gould 35). Indeed, while the Progressive Era was a period of major social reform for working-class Anglo men and women, it marked an intensification of racial oppression for many Americans. The 1890s saw the rise of The Immigration Restriction League and the Supreme Court approval of segregation, which legitimated Jim Crow laws. "There was a degree of social control and political coercion behind some of the progressive rhetoric," Gould writes; "For many white Southerners, the development of segregation in the 1890s went forward as a 'reform' of the existing structure of race relations" (13). Thus, the era's consolidation of power also signaled an increased institutionalization of racial hierarchies within the US. For racialized subjects in the US, Progressive Era politics typified modernity as "ever new, but always, in its newness, the same" (Osborne 13).³⁴

³⁴ Osborne uses this phrasing to describe postmodernity's repetition of modernity, but as

Otero worked both within and outside of this system. His representations of African Americans and Native Americans align him with the institutionalization of racism by Progressive politics, but his rhetoric of reform generally elides racial difference within the New Mexico body politic for the sake of gaining political sovereignty through statehood. Like Roosevelt, Otero sought to expand his executive power in New Mexico. For example, he asked the 36th Legislative Assembly to create new offices under his direction, such as Insurance Commissioner and Irrigation Engineer. He also sought the authority “to remove officials who fail to make annual reports in due time, and also to remove summarily county officials accepting illegal fees, or county commissions accepting such illegal fees. Also of county officials guilty of nonfeasance, misfeasance, or malfeasance in office [sic]” (1940, 368). The latter regulation was part of Otero’s effort to defeat powerful political machines in the territory, which were both his primary political opposition and a hindrance to the territory’s statehood prospects.³⁵ His tactics led Cynthia Secor-Welsh to describe him as a “boss-reformer,” but Otero’s actions—both his attempts to expand his own executive power and his attempts to combat political corruption—place him squarely in the realm of Progressive Era politics (103). The concomitant reworking of progress as *reform* rather than *expansion* created an opportunity for Otero to de-link New Mexico’s geographic position from its temporal position with the United States’ hierarchy in his political speeches and writing. His insistence on New Mexico’s progress—its movement through time—is in fact an insistence on the territory’s presence within the US temporal ideology of linear

a repetition it also applies to modernity proper.

³⁵ See Holtby, pg 11-34, for an account of Thomas Benton Catron’s negative affect on New Mexico statehood as a delegate to Washington, when his actions exposed New Mexico’s corrupt political practices to the nation.

progressive time.

The US colonization of New Mexico's time had a number of political and material consequences for the region. New Mexico had been expecting statehood for almost half a century by the time Otero came to office in 1897. Article IX of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo promised in 1848 that conquered Mexican territory would be "admitted at the proper time." For New Mexico, however, the proper time seemed like it might never come. Almost fifty statehood bills were sent to congress between 1850 and 1897, and each of them was turned down. New Mexico had been established as a territory during the 1850 compromise that admitted California as a state, and Griswold del Castillo explains, "Because New Mexico became a territory rather than a state, the civil rights were less than those in California" (70). Citizens in the territory were not allowed to vote for their Governor or for the President, and decisions made by the elected territorial legislature were subject to federal approval (Griswold del Castillo 70). While former Mexicans and their descendents awaited the "proper time" to be admitted to the enjoyment of full citizen rights, Article IX also stated that, "in the mean time," they would be "maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and their property" (Griswold del Castillo 190). But the "mean time" actually worked to preclude New Mexicans from participating in the nation's temporal structure of progress, as *mean time* is specifically the intermediary between two points in time or two events—a liminal temporality outside of the sequential linear movement of modernity's time.³⁶ During New Mexico's liminal phase of territoriality, the US government did not protect

³⁶ See "mean, adj.2". OED Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. 22 April 2013 <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/115439?rskey=CSUU8W&result=6&isAdvanced=false>>.

Nuevomexicanos' liberty and property, but rather, initiated policies that dispossessed Nuevomexicanos of land and excluded them from democratic participation. New Mexico demonstrates, perhaps better than any other territory, what "the mean time" really looked like for Mexican Americans awaiting full political enfranchisement—the installation of long-term colonial dependency and economic underdevelopment.

The liminality of New Mexico's *mean time* also worked to cast the territory's underdevelopment as a trait of its native population rather than the controlling Anglo American powers. Between the territory's transfer from Mexico and its admission as a state, New Mexico was dominated by portrayals of temporal stasis. In 1893, Charles Lummis described the region as the land of *poco tiempo* in his book of that title. His first chapter artistically mirrors the political justification for not admitting the territory to statehood. He depicts New Mexico as:

the National Rip Van Winkle—the United States which is *not* United States. Here is the land of *poco tiempo*—the home of 'Pretty Soon.' Why hurry with the hurrying world? The "Pretty Soon" of New Spain is better than the "Now! Now!" of the haggard States. The opiate sun soothes to rest, the adobe is made to lean against, the hush of day-long noon would not be broken. Let us not hasten—*mañana* will do. Better still, *pasado mañana*. (3)

As Genaro Padilla writes, "Lummis authorized and instituted a language that has reverberated in other travel narratives, magazine articles, scholarly studies, poetry, novels, and theater of the region down to the present" (208). Ironically, the land of "pretty soon" as Lummis translates his title, is a more apt description of the United States' repeated postponement of New Mexico statehood because the federal government

was the one telling New Mexico “mañana, mañana.” In fact, Lummis’ *Land of Poco Tiempo*, like the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo’s “mean time,” works to deny New Mexico admission to the temporal flow of modernity within the US. Better translated as “little time,” the *poco tiempo* that Lummis assigns the territory is actually a lack or absence of time. Lummis and his cohort were extolled as part of a liberal project to promote the region through art and historical preservation. However, as Padilla observes, “these artists and intellectuals who retreated to the Southwest to escape the dehumanizing effects of an alienating industrial and urban society on the East Coast often participated in the dehumanization of their subjects, or better put, their objects—Mexicans and Native Americans” (210).

Indeed, the artistic promotion of New Mexico was by no means the economic or political promotion of the territory. Politicians working to disenfranchise Nuevomexicanos played on the very same stereotypes of stasis and inefficiency that literary authors used in presenting the region. In a 1902 report to the Senate during one of New Mexico’s bids for statehood, Senator Albert Beveridge of Indiana claimed that the available irrigation would take at least a generation of research before it could “support [...] successful agriculture” and that the majority of New Mexicans lived in “mud houses.”³⁷ Like literary representations, Beveridge’s report fuses images of landscape and people as equally underdeveloped. Even President McKinley, who had shown apparent faith in New Mexico self-governance by appointing a Nuevomexicano governor, saw a similar parallel between land and people. Visiting New Mexico in 1901, he told residents that they would need “more water and people” before the territory could

³⁷ Cited in US congressional record, 57th Congress, 2nd session, 1902, 188-96.

become a state (Holtby 72). During much of his governorship, Otero focused on appeasing this call by promoting Anglo American immigration and investment in the territory and presenting images of New Mexicans as socially, economically, and technologically modern to the rest of the nation. However, his later political speeches and writing openly identify New Mexico's underdevelopment with Anglo American rather than Nuevomexicano political and social structures.

Otero had good reason to assert that the territory's underdevelopment was a product of Anglo American and not Nuevomexicano governance. The federal government's paternalistic role of appointing governors to the territory created rampant corruption and massive land grabs in the second half of the nineteenth-century. New Mexico appointments were a means to personal, political and economic gain for most appointees, and the federal government paid little attention to how an appointee would affect the territory. For example, when Utah residents accused their governor, Samuel B. Axtell, of being too pro-Mormon, he asked President Grant to appoint him as governor of New Mexico instead. Grant's responding telegram read, "Offer Axtell Governorship of New Mexico and appoint Emery in his place if he accepts. Emery may be appointed to New Mexico otherwise" (qtd. in Horn 175).³⁸ For Grant and his appointees, territorial governors were interchangeable, not meant to represent a territory to the federal government but to represent the federal government within a territory. This kind of "representation" aligned the directionality of political influence with Turner's map of

³⁸ Axtell became embroiled in the Lincoln County War during his governorship and supported the corrupt Murphy-Dolan faction. Otero and his family were not directly involved in the war but were economically and ideologically aligned with McSween's side. Thus, Otero's account of the Lincoln County War in *The Real Life of Billy the Kid* is, like his autobiography, a critique of corruption under the territorial system.

social progress, always moving from east to west. Historian Calvin Horn describes New Mexico governors as slightly less virtuous than Turner's pioneers, however, writing that they were "motivated by patriotic zeal, love of adventure, the possibility of a seat in the United States Senate, a desire for wealth, or a combination of these" (15). They were also often inept. Governor Axtell would go on to play a major part in fanning the fires of New Mexico's Lincoln County Wars.

Like Axtell, most New Mexico governors were not residents of the territory. Their appointments rested on the assumption that progress would have to come from outside of New Mexico, since the territory and its native population were seen as fundamentally pre-modern. In reality, non-resident appointees had little interest in aiding or promoting the people of New Mexico. A prime example is Robert Mitchell, who was barely a resident of the territory *during* his term. Governor from 1866 to 1869, he traveled across New Mexico inspecting mining opportunities shortly after his appointment. He then went on an extended three-month stay in Washington D.C. where, according to the *New Mexican*, he was trying to "sell stock in bogus gold mines" (qtd. in Horn 120). During Mitchell's absence from the 1866 New Mexico legislative assembly, the secretary of the territory enacted decisions in his stead that were generally acceptable to New Mexico citizens. However, upon his return Mitchell overturned all laws passed and all appointments filled by the legislature. The resultant chaos when appointed officials refused to step down for Mitchell's replacements is one of many moments where poor federal governance impeded the territory's ability to function. While New Mexicans were accused of being backward and beyond the reach of modernity's temporal progression in popular and political rhetoric, the system of territorial dependency worked

to disrupt the region's economy and install the kind of underdevelopment and federal dependency that politicians used as "evidence" of Nuevomexicanos' unfitness for self-governance.

In the absence of a strong executive within the territory, political rings formed to control local politics and divide the spoils of US land acquisition. Thomas Benton Catron led the Santa Fe Ring, which dominated the territory for over a decade. According to the *Silver City Enterprise*, Catron was one of the largest land grant holders in the nation (Larson 143). Unlike California, New Mexico's status as a territory meant that land claims were decided by the Office of the Surveyor General, established by Congress, and significantly slower than California's judiciary system (Griswold del Castillo 77). This office, like the territory's governor position, was subject to the caprices and changing politics of Washington. Richard Griswold del Castillo writes:

In 1885 the newly elected Democratic president, Grover Cleveland, removed the Republican surveyor general of New Mexico and replaced him with his own man, William Andrew Sparks, an individual Ralph Emerson Twitchell described as "steeped in prejudice against New Mexico, its people and their property rights." [...] The process of reviewing the New Mexico claims gave no assurance that the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, or indeed the rule of law, outweighed political influence of those behind the scenes. (78-9)

Amidst this instability, eastern transplant, lawyer and politician, Thomas Catron, built an empire of several million acres on New Mexico land (Holtby 11). Like other members of the Santa Fe Ring, Catron amassed much of this land through falsifying land survey records to enlarge his holdings and accepting land as payment for legal fees and as

collateral on defaulted loans he had made. Though both Otero and Catron were members of the Republican Party, Catron acts as the primary antagonist throughout Otero's political autobiography. Otero belittles him in all three volumes of the autobiography, often concluding an account of Catron by claiming that all his schemes had come to naught. Though Otero's depictions reduce Catron's extensive political and economic power in the territory to a mere nuisance for the governor, he frames that nuisance in terms of repeatedly wasting time. Otero writes, "His attacks were so continuous and unyielding that I was compelled to make several unnecessary trips to Washington, at great expense, to explain his trumped up charges" (1940, 81).

Otero's focus on efficiency in government was an important part of his progressive platform. His movement to combat waste, including wasted time, parallels another temporal move of his work—the turn away from nostalgia and the past. Just as Otero wanted to stop delays caused by wasted time, his investment in progress and modernization involved a turn away from the past as a locus of meaning and continuity. Unlike other Nuevomexicano authors who utilized the popularity of Southwestern nostalgia to contest Anglo domination through double voiced narratives, Otero specifically writes against the grain of this genre as presented in Lummis's work and co-opted by numerous other Anglo American tourists. His autobiography and his political actions place little emphasis on preserving or recording Nuevomexicano culture and folk practice; nor do they parallel the multi-generic, non-linear structures that characterize many other Nuevomexicano autobiographies.³⁹ For this reason, it is difficult to group

³⁹ See Tey Diana Rebolledo's "Strategies of Resistance in Hispana Writing" for an analysis of how nuevomexicana authors used nostalgic discourses like Loomis's to

Otero with proto Chicana/o authors like Rafael and Eusebio Chacón, Nina Otero Warren, Fabiola Cabeza de Baca and others. In fact, his attempt to position the territory within the present in modern US politics led him, at times, to denigrate New Mexico's cultural history. In a speech to Arizona residents he said:

In New Mexico each year we have thousands of Eastern tourists who stop by for a day or two and delude themselves with the idea that they are making a study of the people and existing conditions. Few of them learn anything of value about the people or conditions as they actually exist. They are attracted by that which is novel and abnormal. They press the button upon every burro they meet. They are delighted to catch the features of a worthless old Indian. They photograph the oldest adobe building erected hundreds of years ago, and they return to their homes fully convinced and satisfied in their own minds that they know all about New Mexico, and that we are unfitted for statehood. (1940, 392-93)

This representation, along with some of Otero's political decisions (for example his promotion of English-only education) has caused some scholars to identify Otero as "agringado" (Vigil 45) or, as Padilla describes him, a "culturally self-denying 'Spanish-American' territorial governor" (35). However, Otero's anti-nostalgic representation of the past shares with other Nuevomexicano authors the underlying intent of contesting Nuevomexicano disenfranchisement by external US forces. Like other Nuevomexicanos, Otero recognized that Anglo Americans had colonized both past and present, but his

contests Anglo domination in the region. See also Genaro Padilla's *My History Not Yours: The Formation of Mexican American Autobiography* about narrative structure.

focus is decidedly on the present, even to the detriment of New Mexico's past.⁴⁰ For this reason, Otero does not draw on the romantic Spanish Southwest of folklore and local color in his political promotion of the territory or his later autobiographical writing. His temporal politics strove to insert New Mexico into the modernist time of both US democratic process and capitalist accumulation. For Otero, "progress" was a means to attaining presence—political and economic—within American power structures.

Yet, as Otero saw the territory's bids for statehood repeatedly fail during his three terms as governor, his faith in material *modernization* as an entrée into the political structures of US *modernity* waned. In his 1904 speech at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis, Missouri, Otero publically censured the federal government for continuing to hold New Mexico as a territory. On a day designated as New Mexico Day at the fair, he told the crowd:

[...] we have seen created out of our original area, California, Nevada, Utah, the southern part of Colorado, and the Territory of Arizona, leaving us with Arizona from the Mexican acquisition, and Oklahoma and Indian Territory from the

⁴⁰ Otero's textual treatment of Native communities is indicative of his political focus on US modernity in that he denigrated Indians throughout his writing except when Nuevomexicanos' mestizo heritage was cast as an indication that they could not participate in democracy. Otero revels in Indian killing in he revels in *The Real Billy the Kid* writing, "The kid fell on them with his axe. In three minutes there was not a live Indian in sight but eight 'good Injuns' slept their last sleep" (1998, 18) and though he laments the killing of buffalo in his autobiography he claims, "it had to be done to put an end to Indian depredations" (1935, x). Yet in a rare moment he claims mestizo heritage (when in fact his grandparents were all Spanish and Anglo American) in order to defend Nuevomexicanos' fitness for self-government. Indian Agent Capt. Nordstrum referred to residents living outside the Zia pueblo as "greasers" unfit to serve on a jury, which reflected on Otero's administration. In response Otero wrote an open letter to citizens of New Mexico writing "I am a native Mexican myself and am proud of the fact. [...] I could never be guilty of the crime of casting any stain or reflection on my own or my father's ancestry, or the race to which we belong" (letter 2-3).

Louisiana Purchase, as the sole remnants of feudal dependencies, and the ancient un-American theory of the Territories to represent to the American people and their World guests here assembled, the unique spectacle of more than one million people, American citizens distributed among four local governing commonwealths, without a voice in national affairs, with no vote in Congress, or an opportunity to ballot for the Chief Magistrate who appoints our Governor and Judges. (1904, 4)

This speech is one of the few in which Otero outlines the region's Spanish history, and he does so in a decidedly modernist fashion. While the Santa Fe Trail had linked New Mexico and Missouri through commerce well before the US conquered New Mexico, Otero opens his speech by linking the two regions through the Louisiana Purchase. He says, "the first land in the Louisiana Purchase was discovered by Spaniards, and their law rather than the French prevails in Louisiana and New Mexico" (1904, 3). At the same time, he situates New Mexico as superior to the rest of the US by saying, "The first settlement in the Louisiana Purchase was at Biloxi, Louisiana in 1699, when Santa Fe and other towns in New Mexico had been established for more than a hundred years under the civil or Roman law, which to a large extent prevails today in New Mexico and Louisiana" (1904, 3, 2). In this way, he re-maps New Mexico as the center of North American law and civilization. Only after the Spanish history of America does Otero mention the US-dominated period of New Mexico's history, and he deemphasizes the US's role as conqueror by presenting New Mexico as social and civilized when US troops arrived during General Stephan Watts Kearney's 1846 invasion of the territory. While other Nuevomexicano accounts of US military action in New Mexico record the trauma of

Kearney's invasion, Otero's St. Louis Fair speech portrays the General's arrival in New Mexico as a social visit rather than an instance of US imperialism.⁴¹ Because Kearney was originally from Missouri, Otero tells his audience that the General's arrival created "an additional bond between you and us," and he concludes his account of the US takeover by listing fraternal orders that Missouri officers founded in New Mexico (1904, 2). This presentation of the US conquest contrasts with the Spanish conquest, in which Otero emphasizes the difficulty of establishing "civil and ecclesiastical authority" in a hostile environment (1904, 1-2). His history of New Mexico serves to marginalize the US's role as the bearer of progress and modernity, and his history of Spanish America presents, not a romanticized lost Spanish heritage, but the foundation for modernity in the region—it set the infrastructure for contemporary legal practices and urban centers. In contrast, the United States is guilty of creating pre-modern, "feudal dependencies." Instead of arguing for statehood on the basis that New Mexico has become sufficiently modernized through the expansion of railroads, telephones, or irrigation, Otero claims that the United States government has failed to recognize New Mexico's primacy and centrality as a modernizer of North America. In doing so, the nation itself has come to embody a pre-modern feudalism.

Otero's assertion that Nuevomexicanos are superior colonizers and his claim that the US is making them a "unique spectacle" through political disenfranchisement is particularly striking when set within the context of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition.

⁴¹ For Nuevomexicano accounts that discuss the trauma of Kearney's invasion see Raphael Chacón's *Legacy of Honor: The Life of Rafael Chacón, a Nineteenth-Century New Mexican* and Genaro Padilla's section on Chacón and references to Juan Bautista Vigil y Alarid, the Mexican governor of New Mexico at the time of Kearney's takeover.

The fair boasted the “most extensive Anthropology Department of any world’s fair,” headed by William John McGee, a prominent US anthropologist whose biologically based theory of racial hierarchy classified the world’s population into “four cultural grades of savagery, barbarism, civilization, and enlightenment” (Rydell 160, McGee qtd. in Rydell 161). His section of the fair featured “living ethnological exhibits” that housed Native Americans, “pygmies from Africa, ‘Patagonian giants’ from Argentina, [and] Ainu aborigines from Japan” (Rydell 163). In addition, the US government sponsored an exhibit of over 1,000 Filipinos, highlighting the nation’s most recent territorial acquisition from the Spanish American War (Rydell 163). Otero wanted to contrast the territorial status of places like the Philippines with that of New Mexico. In fact, he touted New Mexico’s contribution to Roosevelt’s Rough Riders during the Spanish American War in numerous political speeches including the Louisiana Purchase World’s Fair speech. The “spectacle” that territorialism makes of New Mexicans is presented in opposition to the spectacle of racial hierarchy in the anthropology exhibits being held in such close proximity to the New Mexico Day celebration. Otero’s celebratory claims of New Mexican participation in the Spanish American War signify that he is not anti-imperial. Instead, his distinction between modern US empire building in the Pacific and pre-modern vassalage in the Southwest reveal the underpinnings of race within US concepts of time, progress, and democratic participation. The distinction was fundamental to New Mexico’s position within modernity and its bid for statehood.

Senator Beveridge, the man who had described New Mexicans as living in mud huts to the senate committee on territories in 1902, *did* associate Spanish colonial Philippines with Spanish colonial New Mexico. Beveridge’s rhetoric of racial hierarchies

much like the ethnological exhibits at the world's fair, posited the biological superiority of Anglo Saxon blood. According to Holtby, Beveridge believed that, "Both [New Mexico and the Philippines] were backward places, burdened by the legacy of Spain's deficiencies, and much effort would be needed 'to save that soil for liberty and civilization'" (45). After Catron, Beveridge is perhaps the second greatest antagonist in Otero's autobiography. Beveridge was key to the United States' treatment of its territorial holdings. He chaired the Senate Committee on Territories and was a member of the Committee on the Philippines. His 1902 campaign against New Mexico was one of the most devastating experiences of Otero's career, and Beveridge's main weapon was time.

In his 1898 campaign speech, "March of the Flag," Beveridge championed US imperialism, saying:

The opposition tells us that we ought not to govern a people without their consent. I answer, the rule of liberty that all just government derives its authority from the consent of the governed, applies only to those who are capable of self-government. We govern the Indians without their consent; we govern our territories without their consent; we govern our children without their consent.

(paragraph 13)

Here Beveridge's triple parallel between the biological development of a child, the sociological development of a race and the political development of a region works through linear narratives of progress to infantilize colonized ethnic subjects. It was Beveridge's full intent to continue ruling New Mexico without the territory's consent even when a majority of the House and Senate were in favor of granting statehood.

Beveridge worked repeatedly against statehood for New Mexico during the twelve years he sat in Congress and especially during his four years as chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories.⁴² The most devastating experience in Otero's fight for statehood occurred during the congressional sessions held in 1902. On May 9, an omnibus bill called the Knox Bill passed the House after only two hours of deliberation. This bill would have admitted Arizona, Oklahoma, and New Mexico all at once. Residents of all three territories were excited when the bill passed the House so quickly. Once the Knox Bill reached the Senate, however, Beveridge and his committee postponed reviewing it for over five weeks. The Senate session was nearing its conclusion by the time Beveridge seriously examined the bill, and he recommended waiting until the next senate session to vote on it.

Between sessions, Beveridge devised a plan that would prove New Mexico was unfit for admission into the Union. He arranged for a tour of the three territories included in the omnibus bill, focusing mainly on Arizona and New Mexico. Robert Larson convincingly argues that Beveridge orchestrated this inquiry into New Mexico's fitness for statehood explaining that Beveridge prepared for additional testimony upon his return from the territories but "hesitated" to call upon anyone, "unless he knew to what they would testify" (210). In his autobiography, Otero wrote, "I was disgusted with Senator

⁴² Beveridge's justification for denying New Mexico statehood rested on the sociological hierarchy of racial development that he ascribed to, but he had political reasons as well. The Republican party had dominated the national political scene since the 1896 election of William McKinley, which followed the 1894 election of a Republican majority for both House and Senate. Beveridge, Roosevelt, and other Republicans feared that admitting too many western states would sway the balance of power in favor of Democrats. Nonetheless, some Republicans sided with statehood. For example, Otero found a strong ally in Matthew Quay of Pennsylvania by aiding the Pennsylvania Development Company's myriad enterprises in New Mexico. (see Holtby 109-10)

Beveridge as he seemed to be the whole thing [sic] and managed the plans [...] to perfection” (1940, 212-13). Beveridge specifically sought the least educated officials for questioning during the inquiry, and, according to Otero, Beveridge’s assistant, L. G. Rothchild, was directed to photograph drunks and prostitutes to show the “general condition” of New Mexico (1940, 218). Beveridge’s investigation was clearly contrived. He constructed an image of social and economic underdevelopment in order to impede the territory’s actual development. In a letter to Senator Nelson Aldrich, Beveridge promised to “make an unfavorable impression on the people and investors, which will set the territories back for many years” (qtd. in Holtby 55). Like corrupt politicians within the territory, Beveridge worked to create the underdevelopment that he would purport was inherent in the region.

The immediate consequence of Beveridge’s inquiry was a scathing report on New Mexico and Arizona given to the Senate at the beginning of the second session of the Fifty-seventh US Congress. The report stated that New Mexico and Arizona were not ready for statehood; that the people of New Mexico were uneducated; and that the available irrigation would take at least a generation of research before it could support agriculture.⁴³ Otero was in Washington at this time, and he heard the report read to the senate as well as the weeklong debate that followed it before the holiday recess. Otero was unable to influence the Senate debate because only senators were allowed to speak. Frustrated and powerless, the governor felt that the most he could do during Beveridge’s address was “to listen, no matter how badly I felt over his unjust speech” (1940, 216). Instead of actively participating in the US political process, his only available form of

⁴³ Cited in US congressional record, 57th Congress, 2nd session, 1902, 188-96.

protests was passive observation. His physical presence is a form of contestation when his political presence is denied. Otero returned to New Mexico whilst, *in the mean time*, Beveridge sustained a three-month filibuster of the Knox Bill.⁴⁴ Throughout the process, Beveridge's key weapon was time. He depicted the territory as pre-modern and slow to develop in his reports, and he delayed political progress for the territory by repeatedly stalling a vote on the bill. Beveridge's ability to sustain a three-month filibuster against New Mexico statehood exposes the colonial power of extending the "mean time" during which Nuevomexicanos are denied participation in US modernity.

President Roosevelt also manipulated time in his political actions concerning New Mexico. Roosevelt supported statehood in his initial campaign platform, but then reversed his stance while president. In 1906, both Roosevelt and Beveridge came out in support of a bill that would have combined New Mexico and Arizona into one state. The idea of joint statehood had been unpopular in both territories for years, but Roosevelt wrote an open letter to Arizona residents, who were more strongly opposed to jointure, in an attempt to sway their opinion. The letter was widely circulated in New Mexico in both Spanish and English. Roosevelt wrote:

it is my belief that if the people of Arizona let this chance go by they will have to wait very many years before the chance again offers itself, and even then it will very probably be only upon the present terms—that is upon the condition of being joined with New Mexico. [...] If they [the people of Arizona] refuse what is

⁴⁴ Beveridge was able to continue the filibuster for so long because the Senate, fearing the delays a filibuster would bring to other legislature, decided to split their days into two sections. They considered general legislation until 2 pm each day and then commenced debate on the Omnibus Statehood Bill.

profited them [...] they condemn themselves to an indefinite condition of tutelage.

(2)

Roosevelt's threat of indefinite territorial dependence was actually a complete fabrication. Only months earlier, Roosevelt had written a private letter to B. I. Wheeler stating, "The only reason I want them [Arizona and New Mexico] in as one state now is that I fear the alternative is having them as two states three or four years hence" (qtd. in Larson 235). Otero suspected that New Mexico statehood was eminent, and he fought against joint-statehood. But Roosevelt's misrepresentation was successful in swaying a majority of New Mexicans to vote in favor of jointure with Arizona (Arizona's vote against joint statehood is what prevented the bill from passing). Roosevelt's maneuver was a culmination of US temporal colonization in New Mexico. The letter threatened to place Arizona and New Mexico eternally outside of US modernity and outside of the political and economic enfranchisement that modern subjectivity promised while placing the onus of this exclusion on New Mexico and Arizona residents themselves. Otero wrote decades later in his autobiography about watching fellow politicians desert the cause of single statehood at this period. Discussing a letter he received from Stephen B. Elkins, one of the few remaining supporters of single statehood, he wrote "time was to show that we were right" (1940, 219).

Throughout Otero's autobiography, time itself stands in as the justification for his actions, as the proof that *shows* he was right all along. While his faith in the US political process may have waned at times, his faith in the ultimate triumph of progress never did. Otero wrote his autobiography near the end of his life, titling the first two volumes *My Life on the Frontier* (1935 and 1939) and the third volume *My Nine Years as Governor of*

the Territory of New Mexico (1940). In each of them, Otero develops and refines an assertion that he and his family were the modernizers of New Mexico who brought technological and economic advancement in the form of railroads, telephone service, and financial institutions. He, likewise, presents himself as the territory's champion during its struggle to enter US modernity as a politically enfranchised state of the union. Drawing on popular US tropes, Otero positions New Mexicans as modernizing frontiersmen with himself as their Western Hero.

Otero begins the first volume with his childhood travels westward on the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé Railroad. As an overdetermined symbol of modernity, the railroad does a great deal of work in situating Otero as the territory's harbinger of modernity. Juan Bruce-Novoa asserts that through this opening move, "Otero wrote himself into the westward-expanding frontier by fusing his origin with the railroad, the epitome of nineteenth-century progress" (2003, 112). Indeed, Otero emphasizes his father's role in bringing the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé to New Mexico as evidence of his family's modernizing force in New Mexico. The arrival of the rail line brings New Mexico into the folds of US standard time, which the railroads invented and installed throughout the nation. At the same time, Otero performs a spatio-temporal sleight of hand by moving west in the opening pages of his autobiography, thus aligning himself with the movement of US frontiersmen and the "progress" they bring (though he is, in fact, returning to his family home in New Mexico). Importantly, rail travel also played a key role in policing racial boundaries through its enforcement of segregation. Justice John Marshal Harlan made clear the extent of the railroads' symbolic power in his dissent to *Plessy vs. Ferguson* when he argued: "'Personal liberty,' it has been well said,

“consists in the power of locomotion, of changing situation, or removing one's person to whatsoever places one's own inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint” (*Plessy vs. Ferguson*). Here “locomotion” blurs the boundaries between spatial and temporal movement while it highlights how the ability to change one’s situation is racially determined. Otero’s extensive railroad travels position him as a full (white) citizen and participant in US nationalist time.⁴⁵

Yet, Otero’s movement from east to west—along the US spatial grid of development, as described by Thomas Jefferson and Frederic Jackson Turner—is also a disruption of the nation’s spatio-temporal map of racial development. The wild element that Otero observes as he travels west is predominantly composed of Anglo American desperados. Bruce-Novoa concludes that Otero’s descent into the liminality of the US western frontier is part of a process joining the foreign, Spanish community of New Mexico to US industrial centers by squeezing out the uncivilized space between them, the zone of Indian “wildness” that threatens both New Mexico territory and US states (2003, 115-16). However, while Otero was keenly aware of Anglo Americans’ prejudice against “Spanish Americans,” he never equated his ethnic identity with foreignness. Instead, he repeatedly referred to himself and other Nuevomexicanos as “native,” a term that specifically contests the positionality of Mexican Americans as foreigners in their own land, and, like popular nativist movements of the period, naturalizes their place within the

⁴⁵ Indeed, his complete omission of any reference to segregated cars highlights his race and class privilege in this respect. I draw on Daylanne K. English’s discussion of railroad segregation here. She convincingly argues that African American writers are forced to cope with a “continuous past” in opposition to modernity’s “continuous present” because of a justice system that repeats violence against and disenfranchisement of African Americans across time, making both time and justice “political fictions” (19, 24).

nation.⁴⁶ Rather than joining a “foreign” New Mexico to the East, Otero’s childhood observations subtly supplant the “civilizing” force of Anglo American immigrants with native Nuevomexicano civility and reverse the polarity of progress. Native New Mexicans bring progress not only to the territory’s Anglo immigrants, but also to Washington politics in the East. The alternative structure of development in the first volume of his autobiography acts as a proleptic opening for Otero’s political autobiography in the third volume, where he becomes a force of progress by combating economic and political corruption.

The first volume of his autobiography is a picaresque narrative of Otero’s adventures growing up in the Wild West where he meets famous figures like Buffalo Bill, Calamity Jane, and Billy the Kid. These adventures set the stage for Otero’s political ascendancy in the later two volumes. It is precisely the de-politicized naiveté of childhood in Otero’s first autobiography that permits his reversal of racial sociopolitical development as it was imagined in US western historiography. In volume one, Otero eulogizes the passing of the Old West in the same way that nineteenth-century Anglo authors eulogized the disappearance of Native Americans. Like Ruiz de Burton, Otero’s writing works in conversation with US imperialist nostalgia, but instead of critiquing the trope, Otero repurposes it. Generally, the rhetoric of imperialist nostalgia works to absolve the empire of its historically violent tactics of removal and extermination and shifts the responsibility for native disappearance onto native peoples or nature itself. Richard Slotkin adds to the discussion of empire and nostalgia through his myth of the

⁴⁶ His use of the term native may in fact be a subtle response to American Nativism of the time that was pushing for immigration restriction that targeted Chinese and Eastern European immigrants, but also degraded all not non-Anglo peoples through political cartoons and other propaganda.

West, which involves “regeneration through violence.” In this formulation, Indians first teach an archetypal Anglo how to survive in the wilderness of the American frontier and then, as Renato Rosaldo summarizes, “the disciple turns on his spiritual masters and achieves redemption by killing them” (72). Rather than making traditional Nuevomexicano culture the subject of his nostalgic longing like many of his contemporary Anglo and Nuevomexicano authors, Otero draws on the trope of imperialist nostalgia to eulogize the passing of the distinctly Anglo Wild West. His “spiritual masters” are not the Indians of Slotkin’s or Rosaldo’s analyses but the Anglo Westerners and frontiersmen who had supplanted natives in the original US imperialist discourse. By crediting Anglo Americans for much of his moral and cultural formation, Otero has become a problematic figure for Chicana/o history and literary recovery that seek narratives of contestation and political resistance. Yet it is the form rather than the content of his autobiography that belies a contestatory temporal politics through its subtle reversal of spatial and racial tropes of development. The “Wild Westerners” in Otero’s autobiographical history act as simulacra for the “original” frontier, which Otero conquers metonymically through his political campaign of modernization and reform. Otero subsumes the rugged individualistic identities of the Wild Western figures he encounters, incorporating their characteristics into his own powerful political persona. “I found myself thrown altogether upon my own resources,” Otero writes on the last page of volume one of *My Life on the Frontier*:

but I soon learned that in this life one must depend largely on oneself, and I was not long in learning my lesson, for I had gained a wonderful experience for one so young by my association with men who were much older than myself, and I

meant to use the knowledge thus acquired judiciously, fearlessly and honestly.
(1935, 288)

Even as he acknowledges the Old Westerners of his childhood travels, Otero erases them. Their resources become his resources; their knowledge becomes his self-reliance. Otero envisions himself as supplanting, not a “natural” wilderness, but the wildness of an Anglo American Old West through political and economic modernization.

Otero’s narrative strategy in the multi-volume autobiography is more than a repurposing of literary tropes. The temporal structure of the autobiographical account evolves throughout the work in conjunction with Otero’s rise to power and the corresponding order and organization that he supposedly brings to New Mexico. The entire first volume is a series of adventuresome and picaresque vignettes that focus on Otero’s youth. Consequently, the narrative’s explanatory power is cumulative rather than progressive. By the end of the book, Otero’s gain in consciousness appears to be *ex nihilo* because the cause and effect of his maturation is obscured by the narrative form. It is difficult to discern the chronological order of events in volume one. For example, a gambling incident involving Catron occurs some time between 1866 when La Fonda of Las Vegas is founded and 1880 (the historical point in the narrative from which Otero is recounting the events), but this time frame encompasses almost the entire volume, which covers 1864-82. In contrast, *My Nine Years as Governor* is clearly sequential and rarely disrupted by digressive reminiscence. The clarity and organization of this final volume parallel Otero’s “businesslike administration,” and it draws distinct causal relationships between Otero’s actions and the positive results they produce (1935, 286). Though both the first and the third volume are ostensibly about the historical development of New

Mexico, their varying structures give them different explanatory power. While volume one's deployment of tropes from the "myth of the West" naturalizes an Anglo American past, it also naturalizes Anglo Americans *as* past. To an extent, this process performs what Roland Barthes calls "the best weapon against myth," which is "to mythify it in its turn" (135).

However, while Otero's writing undermines one narrative of Anglo American progress, it continues to participate in a construction of linear progressive time as the sole—or at least dominant—form of time within the US. This is apparent in both the structure and the content of his last autobiographical work. Between the first two volumes of his autobiography, Otero penned a biography entitled, *The Real Billy The Kid With New Light on the Lincoln County War* (1936), which John-Michael Rivera recovered in 1998, and his introduction explains that the text "renders Nuevomexicano bourgeois men [rather than Anglos...] as the direct civilizers of the 'new' New Mexico at the turn of the century" (1998, 55). The autobiography does likewise, and this replacement of bourgeois Anglo American men by bourgeois Nuevomexicanos does little to change the underlying temporal structure of modernist time.

Volume two of *My Life on the Frontier* is a transitional narrative, in both style and content, between Otero's carefree, disorganized youthful memories and his official and orderly record as governor. In volume two, Otero becomes involved in local politics where he is more thoroughly acquainted with the corruption of New Mexico politicians, particularly the "Santa Fe Ring," a term that he uses interchangeably with "Catronites" in reference to Thomas Catron. In one chapter of this volume, Otero depicts his own battle over land rights with the Santa Fe Ring in a form reminiscent of the wild western

showdown between Billy the Kid and the Dolan-Murphy clan. In the 1870s, the Santa Fe Ring manipulated a land grant in order to obtain the Nuestra Señora de los Dolores mine, which belonged to the Otero family. Because the Ring controls both the surveyor and the territory's Chief Justice, the Oteros are unable to reclaim the mine legally, and so Miguel Otero decides to give up the court battle and take the mine by force. Otero and his cohorts capture the mine and its adjoining armory, renaming their holding "Fort Otero." The presiding judge throughout Otero's court battle is none other than S. B. Axtell, the former territorial governor whose ineptitude had helped inflame the Lincoln County War. According to Otero, "Axtell's initials seemed at least very appropriate, and surely they were" (1939, 87).

What is even more appropriate is Otero's triumph over Axtell and the Ring where Billy the Kid had failed in the Lincoln County War. Initially, Otero is summoned to court and held in contempt. He arrives in court, not because he is captured by the Ring but because he feels obligated to return to Las Vegas when the San Miguel National Bank needs him to fill out paperwork, and thus he surrenders to the sheriff in order to fulfill his duties at the bank. In the end, Otero achieves success through the legal system when he is acquitted by a grand jury. President Cleveland subsequently removes Judge Axtell and the courts decide the mine case in Otero's favor.

This moment in the autobiography is one of the most complexly constructed, particularly in light of the fact that Otero's was a pyrrhic victory. Like many Nuevomexicanos, Otero was "double crossed" by his own lawyers who received portions of the mine as payment and then manipulated the land grant such that Otero lost almost \$20,000 in the venture (1939, 89). Otero glosses over this outcome in a single paragraph,

however, to maintain the focus on his success throughout the text. It is imperative to Otero's narrative that he remain triumphant in order to fulfill his literary role as New Mexico's modernizing harbinger of progress. Thus, even after his lawyers have stolen the land, he proclaims, "There is one thing certain and sure in this connection: I am still alive, while, so far as I know, all others associated with me in the Nuestra Señora de los Dolores mining suit are now traveling that inevitable route which issues no return tickets" (1939, 96). Otero's only triumph is that he remains present—present to tell his story and the story of New Mexico.

By the time Otero appears in *My Nine Years as Governor*, his Wild West showdowns are purely political. In 1899, Otero performs the role of western hero to perfection in a heated argument with President Roosevelt when he realizes that the President is opposing New Mexico statehood. In this scene, President Roosevelt embodies the kind of pomp and grandeur that Otero had condemned in a childhood encounter with Buffalo Bill in volume one. Buffalo Bill had, in fact, helped spread the fame of Roosevelt and his Rough Riders in the 1898 show *Buffalo Bill's Wild West and Congress of Rough Riders of the World*, and Buffalo Bill's self-aggrandizement in volume one is in many ways a prefiguration of Roosevelt's personality in the third volume. During the political confrontation, Roosevelt tells Otero, "If I were in your place, I would remain a territory as long as the United States government will pay your running expenses," adding that as a territory, New Mexico's corrupt judges could be removed by the executive branch. Otero explains,

Mr. Roosevelt [...] in most eloquent words tried to impress me that all judges in the West were corrupt. He wound up his spleen by saying: 'Governor Otero, I

think a corrupt judge ought to be taken out to the corral, [...] and sh— to death.’ I smilingly agreed [...], but insisted that we had many honest and capable judges in New Mexico, much better than those sent out to us by politicians in the East” (1940, 63, 216).

As with his letter to Arizona, Roosevelt manipulates time in his argument with Otero. He tries to convince Otero that the narrative of New Mexican underdevelopment and political unfitness that Senator Beveridge and Charles Loomis had manufactured was real and that its origins were in the West. But Otero reverses the directionality of corruption and credits Washington with appointing corrupt judges in the territory. Otero later explains that Roosevelt “never outgrew the selfishness and self-display characteristic of children” (1940, 315), and the childish President consequently made “several removals [of local politicians] in New Mexico that [Otero] considered arbitrary and unjust” (1940, 326). Otero’s description infantilizes the president much as Beveridge’s March of the Flag speech had infantilized US territories.

Otero’s rivalry with Roosevelt is interesting because the president was perhaps the most prominent figure of Progressive Era politics and led the Progressive Party, which Otero would later join. This conflict and Otero’s other critiques of US government trouble frequent scholarly readings of him as a pro-US, “Americanized” or “agringado” Nuevomexicano. Otero’s writing is much more complex than these readings would suggest. Like Ruiz de Burton’s recovery as a contestatory author, the simplification of Otero as non-contestatory places him on one *side* of US history—the side of acculturation and US domination. Ironically, reading Otero as assimilationist denies his presence within Chicana/o literary history in the same way that US temporal colonization denied

Nuevomexicano presence within narratives of sociological development. Juan Bruce-Novoa aptly explains that, “although some Chicano critics would rather not acknowledge [Otero] on grounds of his class and privilege, these may be exactly the reasons for giving him the attention he merits if nothing else for the quality of his writing” (2005, 26). Despite Juan Bruce-Novoa and John-Michael Rivera’s efforts to recover Otero’s writing, the *Nuevomexicano* governor is not studied nearly as much as authors whose work was initially recovered as explicitly contestatory, like Ruiz de Burton. Otero’s persistent belief in *progress* never granted him or New Mexico full access to political *presence* within US political processes, and, ironically, his emphasis on New Mexico progress with US structures of modernization has impeded his presence within literary recovery that privileges a contestation paradigm for Mexican American authors.

Otero’s social position provided him with a large Anglo American audience for both his publications and his speeches, allowing his texts to interact in US social discourse in a unique way. It also gave him a window into the political structures of modernity within the US, and insight into the way that modernity seemed to elusively shift away from Nuevomexicanos even as they fulfilled its material requisites. Despite his family’s access to material embodiments of modernity, like railroads, telephones, and capital for investment; despite Otero’s internalization of progress and mechanical time; and despite the nation’s changing physical imaginary; the temporally embedded ideological pressures of Manifest Destiny force Nuevomexicanos to wait in an eternal *mean time*. While the content of his writing aligns with all the ideological values of modernity—the new, capitalist exchange, technological advancement, republican ideals

of governance—the form belies modernity’s exclusion of racialized ethnic subjects from participation in progress or even their existence in the present.

Third space feminism allows a look to the past through the present always already marked by the coming of that which is still left unsaid, unthought.

-Emma Pérez

Chapter 3

Moving across Modernity and Tradition: Differential Time Consciousness in *Caballero*

Jovita González closed her 1929 history master's thesis with a spatio-temporal metaphor. She writes of an emerging group of American-educated Texas-Mexicans, "Behind them lies a store of traditions of another race, customs of past ages, an innate and inherited love and reverence for another country. Ahead of them lies a struggle of which they are to be the champions. It is a struggle for equality and justice before the law" (2006, 116). Poised between two markedly different ways of understanding past, present and future, these young Texas-Mexicans are standing at a moment of temporal rupture. US colonization disrupted the temporal cohesion of Tejano society, which, according to González's MA thesis, had operated through a logic of tradition before the first decade of the twentieth century. As in Ruiz de Burton's *The Squatter and the Don*, temporal colonization in South Texas was the result of US immigrant farmers taking over land previously used for ranching by both Anglo and Hispano Texans; railroad and other commercial/technological developments; and an influx of Anglo Americans who disrupted preexisting Anglo-Tejano relations, reducing all Tejanos to lower-class "Mexicans," though these processes occurred several decades later for South Texas than

they did for California.⁴⁷ The concomitant material changes in timekeeping such as increased use of wage labor and the coordination of farming practices with railroad schedules created a temporal rupture from earlier forms of time practiced on Tejano ranchos, which were regulated by patriarchal structures the Catholic church and Tejano ranch. While González details the historical process that caused this temporal rupture in her master's thesis, her co-authored novel, *Caballero*, mines the rupture itself for alternate forms of time. In González's history, folklore and fiction writing, the linear progress of US modernity works contra to the circular but no-less-linear time of Texas Mexican tradition. Within her framework, the temporalities of both patriarchal tradition and Anglo American modernity are oppressive for Tejanas and laboring Texas Mexicans. *Caballero* moves differentially across multiple forms of time, including modern and traditional times, to critique the ideological structures of colonial temporality and open up new possibilities for decolonial time.

Much of the initial scholarship concerning *Caballero* centers on the novel's supposedly dual or divided subject matter. *Caballero* is a historical novel written in the late 1930s and early 40s by co-authors Jovita González and Eve Raleigh (penname for Margaret Eimer). Set during the US-Mexico War, it details the tragic decline of Don Santiago de Mendoza y Soría and the romances of his daughters. His youngest and most beloved daughter, Susanita, marries an American army officer from Virginia while her older, religiously devout sister, María de los Angeles, marries a rising Anglo American

⁴⁷ See David Montejano's *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986* p113-17. Montejano draws from Jovita González's MA thesis in his account of the early 20th-century collapse of Mexican ranch society on South Texas. While *The Squatter and the Don* chronicles this colonization in California in the 1880s, González and Montejano place it in the first decade of the twentieth century in South Texas.

politician. Like many historical romances, *Caballero* blends the social and historical context of its setting with that of its composition. The 1996 recovery of *Caballero* was framed, literally, by a kind of dialectic debate about how the text fit into Chicana/o literary history. The co-authored novel was also co-recovered by José Limón and María Cotera. Limón wrote the forward for the novel, which places González alongside Américo Paredes, “the primary scholar of Mexican-American South Texas,” and subordinates her writing to his as a “a kind of precursory text” for Paredes’ novel *George Washington Gomez*, also written in the late 1930s (1996, xv).⁴⁸ Cotera wrote a critical epilogue for the novel arguing that if *Caballero* is placed “in the context of other works by women of color and Jovita González de Mireles as a precursor not to Américo Paredes, but to writers like Ana Castillo, Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua, the novel’s trenchant critique of the patriarchal world view of foundational texts like [Paredes’] ‘*With His Pistol in His Hand*’ becomes clear” (1996, 340). This recovery framework was the foundation for later debates about *Caballero*’s place in Chicana/o letters and its status as a contestatory (or assimilationist) novel. The many doubles of *Caballero*—the double time of its setting/composition, its double focus of tragic decline and romantic ascendance, its dual authorship, and dual recovery—also set the stage for critical analysis through dialectic resolution of the novel’s dualisms into a unified meaning through various types of synthesis.

⁴⁸ The chronological confusion that sets *Caballero* as a precursory text for *George Washington Gomez* despite the fact that both were being written at the same time is reminiscent of the typo on the back of Ruiz de Burton’s *Who Would Have Thought It?* that refers to *The Squatter and the Don* as that author’s fist novel. In both instances, the chronology of literary recovery comes to replace the chronology of authorship.

Both Limón and Cotera’s characterizations of the recovered novel rely on a linear unfolding of time figured through dialectic development in Chicana/o literary history as a pattern of oppression and contestation. They interpret González’s work differently because they each emphasize a different moment of contestation within Chicana/o history (*el movimiento* of the 1960s for which Paredes is an intellectual forefather as opposed to Chicana feminism which responded to exclusionary politics in both the Chicano Movement and white feminism). But each of these Chicana/o contestations’ dialectical unfolding relies on identical temporal structures of linear history. In 2005, Monka Kaup examined the novel’s dual historical influences of setting and composition in “The Unsustainable *Hacienda*” to suggest a unified narrative of contestation within the novel. While the decline of the hacienda system did not occur in South Texas until the first decades of the twentieth-century, *Caballero* places this decline in its 1848 setting. Kaup argues that the novel fuses the two historical contexts in order to expose Tejano patriarchy as fundamentally anachronistic, to “divest the old male leadership of its heroic role” and replace male agency with that of Mexican American women (568). In 2004, Vincent Pérez compared the novel’s dual historical structure to Southern plantation romances in order to argue that the two primary romances—between Susanita and Robert Warrener and between María de los Angeles and Red McLane—stand for two different yet compatible types of cultural consolidation in South Texas. His essay “Remembering the Hacienda” draws on José Aranda’s Ruiz de Burton scholarship to argue that *Caballero* likewise speaks to the “heterogeneity of Mexican-American culture and history” rather than fitting into a paradigm of contestation (Pérez 472). Yet, while Pérez mentions multiplicity and the “countermemories of disenfranchised groups such as

women and the lower classes,” his analysis largely sublimates the novel’s critique of Mexican patriarchy into its argument for political and economic collaboration with Northern transplants like Red McLane.⁴⁹ In Pérez’s analysis, for example, Susanita’s romance with refined Southerner Robert Warrener becomes a stand-in for the need to honor Mexican culture in South Texas (475). Rather than maintaining the novel’s multiplicity, his analysis falls into a dialectic resolution of the text’s central message—that Tejanos must enter into pragmatic relationships with incoming Northerners, even as they also cultivate (trans)Southern sympathies that celebrate Southern and Southwestern cultural values.

Later accounts of the novel have read *Caballero*’s doubles and doubled doubles as moving outward toward multiplicity. María Cotera’s discussion of *Caballero* in *Native Speakers* along with J. Javier Rodríguez’s article “*Caballero*’s Global Continuum” and Marissa López’s chapter “More Life in the Skeleton” in her book *Chicano Nations* all notably acknowledge a third romance between Don Santiago’s son, Luis Gonzaga, and the army doctor, Captain Devlin, figured through their mutual love of art and implied desire for each other. These scholars also focus on the novel’s formal ruptures and disunity, and they explore *Caballero*’s temporal structure as “chaotic” or disruptive and irrational (Rodríguez 2008, 124, López 142).⁵⁰ The novel’s chaotic temporal structure

⁴⁹ Pérez draws significantly from José Limón’s “Mexicans, Foundational Fictions, and the United States: *Caballero* a Late Border Romance” for his formulation of the María de los Angeles-Red McLane romance.

⁵⁰ López writes, “The novel’s privileging of *female* desire, which Vasconcelos does not address, disrupts his eugenics of taste. The women are making choices, *Caballero* argues [...] The irrationality (in terms of its being outside a closed system) of women’s desire correlates to the irrationality of history in *Caballero*, and non-heteronormative desire disrupts the utopian project of racial transcendence conceived similarly by both Vasconcelos and LULAC” (142). I take the liberty of interpreting “history” and “racial

stems from the ruptured time of colonization, which serves as the shifting ground for the novel's multiple vantage points of articulation and critique. Rodríguez describes time as a key formal feature of the novel when he writes, "*Caballero* succeeds more at articulating tensions than resolving them, as if the authors felt a stronger imperative to pose the central problem of romance itself, rather than to answer it through a clear teleological purpose or crystallization of cultural value" (2012, 122). Indeed, the problem of romance itself, the problem of teleology, of tradition, of modernity, of cultural affirmation, and of any narrative closure is a problem of time. The opposition between tradition and modernity that appears as the novel's dominant narrative thread collapses into a battle between two colonial temporalities across which women and lower class Tejanos must move in order to survive and critique domination. Their movement is differential, to use Chéla Sandoval's theorization.

For Sandoval, differential consciousness:

is a mobile, flexible, diasporic force that migrates between contending ideological systems. [...] It operates as does a technology—a weapon of consciousness that functions like a compass: [...] The effectivity of this cultural mapping depends on its practitioner's continuing and transformative relationship to the social totality. Readings of this shifting totality will determine [...] the tactics, ideologies, and discourses that the practitioner chooses in order to pursue a greater good, beginning with the citizen-subject's own survival. Reading signs to determine power relations is its principal technique. (47)

transcendence" as temporal structures since both are heavily dependent on time. Cotera also mentions "borderlands culture, time and space" in *Native Speakers* but draws primarily on space and spatial metaphors in describing the text (2008, 218).

Though Sandoval describes differential consciousness through the spatial metaphor of cognitive mapping, *Caballero* demonstrates that ideological structures of domination are grounded in specific temporal formations. Despite its shifting nature, the “social totality” that Sandoval describes depends explicitly on a totalization of time like that of Tejano patriarchal tradition or Anglo American modernity presented in *Caballero*. The chaos of time in *Caballero* is a function of the chaos of colonization where two different totalizations of time converge. The novel’s disruptive treatment of time, which refuses synthesis, is a feature of its differential movement across various ideological temporal forms. The result is not a unified position produced through dialectic resolution, but a multiplicity of co-existing temporalities that subjects can inhabit and deploy as strategies for survival amidst shifting systems of domination.

The multiple and non-linear structures of time in *Caballero* disrupt the linearity of both tradition and modernity. Though tradition and modernity may seem to present opposing temporalities, they share some key features, particularly in the power structures and hegemony that they create. The logic of tradition is that of repetition in which the present draws meaning from its relation to the past and is valued according to its ability to create continuity between past and future. The circularity of tradition is also its linearity because deviation from the trajectory of return is imagined as transgression, much like the Mendoza y Soría daughters’ refusal to participate in traditional Tejano marriages sanctioned by their father. Unlike the circle of tradition, the progress of modernity is figured as a straight line moving toward a future that is different from and better than the past. Yet this line is also a form of continuity between past, present and future. The continuity of modern time is no less restrictive than that of tradition when the

new is often either a transmutation of the old—like scientific discourses of race and gender that worked to justify longstanding social hierarchies—or a projection of the present onto narratives of the past that figure the current hegemony as always already inevitable—like the logic of manifest destiny. Thus tradition and modernity are both linear and, to varying degrees, recursive though the two forms of time support different power structures.

At first glance, *Caballero* depicts the integration of María de Los Angeles, Susanita, and the *peones* into US modernist time via their romantic pairings and economic choices whilst the time of tradition unravels with the decline of Don Santiago and his oldest son Alvaro.⁵¹ The tension between tradition and progress and the seeming supremacy of Anglo American progress appears in a conversation between Don Santiago and his neighbor Don Gabriel who says:

“It is amazing, Santiago, how their minds leap ahead. It is a quality we lack, for we live in the past and the present and see the future with our emotions only. We believe a thing must be so, or so, and then we wait for it to be so. These *Americanos* say, ‘This should be so, I will make it be.’ And in that [...] we are already beaten.” (189)

Yet the fact that this conversation takes place between two older rancheros signals its position as the ideological background of *Caballero*, a background across which other discourses of time move throughout the novel. Disruptive narrative interjections and

⁵¹ The third romantic pairing between Luis Gonzaga and Captain Devlin exists outside both tradition and modernity signaled in part by their travels to Europe, which removes them from the time and the space of a linear US nationalist imaginary or any form of Tejano cultural continuity. See López for an exposition of the way that Luis Gonzaga and Captain Devlin’s queer pairing disrupts nationalist formations of time that depend on biological reproduction and inheritance (143-4).

individual characters' conflicting relationships with the past and future destabilize constructions of unified, continuous time for either tradition or modernity. While the stability of tradition breaks down in the course of the novel's romantic plot, the narrative of progress collapses with the novel's exposition of South Texas' future. González and Eimer interrogate the linear trajectory of both tradition and progress as always already internally discontinuous by playing the two temporal structures against each other.

Within the novel, tradition's discontinuity is not just a rupture in the past, but a rupture of the past that places change and modernity at the very foundation of Don Santiago's heritage. The novel opens with a foreword, which relates the founding of Rancho La Palma in 1748. In it, Don Santiago's grandfather, Don José Ramón, stands on a "bluff that looked like the fragment of a great stone wall" above Rancho La Palma to survey the land (González and Eimer xxxvi, 32, 172). His bluff works to frame the narrative as the locale of the first and last scene and is a place to which Don Santiago returns throughout the novel. As such, it signals the return and continuity of tradition. It connects Santiago to the past through a lineage of inheritance and patriarchal dominance that constructs his own identity in the 1840s present of the novel. The view from the bluff also helps reinforce the hegemony of patriarchal tradition. As Monika Kaup writes:

The Don appropriates the land by imposing a single, fixed perspective. Following the post-Renaissance landscape convention, where the perspective becomes "truth itself," Don Santiago asserts sole ownership, excluding social relationships other than his own and rendering invisible domestic labor via aesthetic objectification.

(570)

The materiality of the land that Santiago looks at and stands upon reinforces his patriarchal identity as the “real” and “natural” relation to a continuous system of meaning handed down from his forbearers. The constancy of the natural landscape and its cyclical seasonal changes follow the temporality of tradition. Embedded in this seeming continuity, however, is a rupture from the past at the moment of Rancho La Palma’s foundation. Don José Ramón builds his hacienda on the 1748 *Tejas* frontier so that he can, “rear his family and keep the old ways and traditions, safely away from the perfidious influence of Mexico City and the infiltration of foreign doctrines; not only for himself but for the generations to come” (González and Eimer xxxvi). The Mexican identity that Don Santiago clings to throughout the novel is, thus, the very identity that Don José Ramón is trying to escape. The heart of Mexico is already “foreign” on the first page of the forward, and indeed it is also modern in the sense that Don José Ramón is likely referring to Bourbon reforms and the resultant European enlightenment ideas that begun impacting Mexico in the eighteenth century.⁵² These influences threaten the

⁵² In 1748 Bourbon reforms were just beginning to take hold in Mexico. These reforms, described as “Enlightened Absolutism” by Scott Hamish, focused on modernizing Spain’s economy and streamlining its governance structure. For New Spain these “reforms” resulted in tightened Spanish control, and, as Raúl Coronado explains, the changes “attempted to convert Spanish America from kingdoms of the mother country into a series of money-making colonies” (7). These reforms sparked tremendous discontent from *criollos*, American-born peoples of Spanish descent, who were no longer allowed to hold upper-level government appointments and were replaced by officials from Spain. Don José Ramón appears to be *criollo* as the forward references a bell that his father, not Don José Ramón himself, had brought from Spain and his marriage to Susana Ulloa who also appears to be *criollo* because, while she moves within the court of Mexico City, her father wants to remove her from “the desolate scions of nobility who were parasites of the court” (xxxviii). Yet it is unclear where José Ramón’s political affinities lie. The “foreign doctrines” and the perfidious influence that he seeks to escape in moving from Mexico City to the Texas frontier could be the French influence that came with Bourbon reforms themselves as the Bourbon monarchs maintained close ties with France and drew on French political structures for their own reforms. On the other

tradition that Don José Ramón wants to maintain and paradoxically prompt him to seek change by moving to the *Tejas* frontier.

While *Caballero* undermines the continuity of tradition at the moment of Rancho La Palma's foundation, its critique of the Anglo American ideology of progress moves into the liminal futurity of Manifest Destiny. This critique is placed strategically in the temporal gap between the novel's historical setting and the time of its composition. The chiasmic form of Don Santiago's tragic decline and his daughters' increasing agency through romantic desire fills the space of the plot. Yet, there is a time outside of this plot, called the future anterior, that makes its way into the novel through narrative digressions. It is the future anterior or *what will have happened* that structures both novelistic form—a completed totality experienced through the linear process of reading—and the supposedly post-modern experience of living the present as the future's past. Frederic Jameson calls the future anterior, “the estrangement and renewal *as history* of our own reading present, by way of the apprehension of that present as the past of a specific future” (italics mine 1991, 285). Within the genre of historical romance, however, the future anterior is the estrangement and renewal *of history* as our reading present. Jameson's future anterior transforms the present into a kind of history yet to be historicized; historical romance

hand, revolutionary text that purported Enlightenment ideas like republicanism and helped fuel *criollo* desires for freedom from Spanish oppression relied on a trans-Atlantic system of ideas that “circulated to and from Europe, Spanish American, and the United States, from Paris, London, and Spain to New Grenada, and from there to Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Mexico, Louisiana, and Texas (Coronado 18). Though this “foreign” influence of circulating texts post-dates Don José Ramón's exodus from Mexico City, their ideals of revolution and self-governance seem more in line with the ideology that his character rejects. Either way, both the Bourbon reforms and the later (resultant) circulation of revolutionary texts are iterations of modernity. See Raúl Coronado's *A World Not to Come: A History of Writing and Latin Print Culture* for an extensive account of Spanish American and particularly Texan formations of Enlightenment ideas through a history of textuality in the region.

transforms history into a kind of present with the potential to be historicized in new ways. The future anterior is thus an ideal space for critiquing the temporal ideology of Manifest Destiny. As I discussed in chapter 1, Manifest Destiny constructs the future as having already happened so that the present of US domination can be projected onto a future of perpetual growth and expansion. At the same time, it absolves Anglo American colonizers of their own violent historical process by positioning US domination as inevitable; it denies historical alternatives. *Caballero's* form—particularly its narrative digressions into the future anterior—unravels the temporal ideology of Manifest Destiny.

Two narrative digressions forecast the violence that would come to Texas after the end of the US-Mexico War in the novel's future anterior. After a scene in which Don Santiago's overseer kills a squatter who is shooting at the Don, the narrator explains, "It was a scene that was to be repeated in variation for many years to come" (194). This exposition replaces the "pioneer" of US Manifest Destiny with "the fugitive, [...] the land-greedy [...], the trash, the '*puerco*' [...] the wanderer, fleeing nothing but himself; the adventurer, his conscience and his scruples long dead" (194). The second major digression into the future appears in the last chapter, where the authors write:

The War, said Washington, was over. Peace, said Washington, was here.

War, Texas knew, is a fecund mother whose children spring from her full grown. Want, wrapped in tattered sheets; [...] Revenge, and Hatred, and Murder, and Greed [...].

The War. Yes, the War was over. So said the record.

Texas wrote its history with a scratchy, blotty pen and called its southern line the 'bloody border.' (331)

In both instances, a revelation of the region's post-war future troubles the dominant Anglo narrative of Texas history. These comments open the novel's post-war future into a perpetual repetition of violence that counters Manifest Destiny's narrative of closure. While Manifest Destiny figures conquest as always already complete (even when it has yet to be enacted), *Caballero* narrates conquest as a perpetual process of violence, structurally incapable of achieving resolution.

John Morán González rightly contextualizes *Caballero* within the 1930s centennial discourse that celebrated the 100th anniversary of Texas independence. He explains that “Centennial discourses [...] celebrated the US-Mexico War as the fulfillment of a national Manifest Destiny begun at San Jacinto” (2009, 182). González and Eimer's future anterior present the war not as fulfillment but as failure of Manifest Destiny's promise to spread progress in the form of economic prosperity and democratic inclusion for Texas. This is important because the valorization of Manifest Destiny in Texas Centennial discourse that John Morán González describes was also a continuation of Manifest Destiny's colonization and oppression through its historical justification. Cotera writes, “the rhetoric of dominance that defined both popular and scholarly ideas about Texas, its people, and its history came to a head in the yearlong orgy of public history that was the Texas centennial celebration of 1936” (2008, 220-1). The Texas Centennial is a moment of public history that typifies modernist continuity as a form of hegemonic self-justification and projects present power structures onto both past and future. *Caballero*'s future anterior re-opens the past (as the novel's future) in order to critique the 1930s future/present created by US domination. *Caballero*'s temporal form disrupts not only Tejano nostalgia for the pre-war past but also Anglo Texan nostalgia for

a preindustrial frontier of pioneers and cowboys. The entanglement of past, present and future in totalizing, hegemonic constructions of time allows the novel's critique of any one form of time to reverberate across all the ideological uses of time made by a specific power system.

J. Javier Rodríguez reads the authors' narrative interjections as signaling a shift from their nostalgia for "the prewar Mexican feudalism being overrun by US troops" to nostalgia for a "hybrid Anglo-Mexican postwar feudalism destined to be superseded by a future wave of unscrupulous Anglo 'pioneers'" (2008, 123). His interpretation aligns well with the historical narrative González presents in her MA thesis, which Montejano would later draw on to formulate his description of the immediate post-war period as a "Structure of Peace." González's own designation of the second, twentieth-century wave of Anglo American immigrants as "America Invades the Border Towns," in a 1930 article, could also support Rodríguez's claim that Eimer and González looked to the period just before this second "invasion" as a time of peace and cooperation. However, I believe the authors' temporal maneuver is more complex here. In describing their narrative interjections, Rodríguez argues:

In effect, the authors have inserted a de-romanticizing sequel to their own novel.

As they bring the narrative to a close, they redefine the object of their nostalgia—no longer the pre-1848 Tejano Mexican patriarchy, but a "proper," more tolerant form of post-1848 incursion" which will then be overshadowed by a morally questionable, virulently racist future invasion. (2008, 123)

Yet this "de-romanticizing sequel" takes root in the 1847 appearance of squatters on the Mendoza y Soría land, and thus the "'proper,' more tolerant form of post-1848 incursion"

that Rodríguez describes does not appear in either the plot or in the novel's immediate future. The object of nostalgia he points to is an absent presence that the novel withholds—a future that never happens. By eliminating the triumphalist future that guides and justifies modernity's present, González and Eimer disrupt the foundation of US modern time in the same way that they disrupt the foundation of Tejano traditionalism. Through the lens of *Caballero*'s temporal critique, the Texas Centennial celebration of Manifest Destiny becomes a kind of mass hysteria, the public remembering of a future that never happened.

Rodríguez and Cotera both describe *Caballero* as dialogic in their move away from earlier dualistic and dialectic analyses of the novel. Yet, each scholar deploys the term dialogic in a different way. Rodríguez draws on the Bakhtinain tradition of novelistic polyvocality, writing, “the dialogism of novels can be seen as already antagonistic to the singular law of the patriarch” (2008, 126). For him, *Caballero* “is not about resolution itself” but about “a dialogistic search for resolution” (2008, 120). This search presents the “deferring mode of life” in which Chicana and Chicano artists dwell, where “to be at home is simultaneously to be in exile” (2008, 120). In *Native Speakers*, Cotera presents *Caballero* as dialogic in both structure and content as the result of a dialogue between its two authors. The dialogue of co-authorship also deconstructs the unitary nature of author(ity), replacing it with multiplicity and an in-between space of narrative negotiation. Cotera writes:

Caballero's collaborative authorship [...] destabilizes the dominant logic of historical mythmaking in Texas by offering a multi-perspectival vision of history, [...] the novel's dialogic structure—and the crossracial relations behind its

production—deny a stable ideological center to the narrative, and thus present a meta-textual challenge to the autonomous subject-in-resistance upon which Don Santiago grounds his oppositional logic. (2008, 215)

Though both Cotera and Rodríguez are drawing on Bakhtin's theory of dialogic imagination, the implication of their arguments can be significantly enriched by a more thorough explication of Bakhtin's construction of "dialogic" and its temporal ramifications.

Gary Morson and Caryl Emerson's critical biography *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* does much to shed light on the Bakhtinian dialogic. For Bakhtin, true dialogue never results in a synthesis or integration of differing points of view; instead, dialogic discourse is the inter-animation or "live entering" of one discourse by another that retains the individuality of each, and instead of renouncing their "out-sideness" to each other in an act of synthesis the two discourses draw on their differences as a "surplus of vision" so that each sheds light on the other (Morson and Emerson 53). This kind of dialogue is a perpetual interaction, constantly creating new potentialities in an open, "unfinalizable" form. As such, it undermines any totalizing or linear conception of history. The dialogic imagination also undermines the singular subjectivity that Cotera and Rodríguez both read in the figure of Don Santiago. Their analysis is right in the assessment that dialogic multiplicity undermines the unity, autonomy and authority of Don Santiago's patriarchal self, but it is the "unfinalizability" of dialogue—a temporal incompleteness—that makes this so. Because time operates through language and in language, the constant dialogic condition of existence is an inter-animation of different temporalities. Morson and Emerson write, "we think of individual selves occupying a

specific place at a specific time. But although that is true of and necessary for physical bodies, it is untrue of psyches or of any other cultural entities” (51). For this reason, dialogic formations always inhabit more than one temporality.

Bakhtin’s inter-animation of discourses is also relevant to Sandoval’s differential consciousness and other Chicana feminist theories upon which she draws. Dialogism is what makes it possible to view multiple ideological constructions from different vantage points and also what makes it necessary to deploy oppositional forms of consciousness differentially rather than synthesize them into a singular, totalized form of opposition. Singular opposition to a totalized system of oppression can only result in the synthesis of a new totality. The problem of dialectic contestation is, in fact, one of Chicana feminism’s primary critiques of Chicano Nationalism and Anglo American feminism. Gloria Anzaldúa writes of the new mestiza consciousness, “it is not enough to stand on the opposite river bank shouting questions, challenging patriarchal white conventions [...] All reaction is limited by, and dependent upon, what it is reacting against” (100). This is the problem with the linear trajectory of dialect interpretation and in particular with the conception of history as a dialectic unfolding through linear time. For Bakhtin, “Dialectics abstracts the dialogic from dialogue. It finalizes and systematizes dialogue. Individual agency, particular evaluations, the rootedness in the word that creates real potential for the unforeseen are reified and die” (Morson and Emerson 57). For this reason, *time* rather than space must be acknowledged as the constitutive medium of decolonial practice. The non-reified, non-linear movement between discourses and the ideological formations that they constitute must remain temporally open rather than mapped-out and processual for true critique and difference to occur. While movement

across borders has been privileged as the key feature of Chicana/o subjectivity, the ability to inhabit multiple spaces and identities at once is a temporal act. Emma Pérez recognizes this when she writes that the interstitial gaps in history's discursive formations "interrupt the linear model of time, and it is in such locations that oppositional, subaltern histories can be found" (120). She identifies movement within these interstitial gaps with Sandoval's methodology of differential consciousness (Pérez 5). The interstitial spaces in linear history are precisely what Pérez terms "third space feminism." But the fact that these interstices are outside of linear time does not mean they aren't *of time*, alternative times. Third space feminism could just as likely be third time feminism. *Caballero's* movement between modern and traditional formations of time, using the discourse of each to deconstruct the other, is the temporal embodiment of both differential consciousness and third space feminism.

In addition to critiquing dominant constructions of tradition and modernity, *Caballero* moves non-linearly across time through various characters' acts of remembering. Memories create inter-subjective dialogues as they move between personal and social formations of the past. Though shaped by shared events and shared narrations, memories draw on an individual's unique subject position and experiences. Memories act as responsive, mobile relations to the past rather than reified, linear narratives of events ordered through structures of cause and effect. Throughout *Caballero*, Doña Dolores' memories are perhaps most disruptive to hegemonic formations of the Tejano past. She repeatedly tries to reform Don Santiago's view of *Americanos* by reminding him of a past she believes he has forgotten. Yet their differing memories of a shared family history correlate to their different relations to power

structures within the Tejano patriarchy. Through the lens of Don Santiago's memory, we learn that Santiago and Dolores's brother, Ramón, returned home from the battle of the Alamo suffering severe internal wounds yet praising his *Americano* opponents. Not realizing that Ramón was wounded, their father, Don Francisco, struck Ramón for his insolence and thus dealt the deathblow to his own son. Don Santiago's memory focuses on the wounds Ramón received at the Alamo and the "devil's charm and contamination" that caused Ramon to praise his enemies (200). His relation to this memory is shaped by Don Francisco's deathbed directive to "Remember always that Ramón was killed because he defended his country against them" (19). Though Dolores is never able to reshape Santiago's memories, her constant reminders play against his figuration of the past to present an alternate history of patriarchal rule as destructive and tyrannical. Her relation to the past inter-animates Santiago's as she appears even within the frame of his own memory. Dolores is present throughout the scenes of Santiago's memory, and after he recalls his father's anger-filled deathbed injunction to "fight [*Americanos*] to the end" as the best way to remember Ramón he also recalls how Dolores "put her arms around her brother's neck and sobbed: 'Santiago let us never be like that, never!'" (20).

Dolores and Santiago's discordant dialogic memory moves well beyond the incident of their brother's death. Like the rupture of modernity at the foundation of Rancho La Palma, Dolores' understanding of heritage and inheritance disrupts the linear narrative of descent upon which Santiago's unified self-conception depends. In a quarrel about traveling to Matamoros for the winter, Don Santiago tells his sister "I command your respect if not your obedience. I am master here!" to which Dolores responds "Go into the *sala* and read what your grandfather carved on the rafter, that the Lord is the

master here. His things come first. Why did your grandfather build the house in Matamoros? So we could renew our souls by going to church [...] Respect [...]. First have some before you preach it” (26). For Doña Dolores, the family motto, *Dios es Señor de esta casa*, carved in gothic letters on the central beam of the *sala*, does not instill the collective memory of divinely ordained patriarchs who rule in God’s stead. She reads in the ancestral inscription an indictment against the arrogance, violence and oppression perpetrated by a line of patriarchs who fail to submit to God’s authority.

Unlike Santiago’s understanding of linear patriarchal descent, Dolores maintains a multifaceted relation to her *antepasados/as*. She links her identity not only to her grandfather’s inscription but also to a history of female endurance that has existed in the hacienda since the first woman, brought to Rancho La Palma against her will, became its matriarch. Doña Dolores’s grandmother, Susana Ulloa, “bore her burden bravely and well” and she alone appreciated the “beauty of soul and intelligence” in her daughter-in-law, Amalia Soría. When Amalia dies, Doña Susana nurtures Dolores’ independent spirit with the excuse that Dolores’s lack of beauty might be compensated by independence, but also with the knowledge that Doña Susana’s own beauty had done nothing to protect her from the isolation of the Texas frontier. Susana Ulloa teaches Dolores, Santiago and Ramón through her own sense of traditional continuity: “Religion, traditions, the ways that had survived centuries and received permanence through that survival, gentility—all those Susana inculcated in her grandchildren” (xxxix). Doña Dolores draws on this past when she forms memories of her family history, and its difference from patriarchal structures of tradition help her survive the temporal rupture brought by US modernity.

Susana Ulloa likewise bestows a cultural inheritance on Don Santiago when she tells him at her death, “You will someday be master of Ranch La Palma de Cristo [...] It was your grandfather’s dream, which he built into reality. It was my entire life. Santiago, be worthy of Rancho La Palma, and the things for which it stands” (xxxix). Marissa López points out that “Being worthy of the ‘things for which [Rancho La Palma] stands’ is an ambiguous task” (135). According to López, this injunction, quite different from Don Francisco’s vengeful deathbed exhortation, “presents the future don with the opposition between the ‘dream of a great hacienda’ and Susana’s exploited life, but the reader is unsure of which Santiago is to be worthy: the abstract dream or the material life, or perhaps she means for him to be worthy of the fact that the two run at cross purposes” (López 135). It is precisely the cross purposes that Santiago is unable to navigate. While Dolores moves between the inheritance of her mother, grandmother, father and grandfather, Santiago cannot incorporate women’s sacrifice into his understanding of duty, tradition or identity. After shamefully whipping Rancho La Palma’s elderly goatherd for providing meat to Texas Rangers, Santiago returns to the bluff overlooking Rancho La Palma to find solace in his patriarchal gaze. Instead, he finds a specter of himself who tries to remind Santiago that the Rancho is a place of communal linkage and that Santiago’s inheritance and responsibilities are multiple. The “man with his own face came and stood beside” Santiago, telling him:

Will you in the end know happiness if you deny it to [your family]? [...] have you forgotten that the master must be servant also? Who is master, the one who lashes, or the one who stays his hand? Learn first to master that most unruly of

servants—yourself. [...] You can be the man you are or the one I am. You know me. I am the part given to you by your splendid mother. (173)

Don Santiago's encounter with his other self, the ghost of himself, is a spectral moment, what Jacques Derrida describes as "a moment that no longer belongs to time, if one understands by this word the linking of modalized presents (past present, actual present: 'now,' future present)" (2006, xix). But Santiago cannot exit the linear time of his patriarchal inheritance to acknowledge the multiplicity that his maternal inheritance brings to his past and his identity; he "struck out with empty hand at the man with the quiet eyes, and struck again and again" (173). Santiago may be worthy of "the dream of a great hacienda," but the fact that he cannot be worthy the hacienda's multiple pasts leaves him immobilized amidst the shifting ground of colonization that women in his family are better able to navigate (López 135).

Doña Dolores' matrilineal memories expose the fissures in a Tejano collective memory that glosses over internal difference, yet she also reveals the way that mutual remembering connects people. Though Don Santiago cannot incorporate a history of women's sacrifice into his relation with the past, *Caballero* indicates that *haciendados* are not all modeled after Santiago. Few scholars note the novel's fourth romance, between Doña Dolores and Gabriel del Lago, perhaps because it develops late in the novel and late in the lives of the two lovers, but this romance is no less important than those of Santiago's children.⁵³ Dolores has grown to expect men to forget aspects of the past that hold significance for women. When Susanita is hastily betrothed to Gabriel del

⁵³ I should note that there is, in fact, a fifth romance outside of Santiago's family between Susana's close friend, Inez Sanchez y Argensola, and a Texas Ranger named Johnny White. Inez spurns Alvaro's advances and elopes with White after she is sent to a convent in Mexico City.

Lago in order to keep her from marrying Warrener, the widowed Dolores plans to give Susanita her old trousseau and comments on the groom's belt "Many a tear I wove into this for Anselmo," her deceased spouse, adding "if Gabriel recognizes it so much the better, though he won't; man demands that we slave for him and never looks at the finished work" (256). After Susanita breaks the engagement and Gabriel admits to Dolores that he is glad of it, Dolores and Gabriel recognize their own love in an act of shared memory. Gabriel tells her "I remember when you were married. You looked so forlorn and unhappy I could have wept. I did weep. I felt such grief for you Dolores" (323).

Unlike Santiago, Gabriel recognizes women's suffering and sacrifice within the tradition of patriarchal dominance. His and Dolores' shared memory does not embody the continuation of a unified Tejano cultural tradition. Instead, the older lovers flout the precepts of tradition and marry each other despite their age and despite the disapproval of Don Santiago, the priest marrying them and, Dolores expects, many of her female friends. Like Luis Gonzaga and Captain Devlin, Dolores and Gabriel's relationship is non-reproductive, though as a heteronormative romance, it is significantly less transgressive of patriarchal and nationalist values. Thus, while the novel effectively banishes Luis and Devlin's romance from the time and space of national development by having them move to Europe, Gabriel and Dolores remain in South Texas where they will continue to provide an alternate inheritance for Santiago's children and grandchildren, one that disrupts the unified linearity of patriarchal descent through intersubjective acts of remembering that create a dialogic relation to the past. Indeed, Gabriel del Lago has

already offered to give Susanita's baby his mother's rosary if the child is a girl, positing new Tejana maternal linkages beyond the bounds of the Mendoza y Soría family.

Unlike a unified collective memory that constructs cultural solidarity and continuity, Dolores and Gabriel's shared moment of remembering initiates a break from the past and from their cultural customs. Likewise the remembrance of Rancho La Palma's matriarchs multiplies and disperses the cultural hegemony that collective memory often upholds. While collective memory has been theorized as a counter to modernist history, it actually works more like a supplement that draws heavily on historical time in its production of cultural consolidation. Pierre Nora's classic theorization of memory-sites—material objects of cultural memory—posits that traditional memory has become unmoored in the wake of modernity. Premodern memory allowed people to envision the present as an organic continuation of the past, much like the circular trajectory of Tejano patriarchal tradition. Here, history opposes “true memory” because it does not enact a continuation of the past in the present, but instead represents the past *to* the present, reinforcing their radical discontinuity. But Nora fails to recognize that both “organic” pre-modern memory and modern (nationalist) memory sites are rooted in a racial logic of modern temporality, which, through discourses of ethnography and anthropology, constructs ethnic subjects as natural, organic and traditional in opposition to cultured, scientific, progressive, and modern Euro-American subjects. The “pre-modern” is thus a creation of, not a predecessor to, modernity. Kerwin Lee Klein critiques the scholarship on collective memory by connecting it to Hegel's assertion that “memory belongs specifically to those peoples, mostly in Africa, Asia and the Americas, who have not yet attained the self-consciousness essential to

historicity,” and he posits a postmodern reversal in which contemporary scholarship often “implies that memory is a mode of discourse natural to people without history, and so its emergence is a salutary feature of decolonization” (134, 143).

As a professional folklorist, Jovita González worked in an interesting nexus of these ideas, where constructing collective memory could be both a tool of oppression and a counter to dominant narratives. John Morán González describes Jovita González’s relation to her Anglo Texan mentor J. Frank Dobie, writing:

In many ways, González appeared to Dobie to be the ideal bridge between what he imagined to be the preliterate world of the Texas-Mexican folk and the literary realm of Anglo-Texan letters. Coming from a shabbily genteel Spanish land-grant family, González also fit Dobie’s preferences for a native informant whose ties to her community made her gathered folklore more authentic yet whose social standing mitigated the conflictual aspects that could emerge from such an identification. (2009, 176)

But González did not fit neatly into Dobie’s expectations. Dobie’s vision of folklore was not the scientific recording and distribution analysis of folkloric motifs like that of his contemporary Stith Thompson. Instead, his work is “an example of the romantic regionalist folkloristic ethnographer [...] who collects folklore from a community” and then presents it in “an embellished, stylized form, usually translated into standard literary form” (Limón 1994, 51). Such stylized professional practice gave Jovita González the literary license to actively produce, rather than just record, narratives of collective memory. And while Dobie’s renditions of Tejano folklore rendered it “ahistorical” and “apolitical” González’s folklore writing was “artistically implicated in a running political

commentary on ethnic, gender and class relations” (Cotera 2006, 13; Limón 1996, xxi). Working in a field that specifically aligned ethnic others with atemporal past-ness through discourses of memory and nostalgia, González used the folklore of her memories and the memories of other Tejanos to critique Anglo Texan paradigms of race and history. By preserving and stylistically modernizing Tejano folklore, Jovita González, like her contemporary, Américo Paredes, was constructing memory sites for a shared Tejano culture.

Yet, as Vincent Pérez explains, countercultural memories are just as apt to “cement layers of history and memory together in an iconic monument to the past, burying contrary memories in their project to buttress Mexican-American ethnic identity” (475). Richard Flores and Vincent Pérez have both drawn on ideas of cultural memory, and specifically Nora’s memory-sites, to discuss iconic figures in the US Southwest in the symbols of the Alamo and the hacienda respectively. Their use of memory sites to interrogate colonial domination is important because the role of colonization is absent from Nora’s original work. At the same time, they reproduce some of Nora’s too-clear distinctions between history, traditional memory and collective memory. Flores writes “for my purpose, memory, both singular and collective, serves as a means of authenticating a particular vision of the past; history, quite differently, refers to specific norms and values concerning evidence and interpretation” (1998, 432). What is interesting about professional historical discourse and sites of collective memory, however, is the way they work together through an interplay of contingent and totalized time. Peter Osborne explains that “Cognitively, dialectical images work metonymically,

with the part [...] imaging the whole,” for example, the hacienda as representative of Mexican American history (147).

Politically, however, they work the other way around, generating their allegedly explosive practical charge from the contradiction between transience or incompleteness of the historical present in terms of which they are constructed, and the perspective of completion inherent in their metonymic structures.

(Osborne 147)

The logic of metonymy itself projects wholeness; the situated, contingent hacienda actually figures the wholeness of Mexican-American culture that it supposedly stands in for. It is the idea that history can be complete or totalized that allows for memory-sites to stand in metonymically for that completeness—that wholeness or unity of identity—which, in fact, was always already an imagined completeness. The totalization of time by historical discourse is what makes collective memory, channeled through memory-sites, possible. The Alamo becomes the totality of history for Anglo Texans only when history is already imagined as totality. Metonymy’s projection of totality is the logic that conditions Dobie’s belief in folklore’s ability to capture the “spirit” of a particular people. The culture he imagines through folklore is already a homogenous, totalized people before his interpretation commences.

Jovita González’s engagement with fiction enabled a narrative interrogation of the links between professional discourses of history, ethnographic practices like folklore studies, and public instances of cultural memory like the Texas Centennial. Doris Sommer’s *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America* has impacted the way *Caballero* and numerous other historical romances are read. For

Sommer, historical romance acts as an allegory of national consolidation in which romantic pairings figure different ways of developing new national identities through the synthesis of different classes, races, nationalities, etc. Thus Límón reads *Caballero* as an allegory for Tejano integration into US modernity through the romances of Susanita and María de los Angeles.⁵⁴ In this figuration, romantic desire becomes an allegory for the way history can or should unfold. But what if *Caballero* is instead figuring history as the symbolic embodiment of desire—not the other way around? Third space feminism conceives of memory and desire as always historically conditioned. Emma Pérez describes memory as an iteration of desire historically inscribed on the body. She writes, “The body constructs its desire through memory, and it constructs its memory through desire. That which may not yet be—but will be—is the scenario created to satisfy desire, where bodies meet as if they had already met” (109). Instead of desire as the engine of history, historical experience is the condition that shapes desire and the ways that subjects are able to remember. Patriarchal tradition and US modernist history are products of white men’s memory and desire, where the sexual politics of colonization are what construct history in a particular way. While the novel’s romances may allegorize different potential histories as different kinds of national formations, underlying the romantic alliances within the plot is an interrogation of historical narrative, which deconstructs linear time as a figure of colonial desire.

⁵⁴ José Límón has referenced Sommer in at least three of his analyses of *Caballero*, the novel’s Foreword, his article “Nations, Regions and Mid-Nineteenth-Century Texas: History in *On the Long Tide* and *Caballero*,” and, most notably, his essay in a collection edited by Somers, “Mexicans, Foundational Fictions, and the United States: *Caballero* a Later Border Romance.”

John Morán González describes women's desire in the novel as a modernizing force that emphasizes the importance of intersubjective (as opposed to subject and object) relationships. For him, Eimer and González present desire and consent as a model for egalitarian cross-cultural relations. His description of the novel's project to modernize gender roles through women's desire risks slippage into an exposition on Tejana desire for modernity, as indicated by John Morán González's sub-section heading "Desiring Modernity in *Caballero*" (2009, 180). The temporal structure of the novel, however, indicates that modernity and the progress it promises are riddled with hypocrisy. Thus Anglo America's promise of egalitarian relationships, be they romantic, political or economic, become highly suspect. The Mendoza y Soría women's desire is constrained by patriarchal and colonial conditions, and thus their choices cannot be analyzed as the fulfillment of their agency as freely desiring subjects. Marissa López's analysis of women's desire in the novel is more fruitful here. She posits "a tension between form and content that can be read as a commentary on the viability of historical narrative" within *Caballero* (127). Historical narrative is disrupted in part because "The irrationality (in terms of being outside a closed system) of women's desire correlates to the irrationality of history in *Caballero*, and non-heteronormative desire disrupts the utopian project of racial transcendence conceived similarly by both Vasconcelos and LULAC" (López 142). Women's desire is irrational because the closed system of history corresponds to the closed system of heteronormative colonial male desire.

While I agree with López's assertion that *Caballero* questions the narrative's ability to represent history, particularly by interrogating the way that race conditions knowledge and temporality, I read the role of Susanita and María de los Angeles's

romantic pairings differently within this framework. López writes, “Angela’s marriage to Red McLane is tropic, representational and resolutely historical, rooted in time and pragmatism. Susanita’s romance with Lieutenant Warrener, on the other hand, exists in a world of metaphor and simile; it is timeless and ahistorical” (138). For López, the tension between the temporal and the ahistorical “raises questions about the relationship of narrative to knowledge and the racial logic of historical narrative” (138). I do not read the temporalities of the two romances as oppositional, primarily because I find the designation of Susanita and Warrener’s romance as timeless to be problematic. Instead, the sisters’ unions are two different iterations of a similar temporality, one that works to inscribe women’s desire within the colonial time of modernity. López maintains that the women’s “rejection of past influence signals a rejection of the racialization of time and knowing,” yet the rejection of past values is a constitutive feature of modern time, which valorizes the new in a constant negation of the past (138). Susanita’s and Angela’s interest in newly arrived Anglo American suitors rather than traditional Tejano husbands mirrors modernity’s privileging of the new (in US modernity this is always an Anglo American newness), which is perhaps the primary reason the novel has been read as a call to embrace US modernity.

Rather than embracing modernity, however, the Mendoza y Soría sisters move differentially through modern time in a bid for social agency. Their differential movement is most apparent in María de los Angeles’ marriage, which is based on mutual respect and mutual benefit rather than on the true love typically presented in historical romance. Don Santiago forbids his pious daughter from entering the convent, and so María de los Angeles’ finds an outlet for her desire to do good works in a marriage to

Red McLane. She will be able to help her people through access to Red's political clout, and he will gain political influence over Mexican American voters by marrying an upper class Tejana. Emma Pérez's comment about another Tejana's differential movement could be applied to María de los Angeles here: "she is still trapped in the confines of patriarchal conditions—and those are the conditions that condition her—but we cannot forget how she manipulates that control for her own benefit, for her own agency" (118).⁵⁵ María de los Angeles does not embrace modernity, but moves within it, using it as a tool to claim her own agency. Denied the limited agency of joining a convent, she chooses the limited agency of an Anglo politician's racialized wife. Angela uses the progressive time of cultural integration to perform her own acts of mercy, which exist in a wholly different temporal construction—one of spiritual redemption.

Susanita's movement within modern time is slightly more complex. It may be ahistorical, but this does not mean it exists outside of time. Susanita and Robert Warrener's love is destined and, as the novel describes, eternal. When Alavaro threatens Warrener for dancing with Susanita at a ball, Warrener thinks in reply, "Why I have always known Susanita. She is why I left Virginia and home and came here. Don't you see she was waiting for me to come to her" (94). Their love is outside the processual time of cause and affect, but as a relationship always already existing—a meeting of *destiny*—their love is not outside the temporal formations of modernity. While María de los Angeles's romance figures the historical process of ethnic integration through linear time, Susanita's eternal romance works through the same temporal logic as Manifest

⁵⁵ Pérez is here writing about the late-twentieth-century pop star Selina. Though enacted in very different ways and in different times, there is nonetheless a parallel in these two Tejanas' third space feminist acts amidst constricting patriarchal circumstances.

Destiny. It is the relationship between *Americano* and Tejana that has always already existed. Instead of working in opposition, the temporalities of Susanita's and Angela's romances work in tandem as two figures of US colonial time—historical progress and Manifest Destiny. Susanita's romance operates in the more abstract ideological formation of US modernity because, unlike María de los Angeles, who desires agency within modern temporal formations, Susanita's desire is for desire itself. She tells her sister, "Do you know, Angela, I often wonder if there isn't a part of us that is completely ours given to us at birth which cannot possibly belong to any one else. How can we completely belong to *papá*, if we have separate souls?" (212). Susanita's decolonial desire is the remembrance of herself *as* desiring subject rather than desired object. Like Angela, Susanita moves within the conditions of colonization to choose the constraints of Anglo American paternalism over those of Tejano patriarchy.

The Mendoza y Soría daughters' differential movements across ideological formations of time are not the only iterations of decolonial desire within the novel, although, along with Doña Dolores' actions, they are perhaps the most prominent. Christian prefiguration is another temporality through which characters and the narrator move to resist domination. The temporality of prefiguration is the only site of resistance inhabited by María Petronilla who highlights the fact that memory can work in multiple directions, not just from past to present. The narrator explains that María Petronilla's historical experience has been entirely of submission to patriarchal domination, and, thus, moving within this ideological formation has been her sole strategy of survival: "She had been too frightened to show resentment against [Santiago's] domination in the early days of their marriage and had protected herself with the armor of meek submission" (85).

Because María Petronilla has no past of resistance to draw from, her differential consciousness effectively works by remembering the future through the Christian temporality of prophesy. When Santiago sends Alvaro to join Canales, she tells him “remember this: your blindness and your hatreds will put a curse on the house of Mendoza y Soría and bring it heartbreak” (141). Unlike Doña Dolores who constantly reminds Santiago of the past, María Petronilla calls on her religious understanding of pre-figuration to remind him of the future for which he is responsible. Catholic temporality is markedly different from US modernity, and though at times it mirrors patriarchal tradition it also provides a site of resistance against this form of domination by working through temporal structures of redemption, prolepsis, reenactment, eternity, teleology and a whole set of causes and effects that operate differently than modern historical cause and effect. Each of the Mendoza y Soría women draws on the temporality of their religion to resist domination at different moments in the text.

The narrator, too, moves through the temporality of messianic redemption to critique Don Santiago’s shortsightedness. Tecla, wife of the Mendoza y Soría shepherd, gives birth to a son who becomes a symbol of religious critique within the novel. Red McLane delivers the baby when he is passing by and gives the shepherd family the gift of a silver coin. The baby’s birth is in many ways the opening of the Mendoza y Soría hacienda to Anglo Americans as José and Tecla’s jacal becomes a space in which Red can return unnoticed by the don. Don Santiago, unaware of the circumstances of this baby’s birth, converses with Gabriel del Lago: “‘Tecla’s first born is a bit of an occasion to the women,’ he explained with a laugh. ‘It is just another *peon* and of small consequence’” (191). The narrator uses biblical figuration to respond, “And had there

been someone to tell him that Destiny might use so lowly a thing as the birth of a *peon* to shape her ends, Don Santiago's laugh would have been long and loud. The birth of a *hidalgo*, yes, but never a *peon*" (191). Like María Petronilla and Dolores, the narrator uses Christianity's alternate temporality in conjunction with a religious hierarchy to subvert Don Santiago's understanding of patriarchal hierarchy as a closed, linear system in which he can ignore events significant to women, *peones* and, perhaps, God.

Despite the narrative figuration of Tecla's baby as future redeemer, the differential movement of *peones* themselves is largely invisible throughout the novel, which is perhaps a function of Gonzalez and Eimer's own class position. The most obvious sign of *peones*' agency is their gradual disappearance from the hacienda to seek paid employment with Anglo American ranchers in what Cotera calls their "love affair with free market capitalism" (2008, 200). Manuelito, great-grandson of the Mendoza y Soría's aged housekeeper Paz, is most visible and moves across cultural formations adroitly. After spending time in Matamoros during the family's winter holiday, he appears wearing the coat of a US soldier and the pants of a Texas Ranger. When Santiago threatens to whip him, Manuel "chanted again in the infidel's language: 'Manuel like 'Mericans, like bacon and ham, damn it all. Hurry up, Bony [the tavern owner], you old-poke, three of a kind beets two pair, the top o' the morning to ye, holy Saint Michael. Manuel you little devil bring me a drink, this is a helluva hole'" (101). Manuel's deployment of American slang is a break down in linguistic signification and a breakdown of the temporal cohesion that structures language, but this moment also signals his ability to cross languages and cultures. He becomes a messenger for Robert and Susanita's love notes and eventually learns to read and write in English and joins the

US army. Like the Mendoza y Soría women, Manuelito moves between different languages, cultures, and ideological formations in an act of differential consciousness. Through Manuel and Tecla's baby, however, *Caballero* pushes lower class Tejano differential consciousness into a future accessible only to *peon* children. The text likewise banishes Luis Gonzaga's queer differential agency to the margins by having him travel to Europe with Captain Devlin. But, then, margins are precisely where differential consciousness and its iteration as third space feminism exist—always between more than one ideological formation. Differential temporal movement allows Mexican Americans to be, not outside of US modernity, but always moving between modernity and something else, some other ideological formation of time in a decolonial moment of situated agency.

Unlike *The Squatter and the Don*, initially recovered as contestatory, and Otero's autobiography, often ignored for being assimilationist, *Caballero* was recovered as a contestatory and an accommodationist text at the same time by different scholars. While the novel's recovery framework moves toward complexity, it nonetheless preserves modernist history's linear structure by setting up a debate between two contending literary inheritances for the text. Later analyses by María Cotera, J. Javier Rodríguez and Marissa López acknowledge that the novel moves between multiple social and historical formations. The novel's irreconcilable multiplicity is a function of its differential time consciousness, an ability to move through and deploy different forms of time in order to expose and survive the ideological underpinnings of colonization. Scholars who look to the novel's multiple forms of time are best able to recognize its complex movements. To draw on López again, *Caballero* is a resistant narrative more than a narrative of

resistance. Like *The Squatter and the Don*, *Caballero* resists is the closure of unified analysis. It also gestures toward an open future through a number of children. Manuel, Tecla's baby, Alfredo, Susanita's new born daughter, and the baby María de los Angeles expects at Christmas will each navigate new forms of time that have not been foreclosed by an inscribed Manifest Destiny but instead remain open through the dialogic imagining of an unfinalized history reopened by Eimer and González' historical novel.

Today, I find that I can only come to terms with the archive when I realize my own investment in keeping it alive. For its death is my own.

-John-Michael Rivera “The Archive as Specter”

Chapter 4

Specters of Recovery: Economies of Debt and Responsibility in Adina De Zavala’s *History and Legends of the Alamo and other Missions in and around San Antonio*

Beginning in 1993, a four-year battle was waged over the Alamo plaza. It was no kitsch reenactment of Crockett and Travis’s encounter with General Santa Anna—after all, that battle only lasted thirteen days. No, this battle was waged over the installation of a memorial plaque honoring Adina De Zavala, dubbed the “Angel of the Alamo” during her effort to save the building from plans of demolition in the early twentieth century and preserve it for future generations.⁵⁶ She also became one of the harshest critics of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas (DRT), who now maintain the Alamo building, after she broke from that organization over differing views on the nature of historical preservation. Shortly after De Zavala’s death in 1955, the Texas House and Senate passed a resolution ordering that “in her name an appropriate plaque be placed in the Alamo ... in grateful recognition of her services to the history of Texas,” but nothing was done for almost forty years and no plaque bearing De Zavala’s name has ever been placed inside the Alamo (qtd. in Ables 131). The main debate about whether to create a

⁵⁶ Adina De Zavala capitalized De Zavala, probably following the convention of her father Augustine, who also capitalized it. Her grandfather, Lorenzo de Zavala, used the traditional Spanish lower-case de Zavala. I follow the usage of each of these individuals when writing their names.

marker for De Zavala and where to place it was waged between the Chair of the Bexar County Historical Commission, Richard Santos and key members of the DRT.⁵⁷ In 1993, Bexar County and the city of San Antonio approved the installation of a bronze historical marker in the Alamo plaza to commemorate De Zavala, but the marker sat in the basement of the county courthouse. Two years later, the *San Antonio Express-News* explained that “the effort to give De Zavala credit for her contributions to Texas has stalled out” (Anderson 1B). The marker was finally installed in September of 1997 under the prompting of a new Bexar Historical Commission Chair and Marker Committee Chair, though it was placed at a significant distance from the Alamo long barracks. In 2006, the Friends of Adina De Zavala celebrated her 145th birthday at a less controversial location—the Spanish Governor’s Palace, which De Zavala preserved after she left the DTR. The *Express News* titled an article about the gathering “Preservationist Adina De Zavala getting her due as historical figure” (Ayala 1C). The *Express-News*’ coverage of De Zavala’s resurgence as a public figure of historical preservation reveals an interesting economy of time. What *credit is due* to figures from the past? How do you repay a ghost?

Adina De Zavala’s writing and preservation work is an intervention in the process of historical recovery that speaks to the temporal movement of each narrative discussed in this dissertation. Her life spans the years of Ruiz de Burton, Miguel Otero and Jovita González’s textual composition (1861-1955), but it also spans the range of their different mobilizations of time. She embraced many aspects of modernity but vehemently

⁵⁷ See Flores Introduction to *History and Legends* p. xxiii-xxiv concerning DRT exclusion of De Zavala from official records. Since the mid-1990s, Adina De Zavala has begun to be reintegrated into accounts of the building’s preservation as evident in the republication of her book and the placement of her commemorative plaque at the Alamo.

opposed capitalism's commodity fetishism when it came to preserving historical material. She maintained complex relationships with the specters of various historical figures and their texts, and she respected the integrity of others' historical memory by interanimating her narrative accounts with theirs. Her work is an archival iteration of the differential temporal movement in the fiction and autobiography that I examine in the first three chapters. As a preservationist and an archivist, however, her work speaks more directly to the process of literary recovery itself. Her ghost points the way to differential movement within and between archives that can guide the preservation of Mexican American literary inheritances.

Adina De Zavala significantly altered the cityscape of San Antonio by spearheading the preservation of numerous Spanish buildings in and around the city, pushing for the retention of Spanish street names and working to have public schools named after Texas historical figures. Yet her work also refigures the city's timescape by creating a new economy of indebtedness to the past. Unlike a financial debt that can be repaid and canceled, indebtedness to the past exceeds the bounds of equivalencies and repayment. The archive and the preservationist give value to each other in excess of any quantifiable market exchange. John-Michael Rivera expresses the way that this relationship overcomes an abstracted and externalized value system when he writes:

I remember my professional training and try to rationalize the experience [of examining archives], to see the object as a kernel of history capable of giving me an objective glimpse into the lived past. But the quick-sonic sensation of walking amongst the dead captures my imagination and obscures my ability to rationalize the objects that constitute the people I study. (2007, 3)

The “rational” othering of history as object of study, as a totalized, linear progression of events separate from the historian, is disrupted by ghosts of the past who are not objects but subjects, complex individuals with whom we form relations across time.

Adina De Zavala worked to extend this intersubjective relationship with the past into the public realm. Her work critiques modern, economically-driven historical preservation that views conservation as an investment with an expected return. Her writing and preservation act against capitalist exchange and abstraction by emphasizing the material and historical specificity of people, places and documents over and against any attempts to commodify them. In doing so, she disrupts the homogeneity of time on which capitalist value depends and creates an intersubjective relation to the past that undermines the linear flow of time from past to future. Her relation to the past is intersubjective in that it grants subjectivity to historical persons by including their voices in her historical accounts and by expressing a responsibility to persons no longer living. Her historical engagement leaves us indebted to Adina De Zavala no less than to the historical figures she recovered and preserved, but that debt has not been fully acknowledged in a system of recovery that still depends on capitalist exchange and its corresponding linear and homogenous temporality. De Zavala models an alternate form of recovery by focusing not on repaying a debt to the past but on redefining how and to whom we are indebted.

In the early 1900s, De Zavala wrote an address to The Club Women of Texas titled, “Texas History: Written and Unwritten” to promote the study of biography to which “we are indebted for the most interesting details” (1). She complements the Club Women that they are well read and “must be perfectly familiar with Texas history written—to which

people in general have access” (“Texas History” N.d., 1). “However,” she continues, “much more has been written” (“Texas History,” N.d., 1). It is the “much more” that encompasses De Zavala’s life and her historical work. The unwritten with which she concerns herself is not what has never been written but what has been *unwritten* by dominant narratives of Texas history, and thus her work is that of rewriting (and re-righting) a past that would again be unwritten and rewritten after her death. The process of rewriting and un-writing signals a historical excess that is a problem of narrative itself. Like the unfinalizability of Bakhtin’s dialogism, historical meaning making is not a closed system. Yet modern historical narrative closes off the possibility of an unfinalized past through a modalized temporal logic that posits a fixed past impervious to change. Including material that has not yet been written does nothing to change this logic. The totalizing drive to gather all historical material in a veritable encyclopedia of everything that has ever happened does not overturn the totalizing drive to narrativize that material through the ideology of linear progressive time.⁵⁸ Refiguring historical erasure as an *unwriting* of the past disrupts this closed system. Historical erasure is not just a form of exclusion but the actual unmaking of history. While adding new material to the historical record changes its content, rewriting/re-righting history holds the potential to change its narrative structure.

De Zavala’s history has also been written and un-written in a number of ways that make it impossible to untangle her impact on Texas historiography. In addition to her unacknowledged impact on the landscape of San Antonio, her work invisibly shaped a

⁵⁸ See Adina Arvatu’s “Specters of Freud: The Figure of the Archive in Derrida and Foucault” for an explication of the interrelationship of Encyclopedic formations in French Enlightenment and German Idealism, and their interrelation (143).

number of official historical accounts. Though numerous professional historians contacted De Zavala for information about Texas history during her life, she was rarely cited. Robert Ables wrote his MA thesis on De Zavala in 1955, and it remains an important source for scholars of her work. He quotes De Zavala's friend, Mrs. W. J. Simmons, who explained:

She was the source of information of many articles contributed to Texas history, for which she received no credit. This I know very well, being a visitor in her home when students and historians of note would be there seeking information. And always in her amiable, unselfish manner she would respond to their call. She was never too busy, or otherwise engaged, to give information of historic value...
(qtd. in Ables 112)

The lack of *credit* given to De Zavala by professional historians, despite the *value* of her historical knowledge, proliferated as their work became the source material for other texts. In this way, the specter of Adina De Zavala moves across narratives of Texas history unaccounted for. The unwriting of her work creates a historical debt, an account that must be reckoned by rewriting her work through historical recovery—yet the unwriting itself makes this debt unpayable. There is no surety that her life and work will not be again unwritten.

The threat of historical unwriting is the result of both the literal and figurative economies of the archive. I will remark first on the literal, financial economy of archivization in which De Zavala is implicated before turning to the psychological economy that draws from Derrida's reckoning of the archive as a psychoanalytic space. Adina De Zavala's work, like the work of Ruiz de Burton, Otero and Jovita González,

was recovered through the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage project.

Richard Flores edited and introduced Adina De Zavala's 1917 book *History and Legends of the Alamo in and Around San Antonio*, which was published by Arte Público Press in 1996. Nicolás Kanellos, director of the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage project, provides an account of the financial economy that threatens recovery of each of these authors and many others. He explains:

Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage was turned down repeatedly for funding for many years by the NHPRC [National Historic Publications and Records Commission] and the NEH [National Endowment for the Humanities] while these agencies poured millions of dollars into projects to footnote the papers of the "founding fathers" (Kanellos 2012, 373).

In the most direct relation, a reifying process of commodification assigns the same degraded economic value to Latina/o culture and history as it does to Latina/o bodies and labor. The US economy thus devalues multiple iterations of Latina/o time from physical labor to creative production, to philosophical engagement. Kanellos also describes the way that the recovery project has entered into economic relationships with private companies like Newsbank and EBSCO Publishing that charge subscription fees for their databases, placing a monetary value on recovered material and leaving individual universities to decide whether or not they should pay large fees for "minority" texts (Kanellos 2012, 374).

On a second level, the financial economy of recovery works through a logic of debt that may appear more subtle but is nonetheless just as oppressive. Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage *is* funded by a number of philanthropic organizations

including the Rockefeller Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, among others. These private and government institutions are invested in maintaining the neo-liberal status quo that keeps them operating, and to do so they often employ the logic of multiculturalism—a superficial homage to diversity that deflects effective criticism of the neo-liberal state’s structural dependence on racism, classism and sexism. In its attempt to give long overdue credit to Hispanic authors of the past who have bestowed an artistic and intellectual inheritance upon peoples of the US, the recovery project becomes indebted to such organizations. Though philanthropy does not entail a financial debt, it does call for repayment in the form of acknowledgement and is often given with the expectation that recipients will not participate in radical political engagement. The copyright page of each volume of the project’s publication, *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*, and most of their (re)published historical texts proclaims “This volume is made possible through grants from [...] the Rockefeller Foundation.”⁵⁹ The economy of recovery that credits the Rockefeller Foundation for recovering US Hispanic texts yet failed for decades to credit De Zavala for her contributions to Texas history is inherently uneven in its recognition of debts to the past. The modern, capitalist economy that recovery must work within transforms people, places and time into abstract, interchangeable values. The financial economy structures questions of recovery like “how much should we pay for a text to be preserved and republished?” or “how much time should we spend studying a particular text?” and ultimately pits the “value” of Anglo American forefathers against Latina/o

⁵⁹ Other organizations have contributed to the publication of individual texts and are listed along with the Rockefeller Foundation, but the Rockefeller Foundation is the only one listed in every single publication.

authors writing throughout the history of the US (This economy is quite familiar to scholars who must argue for the *value* of their intellectual work in numerous grant applications). Thus, despite Kanellos' claim in the inaugural volume of *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage* that the Rockefeller funding was "a natural result of the work that the scholars represented in this volume have been developing over a twenty-year period," the foundation's choice to fund the project was also likely a calculated investment in a timely cultural and intellectual commodity that would add to the foundation's own political and cultural clout in a nation with a growing Latina/o population (1993, 13).

De Zavala's preservation work also left her embroiled in the financial economy of historical recovery. Her battle over the Alamo long barracks reveals the way that capital investment can colonize the past. De Zavala spearheaded the move to preserve the Alamo buildings in 1902, when she was president of San Antonio's first DRT chapter, the De Zavala Daughters (named after Adina's grandfather, Lorenzo de Zavala). She explains in *History and Legends* that in 1900 "The people of San Antonio had looked upon the old Alamo building as public property for years" (41). In the late 1800s, the Catholic Church sold the Alamo church building to the state of Texas and the rest of the Alamo property, including the Convento or long barracks, to a man named Honoré Grenet. Grenet reconstructed the Convento with wooden porticos and supposedly planned to donate the building to the public, but he died before his plans were executed. His part of the Alamo property was sold to Hugo, Schmeltzer & Co. in 1892, and De Zavala approached Gustav Schmeltzer immediately asking that he give her DRT chapter the first option to purchase the building when the company was ready to sell. After

several more visits from De Zavala over the next eight years, Hugo Schmeltzer & Co agreed to sell the building for \$75,000. Though the DRT was promised the first option on the property, De Zavala learned that a company from the East wanted to purchase the building and turn it into a hotel. In an expedited effort to raise funds, De Zavala recruited Clara Driscoll, daughter of a wealthy Texas entrepreneur, to join the cause and contribute funds for the building's purchase. Unbeknownst to De Zavala, Driscoll held radically different ideas about the purpose of restoring the Alamo building as a public space. Driscoll actually wanted to demolish the long barracks, which she thought were unsightly, and replace them with a park that would emphasize the aesthetics of the Alamo church. Their disagreement led to a feud that split the DRT chapter into two autonomous factions who fought over possession of the building. Adina De Zavala is, perhaps, best known for barricading herself in the Alamo long barracks for three days in 1908 to prevent their destruction.⁶⁰ She ultimately left the DRT and founded the Texas Historical Landmarks Association in 1912, which focused significant effort on marking and preserving important historical sites throughout San Antonio and the surrounding area.⁶¹ The DRT's construction of the Alamo as a modern monument and De Zavala's competing vision for the building reveal the way that capitalist forms of time dominate projects of historical recovery. De Zavala's preservation plans focused on historical specificity above and against the capitalist abstraction of value and meaning whereas

⁶⁰ Though she generated a great deal of publicity and forestalled the demolition for a while, the upper story of the long barracks was eventually demolished in 1913. She is still credited with "saving" the long barracks, perhaps because the first floor remains intact.

⁶¹ For account of De Zavala's battle for the Alamo see Richard Flores introduction to *History and Legends of the Alamo and other Missions in and Around San Antonio* and Robert Ables' MA Thesis. A number of De Zavala's obituaries housed in the DRT Alamo archives also recount the battle, which was widely publicized during her life.

Driscoll's vision for the site focused on adding economic value to the city via aesthetic beauty and abstract ideas of Anglo Texan heroism.

The DRT restoration of the Alamo building after De Zavala's departure from the organization worked to produce the Alamo as an abstract, aesthetic space that would contribute to both the ideology of Anglo Texan supremacy and the commercial value of San Antonio. The destruction of the long barracks was part of a modernist aesthetic project to produce the Alamo as a commemorative—that is to say commodifiable—space. As Peter Osborne writes,

Modernity is a form of historical time which valorizes the new as the product of a constantly self-negating temporal dynamic. [Yet ...] by producing the old as remorselessly as it produces the new, and in equal measure, it provokes forms of traditionalism the traditional logic of which is quite different from that of tradition as conventionally received (xii).

The logic of tradition in the DRT's Alamo produces a sacred space of communal memory at the service of commercialism. The Alamo constructed by the DRT is an idealized symbol of history that can be copied and reproduced like, for example, Alamo-shaped paperweights sold in the monument's gift shop. Clara Driscoll specifically sought donations from Texas hotel managers "to improve the surroundings [of the Alamo church], so that they may be in keeping with the dignity and glory of the old ruin" (letter to TX Hotel managers). Her project of "improvement" was actually a planned demolition of the long barracks, which would produce the Alamo as a discreet space surrounded by a park within the newly developed commercial center of San Antonio. The donations from local hotel managers were actually a form of investment made with the expectation that

the DRT's "improvements" would beautify the city and increase tourist and business traffic.

It was also an investment in the construction of Anglo Texan superiority, which went hand-in-hand with Anglo economic domination in the city and the nation. Richard Flores details this process in his book, *Remembering the Alamo*. The ideological development of the Alamo building as a site of Anglo American patriotism worked towards a seamless narrative of Anglo US superiority that, Flores explains, reified Anglo and Mexican identity by depicting the two races in binary opposition as heroes and villains of the Alamo battle respectively. Driscoll specifically wanted to create a "worthy and artistic monument" to the hero-martyrs of the Alamo battle, as she described in a letter to Texas hotel managers, but her own literary account of the battle "[made] no attempt to present the complexities of the past in relation to Texan and Mexican social history and assumes, quite incorrectly that the defenders of the Alamo were all US citizens or 'Texans'" (Flores 2002, 72). Clara Driscoll's wealthy father was part of the Anglo American class that reshaped San Antonio by shifting the commercial center away from the Mexican dominated Main and Military Plazas toward the area surrounding the Alamo building.⁶² Like the Texas Hotel managers, Clara Driscoll's interest in preserving the Alamo was an investment in her own class and race status.

In contrast, De Zavala's vision for the Alamo was based on historical specificity that resisted capitalist commodification and ethnic reification. De Zavala's rhetoric of

⁶² See Flores's discussion of the changing cityscape of San Antonio. He describes changes to Alamo Plaza in the 1870s-90s as "new mercantile and tourists enterprises" that were important infrastructural and commercial anchors that facilitate the growing needs of the city [...] and perhaps more important these changes map "centrality with power" as Alamo Plaza emerges as the new icon of San Antonio's modern identity. (2002, 52-53)

patriotism in her battle over the Alamo long barracks distinctly fought against commodity fetishism that would alienate the Alamo from the community of San Antonio. In her own letter to the people of Texas, De Zavala rails against “the Hotel Syndicate and many property owners adjacent to the old Alamo” who would benefit from the destruction of the long barracks (letter, N.d.), and her animated account of the dispute in *History and Legends* proclaims:

Long the battle waged—it was De Zavala Daughters versus Commercialism! New combinations and new syndicates were formed from time to time as new interests entered the contests to destroy the Alamo proper [...] The methods used by the interests are almost unbelievable! (1996, 46).

De Zavala’s attempt to purchase the Alamo long barracks ironically rested on a desire to remove the building from the realm of capitalist exchange. Her interest in the Alamo differed from syndicate *interests* that expected a financial return on their investment in Texas history. Her plan for the long barracks reflects, instead, both the communal inheritance of history and the material specificity of that inheritance.

While Clara Driscoll wanted to transform the Alamo into a “worthy monument” (Driscoll, letter, N.d.), De Zavala planned to restore the long barracks and use them as a “Hall of Fame and a Museum of History, Relics, Art and Literature” (1996, 45). The temporality of a *museum* is multiple and variegated whereas the temporality of a *monument* is hegemonic. Driscoll’s Alamo is the Alamo Richard Flores critiques as a hegemonic memory site of Anglo supremacy in *Remembering the Alamo*. Unlike monuments, museums can (though they do not necessarily) incorporate multiple voices and bring different temporalities together. Foucault refers to museums as heterochronies

(the temporal permutation of a heterotopia) precisely because they house multiple forms of time in a single space. But De Zavala's plans for the Alamo were unwritten by Driscoll's takeover of the DRT and its subsequent historical production of the Alamo. Despite De Zavala's inability to construct her material vision for the Alamo, her textual rendering of the site is telling.

Rather than a direct linear narrative, her account of the building in *History and Legends* presents excerpts from a wide range of historical documents including Spanish colonial records about the construction and condition of the building, a letter to Sam Houston from Engineer G. B. Jameson about the plan of the building, letters from William Barrett Travis about the prospects of the Alamo battle, and the signed testimony of Gustav Schmeltzer about the transfer of the building to the DRT. Not only that, she refers to defenders of the Alamo as Texans, not Americans and includes a list of men who died in the Alamo with their country or US state of birth listed when known. De Zavala's close attention to textual detail leads her to recognize the indeterminacy of the past. For example, she explains, "Potter and other historians give fourteen as the number of guns used [in the Alamo battle], Mrs. Dickenson said there were eighteen and Green B. Jameson and Santa Anna placed the number at twenty-one" (1996, 18). She notably credits the sources of her information as well. Her concern for the material specificity of the building and the battle work against the capitalist abstraction of value for the physical space of the Alamo and the capitalization on it as a site of Anglo American communal memory.

De Zavala's depiction of the Alamo is no less patriotic or celebratory than that of her rival DRT chapter, but it is significantly less marketable. The individuals involved in

the building's development through time are not abstract symbols but individuals accessible through the words they wrote and spoke. De Zavala defines Texas and Texans as separate from the United States, which they were at the time of the Alamo battle, and thus her patriotic rhetoric *either* celebrates a Texas nationalism imagined contra to US nationalism *or* demands that US nationalism recognize its own transnational origins. Though she proclaims, in patriotic and paternalistic fashion, "The greatest heritage of the children of Texas and America is the noble example of its great men heroes. Let us not forget their deathless deeds," her emphasis on remembering the specific details of not only the battle but the entire history of the Alamo building pushes against the abstract valorization of Anglo Texas and includes a variety of transnational, Tejano and women's voices (1996, 36). Through her inclusion of folklore about the Alamo, its defenders become, not the hero-martyrs of Driscoll's account, but ghosts with flaming swords who stubbornly persist into the present to stake their claim on the building and guard against its destruction.

De Zavala's communal imagining of the building also works to remove it from the realm of market exchange and the colonizing time produced by debt. In her open letter to "Friends," De Zavala writes of the New York based hotel syndicate attempting to buy the long barracks, asking "Shall alien gold dictate to Texans how they shall care for their Alamo?" (letter, N.d.). Capitalist exchange, if not always alien, is at least alienating as it transforms relationships, even the relation to self, into financial transactions. Debt is the gap in value that supports this system by appearing to create equivalencies while actually perpetuating inequity. In theory, debtors can cancel their debt merely by repaying it, but, as Ernest Mendel explains, systems of debt are neither transparent nor

equitable. Within coloniality, capitalism works by installing systems of unequal exchange and siphoning off the surplus value of colonized labor (Mendel 343-47). Mendel specifically describes the underdevelopment upon which first-world capitalist development depends, to recall Clarence Darrel's relation to the Alamars in chapter one. Thus, neo-colonial capitalism produces a system of perpetual debt and dependence to enforce colonial difference through class, race, and gender inequity. For example, the transfer of northern Mexico to the US through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was compensated by a payment of fifteen million dollars to Mexico and the cancellation of Mexican debt to the US. As the previous two chapters demonstrate, the dispossession of Mexican Americans in the US often occurred when they were forced to pay for legal fees and other debts with their land, thus extending the supposedly paid "Mexican debt" indefinitely into a future of economic disparity. The unequal exchange and devaluation of colonized subjects in the US Southwest is both material and ideological. Once lost, Tejano inheritance is transformed into an unpayable debt. The alien(ating) gold of East Coast investors would not have placed a fixed value on the Alamo building that could be easily transferred back to Texas. Instead, it threatened to remove the Alamo from local, communal control and create an alienating space out of Texas' historical site.

Indeed, Driscoll's "donation" to purchase the Alamo for the State of Texas worked equally to create an alienating space for Tejanos in San Antonio. Flores opens his analysis of the Alamo building with a 1960s childhood account of his own alienating experience during a field trip to the Alamo. While on a tour of the site, a young Anglo "friend" told Flores that he and other Mexicans were responsible for killing the Alamo heroes (1998, xiii). The outrageous claim of Flores' young companion reveals the way

that abstract renderings of history not only define ethnic reification, but use that reification to produce a gap in value, a perpetual, un-payable debt that supports the economic and social inequity of Anglos and Tejanos in Texas. Adina De Zavala's construction of the Alamo as a site of historical memory might have worked against this alienation, but her own experience with the building was also clearly alienating. After Driscoll gained control of both the Alamo long barracks and the San Antonio DRT, De Zavala disbanded the De Zavala Daughters of the Republic of Texas and formed the Texas Historical Landmarks Association (THLA). In her efforts to preserve the Spanish Governor's Palace through the THLA, De Zavala outlined exactly what credit would be given to donors of one thousand dollars or more—their name would be included on a bronze plaque—and stipulated that the Trustees of the THLA would maintain control of the building ("Purchase Fund Subscription List"). This contract-like solicitation for donations guarded against wealthy donors who might seek control of the Spanish Governor's Palace the way that Driscoll gained control of the Alamo.

Despite the clearly demarcated authority of the THLA inscribed in De Zavala's solicitation for donations, her description of how the Spanish Governor's Palace would be used was heterochronic and very open. She explains:

It is intended that this building when saved shall be devoted to the needs of the people; to care for their history, past, present and future; to preserve relics—yes—but also to serve the city, county, state and Nation as best may be in time of stress, is the aim of its promoters. The plans are not limited, but unlimited service [...]
("Purchase Fund Subscription List," N.d.)

The time of stress that De Zavala mentions may have been a reference to WWI, which had started but the US had not yet entered when she began her campaign to save the Governor's palace in 1915. But WWI would certainly not be the first "time of stress" for South Texas. The multiple temporal ruptures of colonization in Texas are the times of stress that create a collision of different temporalities within the history of San Antonio. In fact, Texas's multiple iterations of time provide the ground for the Spanish Governor's Palace's limitless potential that links the past and present in an ongoing relationship. The conceptualization of history as past, present and future—rather than just past—proposes an open and heterogeneous historiography and pushes against modernist history that figures relations to the past through totalized systems of valuation. Yet the mobilized, heterogeneous history De Zavala imagines is grounded in material specificity. Just as her actions against the DRT pushed against their production of a totalizing aesthetic for the Alamo building, her plan for the Spanish Governor's Palace remains responsive to the spatially and temporally situated "needs of the people." She demonstrates what John-Michael Rivera's description of archival spectrality would gesture toward fifty-two years after her death—that attention to the details and the specificity of historical material does not require objectivity and its corresponding objectification of history. Her work disrupts not only the financial economy of the archive but also the psychological economy of the archive.

The gathering together of archival material is a form of psychological violence deeply interrelated with the economy of capitalist distribution. Its system of classification denies the fullness and complexity of meaning for archival objects, negating their multifaceted temporal connections by imagining a false unity of material.

The process of selection and exclusion of material for an archive also does violence to that which lies outside the archive, as exemplified by the exclusion of Hispano material in US archives that Kanellos critiques. Rodrigo Lazo deals with the crossing between these two forms of violence in “Migrant Archives: New Routes in and out of American Studies.” He discusses migrant archives as a paradigm for thinking about material outside of official archival structures and the violence that occurs when these materials move into traditional archives through a process of classification and translation. His analysis, like John-Michael Rivera’s, draws on Jacques Derrida’s linkage of archiving and the field of psychoanalysis in his *Mal d’archive* or *Archive Fever*, which implicates the process of archival inclusion/exclusion in a Freudian economy of the psyche. Derrida explains:

The gathering into itself of the One is never without violence, [...] Consignation is never without that excessive pressure (impression, repression, suppression) of which repression (*Verdrängung* or *Unverdrängung*) and suppression (*Unterdrückung*) are at least figures [...] At once, at the same time, but in a same time that is out of joint, the One forgets to remember itself to itself, it keeps and erases this injustice that it is. (1996, 78)

The psychic economy of selection and exclusion creates a false unity, an identity that is self-alienating as the One forgets to remember itself to itself. It is of utmost importance to remember that the material process of archiving is economically dependent. John-Michael Rivera recounts his own childhood experience discovering a treasure trove of material in the apartment of Mr. Martinez, teacher, volunteer librarian, and unofficial archivist of “Latino culture in the San Fernando Valley, the place where he was born and

would die” (2007, 1). When neither professional librarians, nor his own community could afford the time to save Mr. Martinez’s collection, Rivera’s “belief in the power of things, in things Latino, began to lose its significance and appeal” and he “began to see” the cultural objects “as junk” (2007, 1-2). The economic valuation of people and material that bleeds into the archival sanctioning of particular identities contributes to an internalization of the values of market capitalism. The unity that archives project is the unity of the self-legitimizing bourgeois citizen-subject.

Though Derrida does not explicitly link his theories of the archive in *Archive Fever* and his economic critiques in *Specters of Marx*, both books prominently feature issues of inheritance, spectrality and disjointed time. And these texts need to come together in an analysis of Chicana/o history and literary recovery, in part because Chicana/o Studies was itself founded on both Marxist and psychoanalytic critiques of Anglo American oppression. While John-Michael Rivera and Rodrigo Lazo have drawn on *Archive Fever* to analyze the developing archive of Chicana/o and Latina/o texts, neither has linked their analysis to Marxism or the Marxist specter. Modern iterations of both capitalist and psychoanalytic relations to the past are figured through economies of debt. The temporal structure of debt imagines current conditions (economic, psychological, or historical) as being generated by past events, and thus the goal of the present is to discover and make reparation for an originary act, be it an act of patriarchal founding, national origin, capitalist financing, cultural formation, physical or psychological trauma, etc. What is most significant about Derridian specters is the way they disrupt the unidirectional flow of time and thus the psychological and economic relation to the past as a form of debt.

In both *Specters of Marx* and *Archive Fever*, specters disjoin time. In a way, the specter *is* disjointed time, and thus a relation to the specter cannot be the linear relation of debt but only the multi-directional relationship of indebtedness as a form of responsibility, a relationship that can be reciprocated but not cancelled. While spectrality disrupts the binary of physical presence/absence, it also disrupts the binary of temporal presence/absence, of now/not now, which makes it impossible to act in linear time. Adina De Zavala was not a literary theorist; she was a preservationist, but her work models the work of learning to live with ghosts that Derrida presents as an ethics of deconstruction. He writes:

The time of the “learning to live,” a time without tutelary presence, would amount to this [...]: to learn to live with ghosts, in the upkeep, the conversation, the company, or the companionship, in the commerce without commerce of ghosts. [...] No *being-with* the other, no *socius* without this *with* that makes *being-with* in general more enigmatic than ever for us. And this being-with specters would also be, not only but also, a *politics* of memory, of inheritance, and of generations. (1993, xvii-xviii)

Adina De Zavala’s text performs a being-with-ghosts that disrupts the inheritance of modernist linear history and participates in a relationship of responsibility to those not present and those denied presence by modern ideological formations of time—the specters who exist in the time of third space feminism. And this is extremely important because in refiguring the temporal logic of debt through intersubjective relations with ghosts of the past Adina Da Zavala moves toward a decolonization of time.

In contrast, the 1996 literary recovery of Adina De Zavala's work remains firmly planted in the psychic economy of debt. Richard Flores' recognizes the content, but not the form of De Zavala's writing and preservation, and thus he reads her work as a Freudian displacement. He sees in her a repressed Mexican identity because her fervor for Spanish Texas history did not extend into more overt political activism; "[a] preserver of Mexican and Spanish material culture, she gave seemingly negligible attention to the contemporary heirs of these artifacts" (Flores 1996, xl). Flores argues:

the crux of my thesis on De Zavala, is that her deep interest in the material and social restoration of a Spanish and Mexican past, expressed through her work of artifactual preservation and historical legendry, results from the displacement of her "Mexican" self onto these other levels of practice. [...] Her life is spent in search of the "lost realms" of Spanish and Mexican Texas precisely because her ethnic sense of self has been displaced by Texas subjectivity. (1996, xlviiii)

Flores' portrayal of Adina De Zavala as repressed repeats the temporal logic of the DRT's historical repression of her work. In figuring her as ethnically repressed, he implicitly posits a unified, non-repressed ethnic subject compared to which De Zavala falls short. The unity of the subject (be it psychological or ethnic), like the unity of the archive, is a form of violence. Flores' implied critique of De Zavala for failing to extend her work into more overt political activism also belies an assumption that the present is the primary temporal sphere—that De Zavala should have been more concerned with the material conditions of Mexican Americans in her present than she was with the material buildings and documents of the past, and that the parts of history most valued in the

analyst-scholar's present should be most valued in the past as well. This politics of inheritance works against the heterogeneous forms of time in De Zavala's own work.

The political foment in South Texas that existed contemporary to, yet outside of, De Zavala's work is the past to which Flores imagines a debt in Chicana/o culture. From the 1915 Plan de San Diego to the 1930s work of Communist Party activist Emma Tenayuca, John-Michael Rivera asserts that "radical emancipation remains a specter in Mexican peoplehood" and more specifically, "[t]he Mexican American generation emerges [...] by repressing its radical past (2006, 152, 154). Rivera notes the ambivalence between a collective celebration of a radical past via corridos and "old stories" and a collective repression of such radicalism in order to pursue the illusive promise of US democratic inclusion as both equally constitutive of Mexican American collective identity (2006, 147). Adina De Zavala, however, fits neither of these paradigms. The Mexican American radical *past* of South Texas occurred during the later years of De Zavala's adult life and is neither the conscious nor the unconscious content of her preservation work. It might help to remember that Adina De Zavala was actually closer in age to María Amparo Ruiz de Burton than she was to Jovita González or Américo Paredes.⁶³ Nor did she focus on valorizing the present. If De Zavala's work has a radical past at all, it is the radical past of Spanish colonization or the Texas Revolution.

Repaying a debt to the specter of radical Chicana/o emancipation through the recuperation of Adina De Zavala's writing turns out to be impossible. It applies an ill

⁶³ While De Zavala was twenty-nine years younger than Ruiz De Burton, she was forty-four years older than González and fifty-four years older than Paredes. This relation may be easy to forget because De Zavala was very active in historical recovery late into her life. She was also a member of the Texas Folklore Society during some of the same years as González.

suited paradigm of linear development to De Zavala's work, one that combines normative narratives of (Chicano) nationalist development and psychological development. Grace Hong and Roderic Ferguson discuss the way that nationalists of color narratives and the internal colonial model from which they draw:

prompted comparative agendas based on narratives of underdevelopment [and] those narratives were often times articulated as those of castration. [...] From this position, hegemonic comparative analysis would help to constitute a fraternal politics across race, ethnicity and nation aimed at heteropatriarchal retrieval. (8)

Flores' presentation of Adina De Zavala as ethnically repressed depends on a racial binary of Anglo versus Mexican Texas that imagines both groups through a fundamentally heteropatriarchal lens of national and psychological development. While Driscoll's vision for the Alamo embodies the two-dimensional reification of Anglo and Mexican identity that Richard Flores expertly describes in his monograph *Remembering the Alamo*, De Zavala should not be implicated in this project. De Zavala did not participate in its construction as a symbol of anti-Mexican sentiment. According to her own words, she did not want the building to be a symbol at all. In a 1936 letter to the editor, again defending the importance of the Alamo long barracks, she recounts the battle of the Alamo and writes "They tell us that this does not matter; that all we need is a symbol for the people to rave over; that the Alamo church answers that purpose—that we do not have to have even the approximate truth of the facts—or the real thing!" (newspaper clipping 1936). Her writing works against the abstraction of historical meaning that makes ethnic reification possible in South Texas. While Flores commends De Zavala's concern for the "goals of shared responsibility and equality, the issues of

class displacement and racial abuse and the subsequent outcome of social and psychological devaluation” in a letter she wrote in 1949 (when she was 88 years old), he also mentions “the rhetoric of cultural nationalism is clearly absent from her writing” (1996, xlv). But Flores can only imagine two nationalisms, Anglo American and Mexican, when he writes of Adina De Zavala’s public persona as “that of a woman of partial Mexican ancestry whose allegiance and politics lie not with her grandfather’s ‘patria,’ but with the emerging Anglo American status quo of the day” (1996, xxix). The *patria* of her patriarch—grandfather Lorenzo de Zavala—would be the proper origin and thus the proper debt for a non-repressed Adina De Zavala to repay.

The slippage between *patria* and patriarchal lineage betrays a troubling aspect of Adina De Zavala’s incorporation into the US Hispanic Literary Heritage archive. What makes her part of this archive—her name, her familial connections, the content of her work? Rodrigo Lazo writes that “[a]lthough the project is capacious in its definition of ‘Hispanic’ and is also sensitive to the variety of populations that might be part of that group historically, the claim to heritage retroactively organizes the project’s texts under the rubric of contemporary identity formation” (47). The Recovery Project’s focus on heritage and inheritance positions recovered authors within a line of descent that ties together the heritage—familial, racial, ethnic—of recovered subjects to the intellectual inheritance that they bequeath to contemporary readers. As with Freudian analysis, biological lineage and psychological/intellectual lineage are interrelated through narratives of development across linear time. In the case of the Recovery Project, Lazo explains, “an ethnicity and an ethnic archive validate and sustain each other” (50). For Adina De Zavala, this classification requires her lineage to appear more linear than it

actually is. Flores acknowledges that Adina De Zavala has both Irish and Mexican ancestry and asks “But what does she make of her Mexican-Irish-Spanish self?” answering, “Instead of accepting her Mexican, lower-status identity, she reattaches herself to Texan ancestry, one rightly accorded through her Irish heritage” (1996, xlv, xlvii).⁶⁴ While Flores linguistically buries De Zavala’s maternal Irish heritage in the description of her “Mexican-Irish-Spanish self,” he also fails to note the way that Adina De Zavala specifically stakes her claim to Texan ancestry on her link to paternal grandfather Lorenzo de Zavala.

Adina De Zavala’s paternal grandmother was New Yorker Emily West, who married a German and then an Anglo Texan after Lorenzo’s death. These familial intricacies trouble the idea of Adina De Zavala’s “Mexican” heritage since her father, Augustine, was a mere five-years-old when Lorenzo died and was consequently raised by his mother and stepfathers. Adina’s mother was born in Ireland. If her professional writing were purely a reflection of genealogy, one might wonder, in fact, why Adina De Zavala wrote about Mexican Texas history at all. But Adina De Zavala’s claim to Texas heritage hinges specifically on her association with Lorenzo de Zavala. She names her DRT chapter after him, and he is the only ancestor whose biography appears in *History and Legends*. Ironically, like Adina De Zavala’s biological descent, Lorenzo de Zavala’s national identity has proved equally problematic. Flores describes him specifically as a “Mexican statesman” (1996, vii), but John-Michael Rivera more accurately explains “in

⁶⁴ De Zavala’s identity should not be classified as “lower-status” if by that Flores means lower-class. Though De Zavala worked as a teacher from 1844-1907, she was not impoverished even after she stopped working. She moved within the circles of San Antonio socialites and professionals. Indeed, class status troubles recovery projects for each of the authors in this dissertation because it troubles a particular image of ethnic identity and contestation.

many ways he was never fully a native of any land. [...] Zavala was ironically a man without a people” (2005, xxix). Born a *criollo* in New Spain, Lorenzo de Zavala helped draft the Mexican Constitution of 1824, was exiled in 1830 for his Federalist politics, and later helped draft the constitution of the Republic of Texas serving as that nation’s first vice president. Though Adina De Zavala draws on her own biological and nation descent from the *Texas* statesman, Lorenzo de Zavala, it is his mobile diasporic movement that forms Adina De Zavala’s inheritance—an inheritance that disrupts linear development even as it appears to support a line of biological descent. An inheritance of non-linear, multiple and discontinuous identity across time may likewise be a key identitarian relationship between the recovery project’s texts and its readers.

Ostensibly, Richard Flores and Adina De Zavala are both concerned with recovering the forgotten past. In this sense, Flores’ recovery of De Zavala’s text is a repetition of her own recovery work that promotes the continuance of her archive(s). But Flores’ recovery acts through a paradigm of restoration rather than preservation. Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Genaro M. Padilla specifically claim of the recovery project “our endeavor is recuperative; our project is restorative” (21). But true restoration is never possible and always becomes caught up in cycles of repetition. Flores reads De Zavala’s text as a desire for the restoration of a romantic “Tejas” past, but his recovery of her performs its own kind of restoration (2002, 91). By uncovering the Mexican identity that is “repressed” in her work, Flores symbolically restores that identity. His psychoanalysis of De Zavala is what makes her recoverable as a *mexicana* author (albeit a repressed

one).⁶⁵ Restoration works through the logic of debt to create the same kind of gap in value that can then, supposedly, be equalized. Only by being repressed can De Zavala be restored as a figure of Chicana or Mexicana cultural production. De Zavala, however, does not seek to restore a romantic Tejas past or any other past. Instead, her writing creates an intertextual dialogue with the past—indeed, with multiple pasts. A large portion of her *History and Legends* is composed of other people's writing: church records, poems, letters, lists, photographs, and legends that are, to some extent, communally constructed. The texts that make up her tome are literally and figuratively full of ghosts. Unlike Flores' ontological analysis of De Zavala's (repressed) identity, De Zavala's own work is *hauntological*, a mode of inquiry which Colin Davis describes as "the structural openness or address directed towards the living by the voices of the past or the not yet formulated possibilities of the future" (379).⁶⁶ Unlike the haunting of a Freudian uncanny, in which "the ghost's secret" is "a puzzle to be solved" (387-9), Davis writes, "[c]onversing with specters is not undertaken in the expectation that they will reveal some secret, shameful or otherwise. Rather, it may open us up to the experience of

⁶⁵ Indeed, Tejana repression is pathologized by Flores through his comparative analysis of Jovita González. He writes:

Personal displacements such as this are not unheard of for Mexican women of this period. Writing about De Zavala's colleague and associate in the Texas Folklore Society, José Limón's comments concerning Jovita González are appropriate for De Zavala as well. She was, he says, "unsupported by the luxury of a 'growing ethnic-feminist consciousness,' who perhaps only appears to 'turn a blind eye' on her roll as a historical writing subject with respect to her native community." (1996, xlix)

I would conjecture, however, that even if De Zavala and González had enjoyed the *luxury* of an "ethnic feminist consciousness," they would still not be immune to Flores and Limón's critique.

⁶⁶ Davis and other analysts of Derrida's concept of spectrality discuss its difference from and interplay with the work of psychoanalysts Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok, not with Freud directly.

secrecy as such: an essential unknowing which underlies and may undermine what we think we know” (377). De Zavala’s act of unknowing is her engagement with the Texas history that has been unwritten through historiographical erasure in the history texts “to which people in general have access” (De Zavala, “Texas History,” N.d. 1). Such unknowing is a spectral act. De Zavala does not analyze history’s ghosts in order to exorcise them and restore cohesion in the form of a linear narrative of the past. Instead, she includes the temporally disjointed discourses of ghosts in her archive and in doing so creates a new politics of time. The “commerce without commerce of ghosts” that Derrida describes in *Specters of Marx* signals their intersubjective relationships of responsibility across time that Adina De Zavala highlights through her coordination of material relics buildings, and documents with immaterial ghosts, legends, and apparitions (xviii, 2006).

Adina De Zavala does not create one archive but multiple archives—archives within archives—that point to each other and outward toward other archives. To begin with, the buildings she preserved were all archives in their own right, edifices that housed government and church records. They are the sites of authority and historicity from which modern archives would emerge. *History and Legends* also has an archival structure in its collection of photographs and historical documents of various genres that dialogue with each other while also pointing outward toward the missions they reference. Ever knowledgeable about the archival process, De Zavala willed her collection of personal writing, newspaper clippings, organizational records, historical documents and artifacts to the Dolph Briscoe Center for American History and Incarnate Word College, and some of her smaller archives are contained within these official collections of her work. In one of the most fascinating juxtapositions, she transformed large financial

ledgers into scrapbooks full of newspaper clippings and architectural drawings. She also finished Edmond J. P. Schmitt's collation of Kingsborough's *Antiquities of Mexico* after his death from a tubercular condition. *Antiquities of Mexico* was a nineteenth-century multi-volume work of facsimiles of Mesoamerican codices, archeological descriptions and Spanish colonial accounts.⁶⁷ According to De Zavala's editor's note "[Schmitt's] proof being in many places meaningless I had to review the entire work and in some places re-write" (Schmitt, 5). As seen in her work on the *Antiquities of Mexico* collation, De Zavala's interest in archives extended well beyond US national constructions of the archive. In "Texas History: Written and Unwritten," she writes, "In the libraries and archives of Mexico and in the Libraries of Europe are rare and wonderful books and unprinted manuscripts relating to Texas" (N.d. 1). The interconnection and multiplicity of archives referenced and created by her work reveal the impossibility of repaying a debt to any ghosts of history. Instead of tracing a linear trajectory of debt, her work maps out complex networks of indebtedness and responsibility among the ghosts of the Alamo, the ghosts of other Spanish mission, the ghosts of indigenous peoples, the ghosts of other scholars and, consequently, her own ghost.

The Adina De Zavala Papers housed at the Briscoe Center for American History and the University of the Incarnate Word certainly establish De Zavala as a ghost of the archive, but something more fundamental also spectralizes her. By engaging with ghosts in order to create a dialogic relationship of responsibility among people, places and texts of the past, she performs what Avery Gordon has described as "[m]aking a common cause" with her subject of study. Gordon writes:

⁶⁷ An original copy of Kingsborough's *Antiquities of Mexico* was held by the sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word in San Antonio where Schmitt compiled his collation.

Following the ghosts is about making a contact that changes you and refashions the social relations in which you are located. It is about putting life back in where only a vague memory or a bare trace was visible to those who bothered to look. It is sometimes about writing ghost stories, stories that not only repair representational mistakes, but also strive to understand the conditions under which a memory was produced in the first place, toward a counter-memory, for the future. (45)

By engaging with ghosts of the past and recognizing her responsibility to them, De Zavala becomes a specter herself. She is a fragmented absent presence not because of any ethnic repression but because she recognizes herself in multiple relations of indebtedness to ghosts of the past that are themselves already disjointed and moving in multiple directions. Srinivas Aravamudan argues that the historian-subject of anachronism is “a fragmented, fragmentary subject, the object, abject, or even reject of historicism, its craven remainder, and indeed an anachronism, but also its pretext, purpose and incitation” (352). The excess remainder of historicism subverts debt-based economies because there is always something left over, left out, in the reckoning of historical debts. Adina De Zavala can never repay her debt to the ghosts of her past because there will always be another ghost pointing in a different direction and tracing another path of responsibility. Instead of trying to exorcise the ghost by cancelling her debt to it, she calls out to the ghost, invites it into her text—and into her home because, after all, home is where the archive originates—and thus becomes disjointed and spectralized in her common cause with ghosts.

The structure of *History and Legends* can give us leverage into De Zavala’s broader world of preservation and collection. Her tale “The Padre’s Gift” presents a

methodological commentary that sheds light on the content of both De Zavala's book and her archival donations. One way De Zavala traces the routes of archival indebtedness is by tracing the transfer of records and the way that old archives become incorporated into new ones. Her Legend "The Padre's Book" allegorizes the movement of archives, what Lazo might call their potential to migrate. The narrator of this tale describes her encounter with a mysterious old man at a well who gives her an ancient book made of parchment. When she asks if she may have it translated from its original Spanish, he replies, "No, use what you can and pass it on. Promise that no hand but yours shall touch this gift until it is bequeathed by you as I now bequeath it to you" (1996, 56). Though the Padre enjoins the speaker "that no other hand shall touch" the book while she lives, the woman is, herself, is a communal figure. "We all know you," the Padre says when he encounters her (1996, 56). Thus her job is not to hoard the book as an object of private property but to safeguard it for future inheritors. The Padre's lack of instructions about how to use or interpret his gift signals its open-ended indeterminate future. In the tale, there is no specific content for the book. Instead the story is about the circulation of archives and the perseverance and transmission of a particular set of signs or codes that they contain. In fact, the recipient's ability to read the signs is not important to the Padre; what matters is her ability to preserve them and pass them on to another, unknown future recipient. The tale is as much about the deferral of meaning into the future as it is about the recorded past.

That the book is also to remain un-translated signals the importance of its material specificity, just as the Alamo should not have been translated into the commodifiable language of popular culture and capitalist exchange. Lazo discusses the significance of

translation for migrant archives that carries them into new archives and “integrate[s] marginalized and forgotten people even as it threatens to alter the content of the migrant archive and erase, however gently, language difference” (38). Yet even in translation, something remains of the archive’s migrancy—the altered content and the language difference persists as a trace in spectral form, making the archive untranslatable even in its translation. Here is another nuance of the archive’s temporal disjuncture. The singularity of archival material is also its multiplicity. The singularity of archival material is what evades translation, incorporation and valuation, what bars it from being unified into historical narrative. De Zavala’s interest in singularity—in the specific material of the past—is what creates the potential for specters to appear. Writing about spectrality, Frederic Jameson asserts, “such a concept is designed to undermine the very ideology of spirit itself. Ghosts are thus in that sense material; ghosts very precisely resist the strategies of sublimation let alone those of idealization” (1999, 52). This is how they resist the abstraction of capitalist exchange and remain outside the system of debt. The specificity/multiplicity of De Zavala’s archive is what undermines a modernist, hegemonic narrative of Texas history.

The “Padre’s Gift” is concerned with inheritance and succession, which is not the progress of modernity that valorizes the new, but an alternative linkage across time. De Zavala’s interest in the movement of archival material is not confined to the legends portion of her book. In her historical section on the Alamo, De Zavala juxtaposes the progress of land tenure with the transference of archival documents. Discussing church records from Mission San Antonio de Valero, which would later be called the Alamo, De Zavala quotes a record of the resettlement of Adaeseños from current day Louisiana to

the Texas mission saying, “in fact of having found themselves royally in possession, etc., and by the same it [the land] is given to them that they may take it and profit thereby, they, their heirs and successors...” (1996, 8). Immediately after this quote, which concludes with an ellipsis, De Zavala discusses the transference of church records during secularization and quotes at length the affidavits of transfer between various clergy in 1793, 1794, and 1804. The aporia of spatial tenure, signified by the ellipsis, leads to a new formation of temporal linkage (which is not to say a linear or homogenous linkage). De Zavala’s incorporation of the affidavits of transference of Alamo church records also signals her inclusion in this line of succession and, like the Padre’s gift, involves her in a relationship of indebtedness with specters of the past. De Zavala was not preserving the Alamo and the legends because she was searching for answers in the past or even for a restoration of that past. Her preservation of the Alamo, the legends, and other historical material of San Antonio established a communal link to the past at a moment when Tejano connection through space had been uprooted by US colonization.

Traditionally, nation and archive constitute and sustain each other. Archives are the repository of national culture and history from which a nation draws its legitimacy and through which it legitimates specific sections of society as heirs of the archived legacy. Nan Goodman writes, “The image of the legally sovereign nation, moreover, has its analogue in the image of the belletristically sovereign archive” (35). And like the archive, the nation contains its own milieu of specters. Flores rightly asserts in his introduction to her book that “Adina De Zavala was a patriot of Texas, unabashedly so,” but he fails to recognize the particular shape that her Texas nationalism takes (1996, vi). Like her archival work, De Zavala’s patriotism was rooted in both specificity and

multiplicity. De Zavala's focus on the Texas Revolution and the independent Republic of Texas was a way of navigating American nationalism and its racial ideologies through a multivalent and transnational understanding of Texas history that did not blur the battle of the Alamo into a symbol of US dominance. In this way, her work contains a commentary on what Jesse Alemán terms "In-ter" Americanism, which "understands that the nations of the Western hemisphere already contain *within* ("intra") their borders national others whose formative presence is subsequently buried (interred) but nonetheless felt and often expressed through gothic discourse" (2006, 409-10). Inter-American gothic discourse emerges from the repression of the US's Inter-national others for the sake of a coherent national identity at the expense of historical and social complexity. The resultant return of alienating and alienated gothic specters signals the nation's unpaid debts to the past. While De Zavala's book does contain some gothic ghosts, more frequently De Zavala's specters model a learning-to-live-with-ghosts that does not imagine them as threatening gothic repressions.

Mary Coronel of Agreda is one of the most complex specters of De Zavala's work. In fact she does not appear to be a specter at all when she is first introduced in *History and Legends*. In the historical section on Mission San Francisco de los Tejas, De Zavala attributes the colonization of east Texas to Mary Coronel's interest in converting the Tejas Indians writing, "It was the pleading of Mary Coronel de Agreda that had moved Manzanet to [...] induce a third expedition that he might accompany it and sooner reach the Tejas Indians" (1996, 66). De Zavala then quotes Manzanet at length, concluding with his account of the Tejas Governor's request for blue cloth to make a burial shroud because a woman in blue had "come down from the hills" to visit his tribe

“in times past” and he wanted to emulate her (1996, 77). Manzanet concludes that this woman is María Jesús de Agreda “who was very frequently in those regions” (1996, 77). This information is recounted in the section on Mary Coronel where De Zavala explains “[a]t last it seemed to her that a way was opened to her to visit the New World, and after a long sea voyage and tedious overland route, she found herself among certain tribes of Indians heretofore unheard of in the Old World” (1996, 100). Only towards the end of this biography does De Zavala explain that Mary Coronel never left Spain but instead experienced visions of the New World and the Tejas Indians in which she “visited them in ecstasy” (1996, 101). Where other specters are placed clearly in the “legends” section of *History and Legends*, Mary Coronel de Agreda is placed squarely in the history section, in the material world. De Zavala cites Mary Coronel’s own writing, which is “extant” and “preserved in Fordham College, New York,” placing her in the material and intellectual realm of textual production along side Damían Manzanet, William Barrett Travis, and De Zavala’s own writing (1996, 102). Mary Coronel’s embodiment of present absence or dual presence on two continents is not a metaphor, a communal folk tale or an allegory of restoration in De Zavala’s work; it is a historical fact.

Mary Coronel’s transportation is a doubling of the self but not in the sense of the Freudian uncanny double that is a harbinger of death and a loss of wholeness. Her bilocation is a multiplication of the self into a transnational subject that defies the constraints of time and space. There are multiple iterations of women like Mary Coronel across time in *History and Legends*. These women are not a return of the repressed but a multiplication of the specter. “The Mysterious Woman in Blue” who lives in the underground passages of San Antonio and bequeaths “the clear-eyed vision of a Joan of

Arc” to one woman each generation is reminiscent of Mary Coronel and her blue robes (1996, 57). The woman who receives the Padre’s gift is likewise a figure with special knowledge and a unique connection to San Antonio who also reflects many of De Zavala’s own characteristics.⁶⁸

To invoke Avery Gordon again, De Zavala’s contact with ghosts, with the real and textual specters of San Antonio, makes a common cause with her specters by “[striving] to go beyond the fundamental alienation of turning social relations into just the things we know and toward our own reckoning with how we are in these stories” (118). By inserting herself into the archive and into relationships with specters of the archive, De Zavala opens herself to a new subjectivity outside the linear time of debt and restitution. In his account of the Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage’s difficulties constructing an identity-based archive, Lazo suggests, “We are still moving, I would argue, into migrant archives that will ultimately displace the subjectivity that sustains the project” (49). Such transformation may be possible for national archives as well if they can incorporate migrant archives without subsuming them into the dominant structures of classification and reification that repress international specters transforming them into gothic others. One possibility is to imagine the specter as mystical or even ordinary rather than gothic. Texas’ trans-national specters come together in De Zavalla’s collation of historical material not as a restoration, but as a gift to the future, which

⁶⁸ It is easy to read the narrator as a projection of Adina De Zavala. She often presented herself as having special and superior knowledge of the past, something the narrator might gain from the Padre’s book. In addition, De Zavala’s knowledge of Spanish was imperfect, and though she received letters from Spanish speaking relatives and examined Spanish documents, she appears to have written only in English. Flores discusses her knowledge of Spanish in response to Frank Jennings’ claim that de Zavala never learned the language. Flores concludes “there is more cause to believe that she was dedicated student of the language, if not nearly fluent in the written text”.

implicates the recipient in a relationship of indebtedness as well. Her work shows that in recovering texts we are not repaying a debt but are instead shaping our own responsibility to the past.

Recovering the past, creating the future.

-Inscription on copyright page of

Recovering the US Hispanic Literary

Heritage series

Conclusion

I have presented a collection of temporal formations that come together in Mexican American writing of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to show how multiple forms of time impacted Mexican Americans. My work moves from material to ideological temporal constructions as I analyze temporalities of wage labor, railroad operations, investment capitalism, judicial processes, congressional proceedings, commodity fetishism, intellectual production, historical narrative, Manifest Destiny, sociological development, religion, and other iterations of progress and tradition. My analysis departs from a longstanding emphasis on space in Chicana/o Studies, especially as figured through the paradigm of borderlands, though I continue to draw from the lessons of borderland studies. I argue that colonization fractured the temporal structure of the US Southwest for Mexican Americans by perpetrating historical erasure, excluding Mexican Americans from political processes, installing systems of wage labor, and disrupting traditional cultural practices that had organized Mexican American identity through temporal continuity.

Walter D. Mignolo rightly asserts that modernity and coloniality are two sides of the same coin. But where Mignolo focuses on the way modernity structured global spatial relations, I see time as modernity's primary definitional category. Like Peter Osborne, I

believe that modernity is a distinct temporal formation, both the periodization of an epoch and a time-consciousness that structures modernity as newness—as always the most current, most advanced social form. Modernity also universalizes time as external and abstract—as the homogenous empty time that Benedict Anderson analyzes in *Imagined Communities*. In order to counter the colonizing force of temporal abstraction, it is important to see time as a situated construction, not a natural, universal medium through which all people move in the same way. The underlying structure of modern *temporality* supports multiple *forms of time* within specific social and historical contexts. For example, US iterations of Manifest Destiny epitomize modernity’s perpetual newness by imagining the nation’s future as having always already happened, making the US a “nation of futurity” as John O’Sullivan described it in 1839. Likewise, US railroad companies’ creation of standard time depends on modernity’s underlying empty homogenous temporality.

I reject the assertion that Mexican Americans were unable to coordinate themselves within US temporal formations—that they were rendered schizophrenic by US colonization, as Genaro Padilla, Alicia Gaspar de Alba and Leonard Pitt have described. My project also refuses to classify a single form of time as indicative of Mexican American temporal experience the way that Lene Johannessen describes Mexican American literature through Bakhtin’s “threshold time.” Placing Mexican American experience outside US forms of time is itself a colonial practice. Indeed, US colonizers are the ones who positioned Californios, Tejanos and Nuevomexicanos outside of national time, frequently depicting Mexican Americans as lacking history, perpetually late or procrastinating, and incapable of sociological development. In contrast, the

Mexican American texts I encounter in my dissertation explore multiple and often contradictory forms of time in the US to highlight the ideological underpinnings of US colonization and coordinate Mexican Americans within dominant discourses of time.

I chose to focus specifically on literary texts because they self-consciously deploy language in their production of meaning. As I have shown in previous chapters, literature can *unwrite* history and the colonial times imposed on historical experience. Because language is the medium through which humans produce and experience time, they also deploy forms of time more self-consciously than, say, legal texts, financial records, or medical textbooks. The generic self-awareness or meta-critical use of language in literature, and especially in novels, makes it easier to trace the ways that authors and characters move across different forms of time. While Mikhail Bakhtin analyzes forms of time and choronotope in the novel by assigning a singular dominant temporal formation to each specific genre, he also acknowledges that chronotopes work dialogically, and he notes that chronotopes do not inhabit literature alone but reflect and interact with the world of the author and audience (252). While sociological and historical analysis may reveal the ways that particular peoples are constrained or oppressed in the transition from one temporal practice to another, literature is best able to move across multiple formations of time through chronotopic discourse in order to reveal their underlying ideological connections. As such, literature can also deconstruct temporal ideologies as texts move from one formation to another highlighting the colonial nature of each form of time.

Thomas Allen's discussion of timing activities within the nation demonstrates that the existence of multiple times within the nation is not necessarily a new idea. Indeed, he

points to the work of sociologist Norbert Elias, who argued that the increased use of clocks and calendars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did not signal the homogenization of time but, quite the opposite, became necessary as people needed to coordinate their increasingly complex and varied uses of time (11). The act of coordination, however, signals an ordering of different times hierarchically based on power structures within the social network through which timing is organized. As opposed to simply timing multiple activities and temporal experiences to coordinate them, differential time consciousness holds one temporal formation against another to reveal exactly how different social uses and constructions of time are organized through colonial power.

My work is an important intervention in the field of Chicana/o Studies and its current practices of literary recovery. In the turn to space through paradigms of borderlands, transnational movement, and mapping, Chicano Studies scholars have neglected the importance of time in colonial practices and decolonial methodologies. While many scholars acknowledge the interconnection of time and space, space is repeatedly privileged in historical and literary analysis. The deprivileging of time threatens not merely to repeat but to enact Frederic Jameson's depiction of the postmodern subject as having lost "its capacity actively to extend its pro-tensions and re-tensions across the temporal manifold and to organize its past and future into coherent experience" (1991, 25). Unlike Jameson, Chicana/o Scholars recognize that postmodern subjects, or at least colonized postmodern subjects, do not create the postmodern fragmentation in which they live, but instead experience fragmentation as a result of colonization. But by turning to spatialization and cognitive mapping, scholars may

tacitly repeat the idea that postmodern Mexican American and Chicana/o subjects cannot coordinate their lives through temporal relations and continue to organize their own temporal imaginings along the lines of modernist linear time.⁶⁹

Literary recovery may hold the key to recognizing the temporal movement of Mexican American authors and utilizing time as a mode of analysis for Mexican American cultural production. And understanding the relation between time and colonization can help scholars avoid repeating structures of oppression—as narratives of national or biological origin, exclusionary, linear literary histories, or assessments of cultural repression. Many scholars are already moving away from these paradigms of analysis and my focus on colonial structures of time helps explain why and how the field should continue to seek alternatives to linear narratives of literary history and identitarian politics as processes of development.⁷⁰ Though time is less visible than space, its various

⁶⁹ Jameson's reading of the postmodern historical novel is especially telling here. His mocking analysis of this genre as an image of representational confinement should be turned on its head in light of Chicana/o and Mexican American historical novels that demonstrate the oppression of historical erasure in "realist" historical novels. Jameson writes:

This historical novel can no longer set out to represent the historical past; it can only "represent" our ideas and stereotypes about that past (which thereby at once becomes "pop history"). Cultural production [...] can no longer gaze directly on some putative real world, at some reconstruction of a past history which was once itself a present; rather, as in Plato's cave, it must trace our mental images of that past upon its confining walls. If there is any realism left here, it is a "realism" that is meant to derive from the shock of grasping that confinement and of slowly becoming aware of a new and original historical situation in which we are condemned to seek History by way of our own pop images and simulacra of that history, which itself remains forever out of reach. (1991, 25)

⁷⁰ The move away from chronological organization through linear narratives of development is a significant trend in Chicana/o, Latina/o literary scholarship and thus includes a large number of scholars. A few of the people I am thinking of here include:

uses—to regulate bodies, to measure social development, to organize capitalist exchange—have very real, material consequences. Charles Tatum writes that scholars should look to the diversity of Chicana/o communities throughout the Southwest as a guide for establishing genres and chronologies for nineteenth-century Mexican American literature (202). My closing chapter reframes this assertion when I state that we should look to recovered texts and authors themselves for methods of analysis. By recognizing peoples of the past not as objects of study at the service of contemporary readers and scholars but as dialogic speakers, not as living beings but as spectral beings who were already experiencing temporal alterity as they wrote, scholars themselves can begin to move cross time differentially to formulate a decolonial methodology for relating to peoples of both the past and future—because the two are inextricably bound together.

Works Cited

- Ables, L. Robert. "The Work of Adina De Zavala." MA Thesis. Centro de Estudios Universitarios of Mexico City College, 1955. Print.
- Alemán, Jesse. "Historical Amnesia And The Vanishing Mestiza: The Problem Of Race In *The Squatter And The Don And Ramona*." *Aztlán* 27.1 (2002): 59-93. Print.
- . "Novelizing National Discourses: History, Romance, And Law In *The Squatter And The Don*." *Recovering the U. S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Ed. María Herrera-Sobek and Virginia Sánchez Korrol. Vol. III. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 2000. 38-49. Print.
- . "The Other Country: Mexico, the United States, and the Gothic History of Conquest." *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006): 406-26. Print.
- Allen, Thomas M. *A Republic in Time: Temporality and Social Imagination in Nineteenth-Century America*. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P, 2008. Print.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review, 1971. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Anderson, Christopher. "De Zavala's marker lies in basement." *San Antonio Express-News* N.d. 1B-2B. Adina De Zavala Papers. Daughters of the Republic of Texas Library at the Alamo. VF-Gen. Print.
- Aranda, José F., Jr. "Contradictory Impulses: María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, Resistance

- Theory, And The Politics Of Chicano/A Studies." *American Literature* 70.3 (1998): 551-79. Print.
- . "Returning California To The People: Vigilantism In *The Squatter And The Don*." *María Amparo Ruiz de Burton: Critical and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Ed. Amelia María de la Luz Montes and Anne Elizabeth Goldman. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 2004. 11-26. Print.
- . *When We Arrive: A New Literary History of Mexican America*. Tucson, AZ: U of Arizona P, 2003. Print.
- Aravmudan, Srinivas. "The Return of Anachronism." *Modern Language Quarterly* 62.4 (2001): 331-352. Print.
- Arvatu, Adina. "Specters of Freud: The Figure of the Archive in Derrida and Foucault." *Mosaic* 44.4 (2011): 141-59. Print.
- Ayala, Elaine. "Preservationist Adina De Zavala getting her due as historical figure." *San Antonio Express News* 28 Nov. 2006: 1C, 3C. Print.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Austin, Texas: U of Texas P, 1981. Print.
- Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Trans. Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wang, 1972. Print.
- Bebee, Rose Maris and Robert M. Senkewicz, trans and eds. *Testimonios: Early California through the Eyes of Women, 1815-1848*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2006. Print.

- Beveridge, Albert. "The March of the Flag." 16 September 1898. *Voices of Democracy: The U.S. Oratory Project*. University of Maryland and Penn State University. Web. 1 May 2013.
- Brady, Mary Pat. *Extinct Lands, Temporal Geographies: Chicana Literature and the Urgency of Space*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2002. Print.
- Bruce-Novoa, Juan. "Offshoring the American Dream." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3 (2003): 109-45. Print.
- . *RetroSpace: Collected Essays on Chicano Literature, Theory, and History*. Houston, Texas: Arte Público Press, 1990. Print.
- . "When West was North: Spirits of Frontier Experience, Or Can the MacGuffin Speak?" *Kritikos* 2 December (2005). no pagination. *Intertheory.org*. Web. 4 May 2007.
- Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 2011. Print.
- Carey, James W. *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. Media and Popular Culture. 1. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Castillo, Ana. Introduction. *The Squatter and the Don*. By María Amparo Ruiz de Burton. Modern Library Edition. New York: Random House, 2004. xiii-xviii. Print.
- Chacón, Raphael. *Legacy of Honor: The Life of Rafael Chacón, a Nineteenth-Century New Mexican*. Ed. Jacqueline Dorgan Meketa. Las Cruces, N.M.: Yucca Tree Press, 2000. Print.

- "A change of tiempo in Mexico; Variable time in Mexico." *The Economist* 10 Mar. 2001: 2. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 3 Mar. 2014.
- Coronado, Raúl. *A World Not to Come: A History of Latino Writing and Print Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard U P, 2013. Print
- Cotera, María. "Hombres Necios: A Critical Epilogue." Afterward. *Caballero: A Historical Novel*. By Jovita González and Eve Raleigh. College Station, TX: Texas A&M U P, 1996. 339-46. Print.
- . ed. and Introduction. *Life Along the Border: A Landmark Tejana Thesis*. By Jovita González. College Station, TX: Texas A&M U P, 2006. 3-34. Print.
- . *Native Speakers: Ella Deloria, Zora Neale Hurston, Jovita González, and the Poetics of Culture*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2008. Print.
- Davis, Colin. "Hauntology, Specters and Phantoms." *French Studies* 59.3 (2005): 373-79. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 1996. Print.
- . *Specters of Marx: The State of Debt the Work of Mourning and the New International*. Trans. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- De Zavala, Adina. *History and Legends of the Alamo and other Missions in and around San Antonio*. Ed. Richard Flores. Houston: Arte Público Press, 1996. Print.
- . Letter to Dear Friend, signed Daughters of the Republic of Texas. N.d. Adina De Zavala Papers. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, Box 2M 190. Print.
- . Newspaper clipping. 1936. Adina De Zavala Papers. Daughters of the Republic of

- Texas Library at the Alamo. VF-Gen. Print.
- . "Purchase Fund Subscription List of the Ancient Government Palace." N.d. TS.
Adina De Zavala Papers. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, Box 2M 190. Print.
- . "Texas History: Written and Unwritten." N.d. TS. Adina De Zavala Papers. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, Box 2M 190
- Driscoll, Clara. Letter to The Proprietors and Managers of Texas Hotels. n.d. Adina De Zavala Papers. Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, Box 2M 129. Print.
- English, Daylanne K. *Each Hour Redeem: Time and Justice in African American Literature*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 2013. Print.
- Flores, Richard. "Introduction." *History and Legends of the Alamo and other Missions in and around San Antonio*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1996. v-lvii. Print.
- . "Memory-Place, Meaning and the Alamo." *American Literary History* 10.3 (1998): 428-45. Print.
- . *Remembering the Alamo*. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 2002. Print.
- Goldman, Anne E. "'I Think Our Romance Is Spoiled'; Or, Crossing Genres: California History In Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona* And María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *The Squatter And The Don*." *Over the Edge: Remapping the American West*. Ed. Valerie J. Matsumoto and Blake Allmendinger. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1999. 65-84. Print.
- . "'Who Ever Heard of a Blue Eyed Mexican?': Satire and Sentimentality in María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *Who Would Have Thought It?*" *Recovering the U.S.*

- Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Ed. Erlinda Gonzalez Berry and Chick Tatum. Vol. II. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1996. 59-78. Print.
- González, Jovita. "America Invades the Boarder Towns." *Southwest Review* 15.4 (1930): 469-77. Print.
- . *Life Along the Border: A Landmark Tejana Thesis*. Ed. María Eugenia Cotera. College Station: Texas A&M U P, 2006. Print
- González, Jovita and Margaret Eimer (pen name Eve Raleigh). *Caballero: A Historical Novel*. Ed. José Limón and María Cotera. College Station, TX: Texas A&M U P, 1996. Print.
- González, John Morán. *Border Renaissance: The Texas Centennial and the Emergence of Mexican American Literature*. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 2009. Print.
- . *The Troubled Union: Expansionist Imperatives In Post-Reconstruction American Novels*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State UP, 2010. Print.
- Goodman, Nan. "The Law of the Literary Archive: The Case of the Early American Period." *English Language Notes* 45.1 (2007): 33-9. Print.
- Gordon, Avery F. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.
- Gould, Lewis L. *America in the Progressive Era 1890-1914*. Seminar Studies in History. New York: Longman, 2001. Print.
- Griswold del Castillo, Richard. *The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo: A Legacy of Conflict*. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 1990. Print.
- Gruesz, Kirsten Silva. "What Was Latino Literature?" *PMLA* 127.2 (2012): 335-41. Print.

- Gutiérrez, Ramón A. and Genaro M. Padilla. eds. and Introduction. *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Vol. I. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1993. 17-25. Print.
- Hamish, M. Scott. ed. *Enlightened Absolutism: Reform and Reformers in Later-Eighteenth-Century Europe*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, MI: U of Michigan P, 1990. Print.
- Holtby, David V. *Forty-Seventh Star: New Mexico's Struggle for Statehood*. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 2012. Print.
- Horn, Calvin. *New Mexico's Troubled Years*. Albuquerque, NM: Horn and Wallace Publishers, 1963. Print.
- Herrera-Sobek, María. "Po(l)itics of Reconstructing and/or Appropriating a Literary Past: The Regional Case Mode." *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Ed. Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Genaro M. Padilla. Vol. I. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1993. Print.
- Hong, Grace Kyungwon and Roderick A. Ferguson. eds and Introduction. *Strange Affinities: The Gender and Sexual Politics of Comparative Racialization*. Durham, NC: Duke U P, 2011. 1-24. Print.
- Huehls, Mitchum. *Qualified Hope: A Postmodern Politics of Time*. Columbia, OH: Ohio State U P, 2009. Print.
- Huntington, Colis Porter and David Douty Colton. *How Congressmen are Bribed, The Colton Letters: Declaration of Huntington that Congressmen are for Sale*. N.p.: n.p., 1895. *California Digital Library*. University of California. Web. 27 February 2014.

- Jacobs, Margaret D. "Mixed-Bloods, Mestizas, And Pintos: Race, Gender, And Claims To Whiteness In Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona* And María Amparo Ruiz de Burton's *Who Would Have Thought It?*." *Western American Literature* 36.3 (2001): 212-31. Print.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Marx's Purloined Letter." *Ghostly Demarcations: A Symposium on Jacques Derrida's Specters of Marx*. Ed. Michael Sprinker. New York: Verso, 1999. 26-67. Print.
- . *Postmodernism: Or, The Cultural Logic Of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1991. Print.
- Johannessen, Lene M. *Threshold Time: Passage Of Crisis In Chicano Literature*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi, 2008. Print.
- Kanellos, Nicolás. Foreword. *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Ed. Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Genaro M. Padilla. Vol. I. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1993. 13-15. Print.
- . "Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage." *PMLA* 127.2 (2012): 371-4. Print.
- Kaup, Monika. "The Unsustainable *Hacienda*: The Rhetoric of Progress in Jovita González and Eve Raleigh's *Caballero*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 51.3 (2005): 561-91. Print.
- Klein, Kerwin Lee. "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse." *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000): 127-50. Print.
- Larson, Robert W. *New Mexico's Quest for Statehood, 1846-1912*. Albuquerque, NM: U of New Mexico P, 1968. Print.

- Lazo, Rodrigo. "Migrant Archives: Routes in and out of American Studies." *States of Emergency: The Object of American Studies*. Ed. Russ Castronovo and Susan Gilman. Chapel Hill, NC: U of North Carolina P, 2009. Print
- Limón, José E. *Dancing With the Devil: Society and Cultural Poetics in Mexican-American South Texas*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1994. Print.
- . ed. and Introduction. *Caballero: A Historical Novel*. By Jovita González and Eve Raleigh College Station: Texas A&M U P, 1996. xii-xxvii. Print.
- . "Mexicans, Foundational Fictions, and the United States: *Caballero* a Later Border Romance." *The Places of History: Regionalism Revisited in Latin America*. Ed. Doris Sommer Durham, NC: Duke U P, 1999. 236-42. Print.
- . "Nations, Regions and Mid-Nineteenth-Century Texas: History in *On the Long Tide* and *Caballero*." *Amerikastudien/ American Studies*. 53.1 (2008): 97-111. Print.
- Luis-Brown, David. "White Slaves' And The 'Arrogant Mestiza': Reconfiguring Whiteness in *The Squatter* and *The Don* and *Ramona*." *American Literature* 69.4 (1997): 813-39. Print.
- López, Marissa. *Chicano Nations: The Hemispheric Origins of Mexican American Literature*. New York: New York U P, 2011. Print.
- Mandel, Ernest. *Late Capitalism*. London: Humanities Press, 1975. Print.
- Martín-Rodríguez, Manuel M. *Life in Search of Readers: Reading (in) Chicano/a Literature*. Albuquerque, NM: U of New Mexico P, 2003. Print.
- Mendoza, Louis Gerard. *Historia: The Literary Making of Chicano and Chicana History*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M U P, 2001. Print.

- Mignolo, Walter D. *The Idea of Latin America*. Blackwell Manifestos. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005. Print.
- Montejano, David. *Anglos and Mexicans in the making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 1987. Print.
- Moore, Gregory. "Nietzsche, Spencer, and the Ethics of Evolution." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 23 (2002): 1-20. Print.
- Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford U P, 1990. Print.
- Murrah-Mandril, Erin. "Autobiographical Politics in the Contact Zone: Miguel Antonio Otero's *My Life on the Frontier*." *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Ed. Gabriela Baeza Ventura and Clara Lomas. Vol. VIII. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 2012. 123-37. Print.
- Nanni, Giordano. "Time, Empire and Resistance in Settler-Colonial Victoria." *Time and Society* 20.1 (2011): 5-33. Print.
- Nieto-Phillips, John M. *The Language of Blood: The Making of Spanish-American Identity in New Mexico, 1880s-1930s*. Albuquerque, NM: U of New Mexico P, 2004. Print.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: *Les Liexu de Mémoire*." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-25. Print.
- Osborne, Peter. *The Politics of Time: Modernity and the Avant-Garde*. New York: Verso, 1996. Print.
- O'Sullivan, John. "Annexation." *The United States Democratic Review*. 17.85 (1839): 5-10. *Making of America*. Cornell University Library. Web. 13 April 2014.

- . "The Great Nation of Futurity." *The United States Democratic Review*. 6.23 (1839): 426-30. *Making of America*. Cornell University Library. Web. 13 April 2014.
- Otero, Miguel Antonio II. Letter to The Citizens of New Mexico. N.d. TS. Miguel Antonio Otero Papers. Center for Southwest Research, The University of New Mexico. MSS 21: box 4, folder 5. Print.
- . Louisiana Purchase Exposition Speech. 18 Dec. 1904. TS. Miguel Antonio Otero Papers. Center for Southwest Research, The University of New Mexico. MSS 21: box 4, folder13. Print.
- . *My Life on the Frontier 1864-1882: Incidents and Characters of the Period when Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico were Passing through the Last of their Wild and Romantic Years*. New York: The Press of the Pioneers, 1935. Print.
- . *My Life on the Frontier, 1882-1897: Death Knell of a Territory and Birth of a State*. Albuquerque, NM: U of New Mexico P, 1939. Print.
- . *My Nine Years as Governor of the Territory of New Mexico 1897-1906*. Albuquerque, NM: U of New Mexico P, 1940. Print.
- . *The Real Billy the Kid: With New Light on the Lincoln County War*. Ed. John-Michael Rivera. Houston: Arte Público Press, 1998. Print.
- Padilla, Genaro M. *My History, Not Yours: The Formation of Mexican American Autobiography*. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1993. Print.
- Pérez, Emma. *The Decolonial Imaginary: Writing Chicana's into History*. Bloomington, IA: Indiana U P, 1999. Print.

- Pérez, Vincent. "Remembering The Hacienda: History and Memory in Jovita González and Eve Raleigh's *Caballero: A Historical Novel*." *Look Away! The U.S. South in New World Studies*. Ed. Jon Smith, and Deborah Cohn. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2004. 471-94. Print.
- Pérez-Torres, Rafael. *Movements in Chicano Poetry: Against Margins, Against Myths*. New York: Cambridge U P, 1995. Print.
- Perkins, Maureen. *The Reform of Time: Magic and Modernity*. Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 2001. Print.
- Pitt, Leonard. *The Decline of the Californios: A Social History of the Spanish Speaking Californians, 1846-1890*. Berkley, CA: U of California P, 1966. Print.
- Rebolledo, Tey Diana. "Narrative Strategies of Resistance in Hispana Writing." *The Journal of Narrative Technique* 20 (1990): 134-146. Print.
- Rivera, John-Michael. "The Archive as Specter." *English Language Notes* 45.1 (2007): 1-4. Print.
- . *The Emergence of Mexican America: Recovering Stories of Mexican Peoplehood in U.S. Culture*. New York: New York U P, 2006. Print.
- . ed. and Introduction. *Journey to the United States of North America/ Viaje a los Estados Unidos del Norte de América*. By Lorenzo de Zavala. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 2005. vii-xxxiii. Print.
- . "Miguel Antonio Otero II, Billy the Kid's Body, and the Fight for New Mexican Manhood." *Western American Literature* 35 (2000): 46-57. Print.
- . ed. and Introduction. *The Real Billy the Kid: With New Light on the Lincoln County War*. By Miguel Antonio Otero II. Houston: Arte Público Press, 1998. Print.

- Rodríguez, Jaime Javier. "Caballero's Global Continuum: Time and Place in South Texas." *MELUS* 33.1 (2008): 117-38. Print.
- . *The Literatures of the U.S.-Mexico War: Time Narrative and Identity*. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 2012. Print.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. "The President's Plea for Arizona's Assent." Special to *The New York Times*. *New York Times (1857-1922)*: 2. Jul 04 1906. *ProQuest*. Web. 8 May 2013.
- Rosaldo, Renato. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993. Print.
- Ruiz de Burton, María Amparo. *The Squatter and the Don: A Novel of Contemporary Occurrences*. Ed. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1992. Print.
- . *Who Would Have Thought It?* Ed. Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1995. Print.
- Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984. Print.
- Saldívar, José David. *Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1997. Print.
- Sánchez, Rosaura. *Telling Identities: The Californio testimonios*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 1995. Print.
- Sánchez, Rosaura and Beatrice Pita, eds with commentary. *Conflicts of Interest: The Letters of María Amparo Ruiz de Burton*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 2001. Print.

- . Introduction. *The Squatter and the Don*. By María Amparo Ruiz de Burton. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1992. 7-49. Print.
- Sandoval, Chela. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota P, 2000. Print.
- Schmitt, Edmond J. P. *Copies from the Archives: A Collation of Kingsborough's Antiquities of Mexico*. San Antonio: Johnson Brothers, 1901. Adina De Zavala Papers, Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, Box 2M 167.
- Secor-Welsh, Cynthia. "Governor Miguel Antonio Otero 1897-1906." MA Thesis University of New Mexico, 1984. Print.
- Seguín, Juan Nepomuceno. *A Revolution Remembered: The Memoirs and Selected Correspondence of Juan N. Seguín*. Ed. Jesús F. de la Teja. Austin, TX: Texas State Historical Association, 2002. Print.
- Sewell, William H. Jr. "The Temporalities of Capitalism." *Socio-Economic Review* 6 (2008): 517-37. Print.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Gunfighter Nation: The Myth of the Frontier in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1993. Print.
- Stutje, Jan Willem. "Concerning *Der Spätkapitalismus*: Mandel's Quest for a Synthesis of Late Capitalism." *Historical Materialism* 15 (2007): 167-98. Print.
- Tatum, Charles. "Canon Formation and Chicano Literature." *Recovering the U.S. Hispanic Literary Heritage*. Ed. Ramón A. Gutiérrez and Genaro M. Padilla. Vol. I. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 1993. 199-208. Print.
- Thompson, E. P. "Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism." *Past and Present*. 38 (1976): 56-97. Print.

- Turner, Frederick Jackson. "The Significance of the Frontier in American History."
History, Frontier, and Section: Three Essays by Frederic Jackson Turner. Ed.
Martin Ridge. Albuquerque, NM: U of New Mexico P, 1993. 59-91. Print.
- Vigil, Maurilio E. *Los Patronos: A Profile of Hispanic Political Leaders in New Mexico
History*. Washington D.C.: U P of America, Inc., 1980. Print.
- Villa, Raúl Homero. *Barrio-Logos: Space and Place in Urban Chicano Literature and
Culture*. Austin, TX: U of Texas P, 2000. Print.
- Wells, Cheryl A. *Civil War Time: Temporality and Identity in America, 1861-1865*.
Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 2005. Print.
- Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics
and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. Writing Past Colonialism Series. New
York: Cassell, 1999.