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Introduction

Spanish-speaking peoples living in the U.S. “Southwest,” many of whom are of Mexican national descent, continue to traverse the pre-national historical geographies and spatial orientations of their ancestors, albeit with a few more recent walls in their line of sight. My evocation of “walls” brings up the serious political state of our bi-national relations with Mexico, as the U.S., via Operations, Gatekeeper, Hold-the-Line, and Safeguard, has produced 652 miles of steel and iron-clad walls along the 1,954 mile long international border. While some cite the importance of impeding illegal drug trade and the flow of undocumented people, these walls, at their core existence, are a material manifestation of controlling space and maintaining what the nation-state views as acceptable and unacceptable movement within its Southwest. However, the material conditions that barricade the Southwest from Mexico are reinforced by an equally confining yet perhaps more dangerous set of linguistic and educational spatial controls, which at the level of figurative and epistemic production teach the conquered citizen-subject to build walls that obstruct their spatial heritage.

For the first twenty-five years of my life, I lived in “extreme South Texas.” These were the words my father used on our summer vacations to illustrate for hotel clerks or gas station employees who happened to study the words WESLACO, TEXAS on his driver’s license and inquire where exactly in the grand cartographic scheme of the state our family of four might be from. “Oh, you mean near San Antonio or Corpus Christi?” “No,” my father would say with a smile, “further south, near the tip of Texas, about five miles from the Mexican border.” Usually this bit of information resulted in the wide-eyed response, “Wow, you guys are way down there,” which put a close to conversation. We would pile back into
our ’94 Dodge Ram Mark III, and I continued with my charge of calculating the distance to our next destination with an oversized Rand McNally roadmap. My eyes traced I-10, I-40, I-70, depending on which Interstate we decided to take on our yearly summer vacation through the Southwest while the rest of my family passed the miles listening to my father’s Golden Oldies mix-tape. The Riviera’s 1964 hit “California Sun,” and the song’s memorable opening line “I’m going out west where I belong” played regularly on our way to Las Vegas, Nevada or Disney Land. We were a racial and spatial foil to National Lampoon’s film *Vacation* and the Griswold family. True, like the cinematics family, we headed west. But Clark Griswold, however, would drive his family home to Chicago by Route 66, while our Mexican American familia dropped in latitude via I-10-East, I-37, and Highway 77, the final stretch of road that returned us to the bowels of the nation-state, “extreme South Texas.”

Of course, “extreme South Texas” was merely a way for my father to describe the region to friendly strangers. We know our area as the Lower Rio Grande Valley, or more intimately as El Valle/The Valley. The region is not a valley in the geological sense of the word. The nearest mountain range, the Sierra Madre Oriental, is about 150 miles away in the Mexican state of Nuevo Leon. But, it is a valley in the cultural sense as a multitude of people – from the indigenous Cuahuiltec, to the families brought north from the colony’s interior in the 1700s by Spanish-criollo colonizer Jose Escandón, to the waves of Anglo immigrants who came south and changed Mexican American ranchlands into farmlands, to the present day Winter Texans who escape the bitter chill of northern climes, to the Mexican bourgeois and working class who drive, fly, or walk across the Rio Grande to shop, dine and sometimes stay to carve out a living – have historically ascended and descended into a land that desires to share both perspectives.
Unfortunately, for those of us living north of the Rio Grande, in El Valle, the state’s educational institutions desire to enforce a narrow historic, spatial narrative of the peopling of the region. This narrative especially displaces the spatial heritages of its Mexican American students as it replaces their worldview with an Anglo colonial perspective of Manifest Destiny. When I attended history class in junior high, the Alamo mythos, complete with Davy Crockett, Jim Bowie, and the subsequent battles associated with the Texas Insurrection of 1835-36 against a recently independent Mexico, invented an Anglo Texas as the sole property of pioneer and modernizing folk while ridding its historic Mexican presence, including the cartographic fact that Texas had been an amalgamation of the northern Mexican states of Tejas, Coahuila, Chihuahua, and Tamaulipas. However, the words of a seventh grade history book (or popular culture’s Southwestern productions of space) could not be taken so presumptively if it were not for the elementary indoctrination into Manifest Destiny that I received.

It was March, just before school let out for Spring Break and the week-long Rio Grande Valley Live Stock Show, an annual rodeo, carnival, and Ag-competition rolled into one that dates back to the 1930s, when our first grade class was selected to perform a musical tribute to the upcoming mid-Valley festivities. We were the first grade’s “GT” class, or “Gifted and Talented,” which was a label the state used in its hierarchical system of tracking students in the elementary grades, and we were not an accurate reflection of the status quo. For a region that is approximately ninety-five percent “Hispanic,” our class of eighteen was about forty percent Anglo. I do not remember much about the preparation for this event. But, what has been engrained in my memory is that my classmates and I were dressed in boots and blue jeans with white collared shirts and red bandanas draped around our necks as we
walked onto the stage in our school’s cafeteria and took our positions in front of a giant
backdrop of the United States, from sea to shining sea, with all the states in between. The
speakers rang out the spry notes of Woody Guthrie’s “This Land Is Your Land,” and we sang
along:

This land is your land, this land is my land
From California to the New York Island
From the Redwood Forest to the Gulf Stream waters
This land was made for you and me.

Spatial theorist David Harvey asserts “we learn our ways of thinking and conceptualizing
from active grappling with the spatializations of the written word, the study and production
of maps …” (206). His views are relevant to my experience. Since I was a child, I knew my
father’s people came north centuries ago and were granted a tract of land near the Gulf coast.
I also knew that my mother’s family, centuries later in the 1960s, followed a similar northern
migration when they moved from Zacatecas to Juárez and then to El Paso. But, the spatial
poetics of “This Land Is Your Land” had me believing in a nostalgic and monologic
latitudinal history of the nation that was apparently “made for me.” The song’s lyrics taught
me to celebrate the movement made possible via Manifest Destiny as the words
cartographically transported me back and forth from the west coast to the east coast. Unlike
my Anglo peers, my Mexican American classmates and I, along with our parents, and other
people of Mexican descent smiled and sang – in the manner of Althusserian interpellation – a
song fraught with an Anglo colonial logic. The performance was not unlike similar
experiences that cultural theorist Franz Fanon claims “disfigures and destroys the past of
oppressed people” (224). And, we, complicit in our own domination, unknowingly mimicked
the colonizer’s discourse, gaze, and production of space (much as I would do years later as I eyed I-10, I-40 and I-70 cutting through the Southwest) and forgot our spatial heritage.¹

Eventually, I learned that this land was unmade for me. The land from “the Redwood Forest to the Gulf Stream waters,” which I interpreted as the region stretching from California to the Texas Gulf coast, the origin of the Gulf Stream, was unofficially transformed into a “Southwest” when Thomas Jefferson, in 1801, captivated by Aaron Arrowsmith’s map of North America, gazed onto its imaginatively blank lower left quadrant that erased and diminished the presence of Mexican peoplehood. This Jeffersonian-ignited process of spatial imperialism, eight presidential administrations, the Texas Insurrection (1835-36), the U.S.’s war against Mexico (1846-48), and the political incorporation of more than one-half of Mexican territory into what we now call the Southwest resulted in the first “walls,” or material markings constructed by William H. Emory, head surveyor for the Corps of Topographical Engineers. Emory, in 1853, traversed the newly formed border to build “pyramids of stone where possible.” In accordance with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican-American War, he transformed the natural current of the Rio Grande into an unnatural geopolitical boundary, all along mapping the region as Southwest for the new colonial power.

My greatest lesson, however, came from my grandmother, which I take as follows: a colonizer will alter the map, take away language and land, but the memory of movement and space and the will to iterate them into being are more difficult, if not impossible, to terminate. The lesson occurred when I was in my early twenties, and my mother, grandmother, and aunt visited me while I was in Guadalajara, Mexico taking Spanish immersion courses. Guadalajara was only a few hours by bus from Jerez, Zacatecas, where my mother’s family
lived until her father died and economic opportunities for my grandmother in agriculture and domestic services brought them to the United States. On the weekend, when school was not in session, we travelled to Jerez and visited the childhood homes of my mother and grandmother, which were still in possession of our relatives. In the space of her origins, my eighty-nine year old grandmother, conversing with a cohort of female familia she had not seen in decades, re-membered her own move to “el norte.” The following day when my mother, grandmother and aunt boarded a bus returning them to Texas, I reflected on my grandmother’s story and realized that we had been living in different spaces: I in a “Southwest” and she in a north. In the process of seeing their bus take its northbound course, recounting the mobile narrative of my grandmother’s past and listening to her word choice of “el norte,” my worldview shifted. My cultural space was remade through memory, as the bowels of south Texas and “the Southwest” became a North.

The Southwestern aficionado, layperson or scholar should not read this dissertation as an anti-regional or anti-national effort at effacing the U.S. Southwest. Neither do I intend to engage in the near century-long debate waged by literary critics and geographers determined to definitively, or variably, define the parameters of the “Southwest.”² I agree with Southwestern historian Richard Francaviglia who claims that such a debate “remains a relatively unproductive investment of time and intellectual energy” (11). Rather, for the sake of what I believe to be a productive investment of time and intellect, this dissertation is an effort to understand the region many have come to naturally know as the Southwest with a different state of mind and orientation. Like my personal narrative, my work is critical of the region in name and nature, and it exhibits ways geopolitical space is redefined.
In this postcolonial, post-structuralist age, the late southern literary scholar C. Hugh Holman’s polite call for “No More Monoliths, Please” is a regionally self-reflective adage with which the Southwest, literary culture and all, needs to reckon. Indeed, among many scholarly circles of Southwestern and Western regional studies, there has been a shift of thought, especially in recent years, to perceive the region as more than the natural result of Anglo Manifest Destiny. However, traditionalists remain whom perhaps unknowingly, perpetuate uncritical stereotypical and dominant views of the region. In fact, a collection of essays complied in 2005 entitled *Mary Austin’s Southwest* highlights this notion. An evaluation of the title’s three seemingly innocent words showcase subjectivity, racialized and gendered perspective, and perhaps most problematic, possession, factors that have impeded efforts to define the Southwest in historic and inclusive terms.

Austin’s literary and philanthropic career in *her* Southwest, particularly New Mexico, is laudable as her efforts to preserve Native American and Spanish culture literally and materially “gave voice to disenfranchised people.” But, in critical fairness, it was her voice that she gave, which colored her Southwestern landscape according to her desires. Contrary to Mary Austin’s belief that “regionalism is the very nature and constitution of the planet,” it must be understood that there is nothing natural about regionalization (71). Francaviglia reminds us, “regions are a fundamental manifestation of the way a culture or subculture visualizes and verbalizes space”; and for Austin, like many of her Anglo contemporaries and predecessors, she desired to visualize and verbalize a Southwest of the purest spatial orientation and form (9). Maintaining a Spanish heritage fantasy in *Earth Horizon*, Austin asserts the Spanish-speaking people and artisans that dot her New Mexican landscapes were “colonists who originally came direct from Spain; they had not much tarrying in Mexico”
(358). When these colonists “mixed,” they did so with local Indians, and “brought into their blood an Indian strain with the capacity for making things […] in the pattern of Southern stuffs with a little suggestion from Mexico” (358). Diminishing Mexico’s connections within her “Southwest,” Austin extinguishes New Mexico’s historic ties with Mexico as a historic Viceroyalty of New Spain and post-independence nation-state. With this extinguishment Austin severs the centuries old south-to-north/north-to-south longitudinal movements that define the cultural patterns of people throughout the North Américas, especially prior to Anglo colonization. But, what is more troubling, with the erasure of longitudinal cultural movement, Austin also erases Mexican American social presence in her Southwest by relying on a hard division of the U.S.-Mexico border. As Camilla Fojas asserts in her study of cinematic space in Hollywood border films, “the south[western] frontier plays a large role… as the symbolic opposite of the open western frontier…” because it “marks the limitation of movement” (25). Thinking in regional terms unique to the Southwest, Austin’s limitation of movement is an elimination of Mexican peoplehood that proves if one erases space, one erases race.

Mary Austin’s Southwest can generally be defined as an Anglo Southwest, since it imagines or “produces,” to use the language of spatial theorist Henry Lefebvre, a culturally specific and privileged way of seeing, knowing, and naming space. Arguably the U.S.’s most iconic region, the Southwest is predicated on an Anglo point of view where its very name illustrates imperial, cultural possession and spatial privilege. Offering a nominal interrogation, Francaviglia notes the “compound word southwest” reveals two things: One, “relating to linguistic ownership, the derivation of southwest is English, instead of Spanish or Indian,” and two, because the term is as much a direction as it is a location, we must question
“southwest of what?” If we adjust Francaviglia’s rhetorical question to “southwest of whom?” the answer, obvious as it is startling, reveals the northeastern eyes who named and thereby fixed the region within their monolithic gaze as they sought and succeeded in fulfilling their south-westward Manifest Destiny. In their trek toward possession, it was the often forgotten Mexican-American War and the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848 that shifted what some historians now call the “Old Southwest” (Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas) westward and “officially” mapped the Southwest into cartographic existence securing it as the dominant spatial production of the region.

Of course, violence does not end on the battlefield. To accept the notion that space is a verbal and visual cultural production is to understand that space, like language, is an assertion of one’s cultural identity. Therefore, if war involves the destruction of a people’s source of identity, then the residual effects of the battlefield that shifted the possession and/or orientation of land for thousands of people of Mexican descent north of the borderline lasted long after the final volley. I follow José Rabasa and Michael Shapiro when I say that privileging point of view and naming spaces of the colonized are exertions of violence. The very utterance and inscription of the region as the Southwest silences the spatial identities of the conquered while it dissolves their historic claim to existence in the region.

In name and production, the Southwest de-spaces the overwhelmingly longitudinal heritages of the Mexican American body politic as contemporary descendants of primarily indigenous and Spanish colonial peoples. But, a recollection of the spatial histories of the lands that comprise today’s Southwest prior to Anglo colonization unearths a rich heritage of cultural movements and cartographies traversing a north-south axis.
It should come as no surprise that Amerindians entered from the north and migrated on a southward trek throughout the Americas. But, what may be less well known, regarding common perceptions of indigenous peoples, are the vast pre-capitalist trade networks and subsequent settlement practices linking the Navajo and Pueblo in the north to the MesoAmerican cultures in the south. When the Spanish colonized central Mexico and sought to extend their empire, they drew upon these same indigenous vertical spatial sensitivities.

Figure 1. Henry Schenck Tanner’s map of “Mexico & Guatemala” printed in 1834.
Amerindian escorts utilized longitudinal geographic and cartographic knowledge to lead Spanish colonizers like Francisco Vásquez de Coronado and Juan Oñate northward. The formation of New Spain and later Mexico’s geopolitical existence and the longitudinal economic, political, and cultural worldview of their citizenry were based on an orientation already cut by indigenous routes and roots of trade and commerce, a Norte and a Sur. (See figures 1 and 2).

I do not intend to downplay the spatial violence inflicted by the Spaniards and later Mexicans to indigenous peoples that, too, saw the renaming and remapping of their spatial cognitions. Nor can I deny that Amerindians’ vertical spatializations also came under as much duress and reconstitution as their Mexican counterparts when the borders of the U.S.
Southwest were established. Thus, I do not find it coincidental that Navajo poet Luci Tapahonso, in a recent collection of “women writ[ing] about the Southwest,” writes a recollective ode titled “A Song for the Direction of North,” which details a Native mother and her daughters both honoring and merging their identities with the celestial bodies of the northern night sky. “Somewhere my daughters’ smooth laughter” Tapahonso’s speaker says, “deepens the old memory of stars” (20).

It is by the act of remembering and reiterating the spaces and cartographies of one’s complete cultural identity that the authors of my study – María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, Fray Angélico Chávez, Federico Ronstadt and Américo Paredes – challenge dominant Southwest regionalization. These early Mexican American authors, writing in a variety of literary genres between the late-nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth, who either initially or ultimately lived in the present-day Southwestern border states of California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas, are often unheard of, overlooked, or marginalized in literary circles of the “Southwest” (some more than others) for their more popularized Anglo counterparts. Whether such literary amnesia results from innocent forgetfulness, historic racial discord, or the desire to upkeep a traditional Southwestern cannon of the fin de siècle and the proceeding decades of the twentieth century is questionable. But, what remains undeniable are the fresh perspectives of the region this early Mexican American collective gives as they remember their land, their livelihood and the livelihoods of their people in a manner that spatially challenges the essence of Southwest regionalism. Vocalizing spatial memories through the act of writing or oral communication are discursive strategies for reproducing and reviving cultural spaces that are under erasure. While Foucault tells us “language is a thing of space,” (163) Chicana scholar Mary Pat Brady emphasizes the power of memory within the
dialectics of space and language. Analyzing the urgency of space in contemporary Chicana literature, Brady says the “complex legacy of memory” is at once “politically charged and connected to desire. … Somewhere memories lie rooted in bodies and spaces, in song and words…” (128). It is this early Mexican American trialectics of memory, words, and space that Remapping the U.S. “Southwest” sets out to recover.

When one’s cultural perspective runs the risk of elimination, the desire to remember may emerge as a spatial political imperative. The discursive remembrances of these authors, who either directly experienced or were no more than a few generations removed from what could be described as the “disorienting” outcome of the Mexican-American War, are more than narrative analepses or recollections into their pasts. If we deconstruct the verb remember into its basic units, the prefix re- (to make again) and its suffix member, the politics of spatial preservation and association becomes clear. Member, as a general noun, can mean “a person that is part of a society, community or other body.” However, (and especially with regard to “other body”) member has a geological meaning denoting “a stratigraphic unit recognized within a formation, and mapped as such” (Webster’s). These authors’ remembrances of their spatial pasts are equally about preserving their cultural space in their discursive presents, as they “make again” the directionalities, cartographies and geopolitical bodies displaced under the colonizing weight of “the Southwest.” Remembrance is an act of remapping.

The complex legacy of spatial memory and one’s ability to discursively narrate it, whether orally or by the written word, Brady instructs, “makes interpellation always already incomplete if not completely undone” (138). When confronted with hegemonic productions of Southwestern regionality, Mexican America, at large, maintains a discursive legacy that re-members cultural lands in order to actively remap the Southwest. These spaces of
resistance to the dominant order, or “counterspaces,” a word I borrow from Edward Soja and Lefebvre, are also readable in present-day cityscapes throughout the Anglo Southwest, but from my experience, they are most notable in Santa Fe, New Mexico. After exiting I-25 North (the modern-day road graphed onto the Chihuahua Trail, which had been the Camino Real, which had been the indigenous trade route that delved into MesoAmerica) and entering Santa Fe, the production of modern discursive counterspaces unfolds like an open book in Santa Fe’s city-space. Away from the plaza, the “heart” of the City’s tourism, where Anglo discursive and symbolic spatial production omits Mexican cultural geographies and peoplehood, there is a remaking of Mexican space razed by the Southwest. (See figures 3-6).

Figure 3. One of several commercial signs displayed on the Southeast end of the historic Santa Fe Plaza nearest the Santa Fe Trail.
Figure 4. In addition to road markers, a plaque commemorating the Santa Fe Trail celebrates the east to west movement "from Kansas City to Santa Fe," a spatial production that omits the Mexican populous' movement eastward along the trail and elides the Chihuahua Trail, a nineteenth century commercial trade route from Santa Fe to Mexico.

Figure 5. del Norte Credit Union, initially Los Alamos Scientific Lab Credit Union when it was chartered in 1954, went through several name changes until it became a community charter with a "Hispano" majority board of directors.
Spatial memories iterated in the form of storefront signs by historically rooted Nuevo Mexicano families and newly arrived Mexican immigrants of the business class reorient Santa Fe via a counterspatial cultural dialogue that simultaneously speaks back to dominance as it deconstructs the Southwest. A drive along Cerrillos Rd., a main artery of transportation that cuts through the modern city and ends a few blocks south of the Plaza, reveals a trail of discursive spatial subversions. Business monikers such as Camino Real Imports, México Lindo, Del Norte Credit Union, Plaza Del Norte, Chihuahua Tires and Plaza de Centro America complicate and transform the Southwest’s monological and imagined isolated regionalization. Indeed, these business names to varying degrees capitalize from the cultural space they name. But in principal, these names are cultural capital that produce social mobilities and geopolitical bodies evoking outer-national, transnational, and hemispheric
orientations, which always already remap Santa Fe and the Southwest as something other
than what hegemony dictates.

Fanon tells us “we must not … be content with delving into the past of a people in
order to find coherent elements which will counteract colonialism’s attempts to falsify and
harm” (168). Yet, it is the past that grants a people the fortitude to alter their present from
colonial trauma. The present-day counterspaces produced by the Mexican American body
politic living in the Anglo Southwest would cease to exist if it were not for the legacy of
spatial memory remapping the region. According to Américo Paredes, “Mexican Americans
have been awake to their problems” and “preoccupied with questions of self-analysis and
identity since the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo” (27). However, concerning Mexican
America and the problem of space and spatial identity, we can extend Paredes’ cultural
observations to before the ink dried on the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo February 2, 1848.
After receiving news that the United States takeover of Alta California was nearly complete,
Angustias de la Guerra, a self-identified Californio woman of the landed class, laments in her
journal on September 17, 1846:

I cannot help but feel that we do not know what will happen to the poor
[Mexican] flag! This can all be blamed on the distance between the center of
government and the inability to get to Mexico quickly! Who can arrive in
Mexico in less than a few months’ time? Only those who are lucky enough to
travel by steamship. … I will attribute whatever may happen to “Destiny!”
And that is such a pretty song. There is so much truth in the verse – I find
myself a foreigner in the world! (Testimonios 275)
De la Guerra, aware that the end of Mexican nationalization is near, spatializes her sympathies and nostalgia. Her concern for the fate of the Mexican flag flying in the presidio of Monterey and her frustration with the distance between the Mexican outpost of Alta California and the seat of government in Mexico proper illustrate her attempt to ward off the onset of disorientation, which comes nonetheless. Attributing the future to “Destiny!” de la Guerra references the lyrics to the Spanish Mexican song “Destino fatal” (or Fatal Destiny) and its opening line, which reads “Fatal destiny keeps me from your home.” But, since she would have been privy to the term Manifest Destiny, her word choice takes on a dual meaning. Her abrupt outcry “I find myself a foreigner in the world!” can be attributed to the spatial shift of oncoming Manifest Destiny and renationalization that keeps her from her “home” or familiar worldview. De la Guerra lamentations, however, three decades later, turn to sharp-minded remembrances of hemispheric cultural and economic connections, when asked to provide at the behest of California historian Hubert Howe Bancroft, a testimony of her bygone years. De la Guerra’s ability to make again the spaces lost under nationalization and regionalization is one of the earliest examples of the historic legacy of counterspatial cartographies, geopolitical bodies, and directionalities re-membered by Mexican America.

*Remapping the U.S. “Southwest”* first and foremost, attends to Mexican America’s discursive legacy for remapping spaces of the Southwest. The theories that provide a foundation for my endeavors and argument derive from the works David Harvey, Henri Lefebvre, Michael Foucault, and Richard Francaviglia. All assert that space is a “production” and note its imperial desires. Also, to various extents, some offer spatial strategies of the colonized. In addition to Lefebvre’s notion of counterspaces, Foucault, thinking in terms of geographical metaphors, writes “displacement” is “an army” (176). Early Mexican America,
like their later twentieth and twenty-first century progeny, politicize (and dare I say militarize in keeping with Foucault’s metaphoric poetics) their discursive productions of space.

Soldiers on the cultural battlefield, where the colonial logic of the Southwest seeks to displace them, the subjects of my study represent the initial combatants fighting for Mexican America’s production of space that does not forget its longitudinal and complex heritage.

However, what is foundational is not necessarily motivational. The spatial theoretics of Foucault in particular, as well as Harvey, Lefebvre, and Francaviglia, lend themselves to interrogating space, but they do not fully attempt to elucidate the spatial prerogatives of the postcolonial “Other.” Chicana spatial theorist Gloria Anzaldúa, who remapped the Southwest as a cartographic and psychological “borderlands” in *Borderlands/La Frontera*, declares:

> Because we are not allowed to enter discourse, because we are often disqualified or excluded from it … it is vital that we occupy theorizing space, that we not allow white men and women solely to occupy it. By bringing our own approaches and methodologies we transform that theorizing space. (xxv-xxvi)

Therefore, I could not attend to Mexican America’s discursive legacy if it were not for Homi Bhabha, Edward Said or Chicana/o cultural critics Gloria Anzaldúa, Mary Pat Brady, Tey Diana Rebolledo, Monika Kaup, Edward Soja, Juan Bruce Novoa, Raúl Homero Villa, José David Saldívar, Ramón Saldívar, Sonia Saldívar-Hull, Héctor Calderón, Richard Griswold Del Castillo, Juan Gómez Quiñones and Emma Pérez. I follow their postcolonial spatial theories and especially the contemporary literary insights provided by Brady, Kaup, Anzaldúa, los Saldívars, Soja, Calderón and Rebolledo. According to Rafael Perez-Torres, “The desire to remap what has been made unfamiliar has remained strong within Chicano
criticism” (447). The aforementioned authors are the metaphoric brick and mortar upholding Perez-Torres claim. From Novoa’s assertion that Chicano literature “becomes a space for responding to chaos” to Brady’s contention that Chicanas “write with a sense of urgency about the power of space… and the need to contest such power with alternative spatial configurations, ontologies and genealogies,” Chicanos and Chicanas have staked a claim in bringing their own approaches to what Soja calls the “spatial turn of cultural literary study” (96, 9).

To add to Chicana/o literary-spatial study already forged, my approaches and claims depart from what can be described as a gendered division of spatial interests that is sometimes warranted and other times a distraction from the collective efforts which women and men of Mexican America challenge monological productions of the Anglo Southwest. For instance, Monika Kaup in *Rewriting North American Borders in Chicano and Chicana Narrative* (2001) creates a chronological and gendered binary that positions the literary frameworks of Chicano nationalism in conflict with Chicana postnational and transnationalisms of the late-twentieth century. Kaup writes:

> In the late 60s and early 70s, Chicano literature began to express the ideas … of cultural nationalism that situated itself in opposition of American notions of culture, identity, place and home. … Chicano authors insisted that the space of their culture, the *mexicano* borderlands of the Southwest, was not the peripheral fringe of the American historical process, but a place in its own right, home, Aztlán, the native homeland … . Later, after the phase of cultural nationalism … in the 80s, the border takes on a different meaning. In this period, earlier statements of a unified oppositional identity to Americaness
give way to a focus on internal heterogeneity, on internal differences in
gender, region, sexuality, and on mapping transnational spaces. (1-2)

For the most part, I have no qualms with Kaup’s summation of the spatial politics that inform
Chicano/a literature over the last half-century, with the exception that I would not bar the
oppositional impulse present in the spatial production of Aztlán from later reorganizations of
the “Southwest” by Chicanas/os seeking to rename and reorient its space. While Aztlán does
function as an alternative space to the Anglo Southwest in name and spatial production since
it historicizes the longitudinal “destiny” of Chicanos with the migratory Aztec journey
southward to the Valley of Mexico, it is yet another paternalistic and nationalistic-inspired
construction that fixes Mexican America to a monologic space. We only need to juxtapose
Rodolfo Anaya’s *Heart of Aztlan* (1976) with the heterogeneous and transnational spatial
shifts evident in Helena Viramontes’ *The Moths and Other Stories* (1985) and Anzaldúa’s
*Borderlands* (1987), as one comparative literary example, to understand Kaup’s point.

However, we must be careful not to apply Kaup’s chronological and gendered spatial binary
to the historical body of Mexican American literature. In response to gendered and
chronological divisions within the field of Chicano/a literary spatial studies, *Remapping the
U.S. Southwest* argues that Mexican American women and men have been engaged in
rewriting North American borders since early formations of the U.S. Southwest by
recounting transnational movements, cultural cartographies and “transfrontera contact zones”
that problematize the naturalness of the region. This argument, however, also dialogues with
the field of Southwestern literature.

Introductions to Southwestern literary collections are quick to proclaim the
contemporary period is marked by a slew of “new” ethnic voices that speak to topics of
rootedness and landscape in addition to recent transformations of urbanization, heterogeneity, and industrialization. While the past century has ushered in an unprecedented amount of growth and globalization for the region, implicit dichotomies of new/old, contemporary ethnic writers/foundational Anglo writers, and globalization/isolation emerge and most importantly reveal that Southwestern literature is still susceptible to regionalizing itself according to ethnocentric formations of its past.

Regionalization of the Southwest was not a singular production of war or mapmaking. As I discussed earlier with my biographical experience as an example, material conditions that define a region rely on figurative representations, or conceptualizations, to continually maintain their boundaries and create desired cultural conditions. Cartography needs an accomplice and finds one in conceptualization. Thus, the subsequent literary and cultural formations in the decades following the Mexican-American War such as Ned Buntline’s dime novel series *Buffalo Bill, the King of the Border Men* (1869), the multiple amalgamations of Buffalo Bill’s Wild West shows (1883-1913), and Fredrick Jackson Turner’s *Frontier Thesis* (1893), to name several that loomed large in the national consciousness, helped conceptualize the Southwest as a space of finite Anglo westward expansion to be redeemed from cultural degenerates in its sparsely populated expanses.

Equivalent to Turner’s “Frontier Thesis,” traditional Southwestern literature and cultural production is predicated on the closure of “primitive” space by Anglo America upon “winning a wilderness and developing … each area of this progress” (9). For early canonical writers like Willa Cather, Walter Noble Burns, and Walter Prescott Webb, westward national movement was the epitome of regional definition and culture. Contrastingly, early Mexican American writers befit Boltonian ideologies of spatial, historical, and geographic
understanding. As Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett assert in their accounting of the evolution of Borderlands studies, Herbert Eugene Bolton was “an enlightened counterpart to Turner” who, with his Spanish Borderlands and Greater America historical conceptualizations, unsettled centrist, nation-based, westward directional paradigms (341). Contrary to Turner, Bolton favored attuning “to people and spaces at the margins” and reoriented space along a south-north/north-south trajectory (340).

However, by “befit” I do not intend to position Bolton as a foundational forefather for the writers of my study, even though, from an academic perspective their discursive productions of space and cartography resemble or stem from a tradition of Boltonian ideology. The fact of the matter remains that this cohort of early Mexican American writers and their re-membrances of geopolitical space, cartography, and cultural movements are without question cultural and personal. The spatialities these writers exert are not only learned but lived, as I emphasized prior, through their own experience and/or the experiences of their ancestors. In some instances, like with Ruiz de Burton, spatializations predate and exceed Bolton’s academic geographic perceptions. Much like José Martí, the writers of my study understand the world mostly via longitudinal cultural and economic movements. Although, it seems even Martí could not evade the interpellating power of the Anglo Southwest. One wonders if Martí’s decision to set the bounds of “Nuestra América” “from the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan” instead of from the forty-second parallel was influenced, even remotely, by the Wild West productions of Buffalo Bill he took in during his time in New York and his fascination with Jesse James. At this point, perhaps Martí, looking through the eyes of dominance, may have seen the Rio Grande as an impermeable
border of the Southwest, too, where cowboys and Indians duked it out “in the remote regions of this country exposed to the raw wilderness” (130).

For Ruiz de Burton, Chávez, Ronstadt, and Paredes, writing north of the Rio Grande in the region Martí forgot, their early Mexican American voices play an integral role in reframing the region as a site of global contact, cultural cartography, and transnational connection across the U.S.-Mexico border, across the hemisphere, and among radial circuits beyond. The variations of counterspaces these writers produce prove that early Mexican American writers cannot be conceptualized within the “Frontier Thesis” framework that predominates traditional Southwestern literature and culture. To this history of regional and spatial dominance, my work makes its most strident argument: Remapping the U.S. “Southwest” brings to light a legacy of Mexican American spatial resilience that troubles Anglo-centric literary constructions of the Southwest, its history, and cultural formation as a byproduct of westward expansionism. Early Mexican American writers offer a unique cultural paradigm of transnationalism for understanding the literature, culture, and geography of the U.S. “Southwest” as it has been imagined in Anglo American cultural production of the region. For early Mexican American writers, the Southwest was not a quaint region, but a space, oriented along a north-south axis and beyond, of historic transnational zones of contact, commerce, and cultural geography where they maintain degrees of agency.

Chapter I, analyzes the terrestrial and maritime transborder memories and desires of María Amparo Ruíz de Burton’s 1885 novel The Squatter and the Don. I situate both author and novel within a transnational scope, heeding Rosaura Sanchez and Beatrice Pita’s critical remark: “to understand Ruíz de Burton’s life [and texts] … one needs to have some familiarity… with the broader history of the border area, not merely the area of San Diego or
the U.S. Southwest, but Baja California as well” (*Conflicts of Interest* xiv). By taking into account Ruiz de Burton’s historic familial and economic ties to the Baja California frontera and the greater peninsula region, I argue that *The Squatter and the Don* looks south (of the Border) to imagine a transnational space that unites the California frontera and reconnects Alta and Baja California. I evaluate how “collateral” family ties in Lower California, the Texas Pacific Railroad, and steamship travel function in the novel to contribute, by land and sea, to Ruiz de Burton’s transnational sensitivities.

Chapter II zooms in on Fray Angelico Chavez’s short fiction to illuminate his globalized representations of historic and contemporary New Mexico in the face of parochial and primitive portrayals from members of the Santa Fe and Taos writers’ colonies. Whereas Willa Cather’s *Death Comes for the Archbishop* spatializes northern New Mexico and its native peoples as rural, unrefined and a byproduct of Anglo contact, I argue Chávez’s body of short fiction primarily reorients New Mexico from an Anglo Southwest to a historic Spanish Borderlands engaged in global and transnational contact. One of the more controversial writers in this study, Chávez was a known Hispanophile who often disassociated from cultural ties with the Mexican nation-state. However, as this chapter reveals, there is a period within his genre of short fiction where Chávez recognizes the cultural movement between Northern New Mexico and Mexico when it was a Viceroyalty of New Spain and the resulting racial mestizaje that ensued with this connection.

Chapter III recovers the mid-twentieth century memoirs of Federico Ronstadt, a half German-half Spanish-Mexican entrepreneur and musician, who recalls his life and times in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands at the fine de siècle. I position Ronstadt’s memoir as a response to the racial discord between Anglos and peoples of Mexican descent, which
resulted in militarized spatial control of Arizona during Operation Wetback. I contend that Ronstadt engages in an oppositional spatial production of southern Arizona that reorients Tucson along familial, economic, and cultural fronts within the transborder region known as the Pimería Alta (a historic region comprising northern Sonora and southern Arizona) and recaptures Tucson as a space of cosmopolitanism and cultural mestizaje.

My final chapter brings the discussion of Mexican American counterspatial production into the academic arena. Unlike the previous writers that comprise this study, Américo Paredes, as a collegiate scholar, was able to challenge Anglo spatial constructions of south Texas emanating from the University of Texas at Austin. I evaluate Paredes’s collegiate writings, his dissertation-turned-groundbreaking study *With His Pistol in His Hand* and novella *The Shadow*, as textual “fraternal twins” equally engaged in reconfiguring and reclaiming the south Texas borderlands from the writings of J. Frank Dobie and Walter Prescott Webb, but through different means of spatial production. Whereas *With His Pistol in His Hand* remaps South Texas in the form of the historic Spanish province Nuevo Santander, I argue *The Shadow* is Paredes’s first ideological iteration of Greater Mexico, as he unifies northern Mexico, south Texas and its constituents within a transfrontera space of global capitalism.

If regions, as John Allen, Doreen Massey and Allan Cochrane contend in *Rethinking the Region*, are conceptualized “out of spatialized social relations – and narratives about them …” [my emphasis], then Southwestern literary studies must wrestle with the fact that canonical texts from its most treasured authors of the earlier era work to maintain myopic imaginings of the Southwest and prevent the field from recognizing it historic transnational potential. *Remapping the U.S. Southwest* contends with this historical literary myopia by
advancing what can be considered a Mexican American literary canon of the Southwest that reclaims identities, preserves cultural histories and troubles the prevailing literary construction of the Southwest.

In the hopes of contributing to J.D. Saldívar’s call for an outer-national, transnational and global cultural studies, Remapping the U.S. Southwest listens to the trialectics of space, discourse and memory that early Mexican American writers share. With regard to my study’s attentions, I am reminded if a poem, “Envoi,” written by Octavio Paz and used by Henri Lefebvre as an opening to The Production of Space, that is short, but powerful, and worth reciting:

Imprisoned by four walls

(to the North, the crystal of non-knowledge

a landscape to be invented

to the South, reflective memory

to the East, the mirror

to the West, stone and the song of silence)

I wrote messages, but received no reply.

Paz’s poem illustrates the keen awareness of space experienced by those of Mexican descent and showcases the lack of response to individuals of the culture. For the subjects of my study, let this work be a long overdue reply.
Chapter I

Romancing the Frontera and the “Mexico Beyond”: María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, 

_The Squatter and the Don, and the Desire for a Transnational California(s)_

Three months after the sudden death of her husband, Colonel Henry S. Burton, María Amparo Ruiz de Burton, widowed at thirty-seven, with two teenaged children under her care, and rising debts, wrote her longtime friend Mariano Vallejo. The letter, dated August 17, 1869, and written from Staten Island (Colonel Burton was stationed in the northeast when he died, and Ruiz de Burton temporarily refrained from returning to the California borderlands in an attempt to settle financial matters on the east coast), showcases Ruiz de Burton’s frustration, fortitude, and foresight for securing her and her family’s economic survival. She vents to and asks Vallejo for his advisement regarding the struggle to keep her lands on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border. Ruiz de Burton writes:

Don Guadalulpe, […] Me dice Ud. que como mis tierras están cerca de San Diego no debo perder de vista mi interés allí. No, amigo mío, de vista no pierdo mi interés. Mis pobres ojos están muy fijos en ese punto, pero ¿qué hacer? ¿Qué hacer una mujer sin capital? ¡¡y…mujer!! […] Lo único que por ahora se proporciona es adoptar the policy of “a-masterly inactivity” – Como hacen los “Great men” de Estados Unidos cuando no saben cómo salir de apuros. Ojalá que Rosecrans y (su amigo de Ud.) Fremont tengan buen éxito y el Southern Pacific railroad se construya luego. **Ya veo que todo depende de eso** [my emphasis] […] también veo que debo tener alguien por allá que se interese en mí lo suficiente para siquiera aconsejarme qué debo hacer. Como mi amigo, Ud. me podrá aconsejar, pero qué haré para tener un agente? Es
verdad que allá está Federico mi hermano, pero aunque el muchacho no es
tonto, siempre no sé si él tiene suficiente aptitude y experiencia en negocios
para que pueda ser un agente capaz de habérselas con los Yankies que son
agujas puntiagudas. [...] Deme razón de algún otro abogado (de los menos
bribones) para que si se me ofreciere pueda encargarles mis negocios por allá.
[...] También avíseme si se remueva algo por allá sobre especulaciones en
tierras por San Diego o la Frontera. Sólo Dios sabe hasta cuándo llegará la
hora en que esa pobre Frontera despierte. Tal vez no sea hasta después que yo
me haya ido a dormir mi sueño eterno. (Conflicts of Interest 292-93)

Don Guadalupe, [...] you tell me as my lands are close to San Diego I
must not lose sight of my interest there. No my friend, I do not lose sight of
my interest. My poor eyes are fixed on that point, but what to do? What is a
woman without capital to do? And…a woman!! The only thing, provided, that
I can do now is adopt the policy of “a-masterly inactivity” – As the “Great
men” in the United States do when they do not know how to get out of trouble.
Hopefully, Rosecrans and (your friend) Fremont have much success and the
Southern Pacific railroad is built. I see now that everything depends on this
[my emphasis] [...] I see now that I should have someone out there interested
in me enough to advise me on what I must do. As my friend, you may advise
me, but what can I do to get an agent? It is true that Federico my brother is
over there, but although he is not foolish, I don’t know if he has sufficient
aptitude and experience in business to be an agent capable of dealing with the
Yankees who are sharp as needles. [...] Provide me the name of another
lawyer (a less rascally one) so that if I need to I can put him in charge of my business dealings over there. […] Also, let me know if something changes regarding the speculations of San Diego or the Frontera. Only God knows when the time will come when that poor Frontera is awakened. It may not be until after I have gone to sleep my eternal dream. [my translation]

What Ruiz de Burton’s letter to Vallejo illustrates, or rather commands, is that she was a borderlands businesswoman determined to mobilize her intellectual faculties and personal contacts to spur the sleeping industries of Southern and Baja California. Besides San Diego, as Rosaura Sánchez and Beatrice Pita discuss in Conflicts of Interest, Ruiz de Burton “was linked throughout her life to La Frontera, the northern border area of Baja California” (xvi). Far from emitting a “hacienda identity” longing for the pre-1848 days of yesteryear and a pastoral economic order, Ruiz de Burton, aware of her gendered and financial position, as a “woman without capital,” relies on Californio patriarch, Vallejo, to keep her abreast of the latest developments that could effect her potential business dealings in what she hopes will be developing capitalist economies on both sides of the California borderlands.12

Moreover, her letter evokes the often-overlooked fact that Ruiz de Burton was a bi-national landowner. She lay claim to the Rancho Jamul land grant twenty miles east of San Diego, and to two claims in Baja California, the San Antonio, eighty-seven miles south of San Diego, and the Ensenada, an ancestral claim seventy-five miles south near the present-day Pacific coastal city that bears its name. Therefore, Ruiz de Burton, longed for Rosecrans’ Southern Pacific to stimulate the economies of Southern California and Northern Baja California. Equally important, this letter also affirms Ruiz de Burton’s double sensibility for the word “Frontera.” Though she uses the term in capitalized form to specifically speak about the
geographical region of Northern Baja California, Ruiz de Burton’s interests in “the speculations of San Diego or the Frontera,” marks her attention to “la frontera,” the transnational social space of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands.13

Regarding her lack of “capital,” Ruiz de Burton understood all too well what Sánchez and Pita elucidate in Conflicts of Interest. Ruiz de Burton had in her possession land claims, or what Sánchez and Pita call “virtual capital,” enabling her potential for profit. But, what Ruiz de Burton knew she lacked was both “liquid capital” and “venture capital,” which was in the possession of the “sharp as needles” Yankee investors, she simultaneously despised and desired, with gold and legal tender to fuel mining and other commercial projects she dreamed of pursuing on her bi-national claims. With the whole of her beloved Mexico and La Frontera not reaching its economic potential due to decades of socio-political upheaval caused by the Mexican-American War, American filibustering in the north, the War of Reform, and French occupation, Ruiz de Burton foresaw a bi-national Age of Reconstruction where economic prosperity depended on a southern U.S. transcontinental railroad. Former Union General turned railroad promoter William Rosecrans’ post-bellum attempt to revive the San Diego Gila Southern Pacific and begin forming what would have been the U.S.’s second transcontinental railroad was a key to bi-national economic stimulus that Ruiz de Burton desired. Her utterance, “I see now everything depends on this,” referring to Rosecrans’ railroad, is an epiphany sprung from her frontera-frame of mind that comprehended the transnational implications a southern U.S. transcontinental railroad would have on “awakening” the California borderlands.14

It is the norm to position Ruiz de Burton as Californio (or more precisely Alta Californio), in light of her Jamul Rancho and residence in San Diego and as a Southern
sympathizer with ambivalent sentiments towards Yankees based on her east and west coast experiences. However, this geo-national positioning obscures the most profound element of Ruiz de Burton’s sense of self, her frontera identity. As Sánchez and Pita observe, “it has become commonplace to talk of identity as multiple, but what is often left out is an accounting and analysis of identity as socio-spatial” (1). These aforementioned multiple national identities fail to consider the dynamics of Ruiz de Burton’s frontera identity by overlooking the transnational socio-spatial politics that shaped her own identity formation and worldview.

After all, in addition to the capitalistic, self-interested fronteriza discourse Ruiz de Burton uses in her correspondence, she also emotes her sentiments for the land, in particular, La Frontera. Her statement “God only knows when the time will come when that poor Frontera is awakened,” carries with it sympathy stemming from the historic and cultural weight of Ruiz de Burton’s bajacalifornia and Mexican identity. This frontera identity was one that she maintained, though sometimes quietly and privately, in her transnational travel to the United States and incorporation as a U.S. citizen. Although Ruiz de Burton was only four years of age when her grandfather, Don Jose Manuel Ruiz, died in 1835, a biographical sketch of her grandfather that she prepared in 1878 for Hubert Howe Bancroft’s historical project demonstrates her deep knowledge for her intimate and extended family’s genealogical and geographical network throughout Baja and Alta California. She tells Bancroft that Don Ruiz was born in Loreto, Baja California and was the grandson of Doña Efigenia and Sr. Carrillo, “ancestors of almost all the principal families of both Californias.” 15 Ruiz de Burton also provides a summary of her grandfather’s distinguished military career that encompassed colonial expeditions against “cruel races of Indians” at the
“head of the Gulf of Cortez,” his establishment of missions across “the frontier of Lower California” that resulted in a gubernatorial grant to the Ensenada, and his death, after serving as Commander at Loreto, at the tip of the peninsula, in La Paz.

True, we can extract from her telling what many literary scholars have expounded in analyses of her two novels *Who Would Have Thought It?* (1872) and *The Squatter and the Don* (1885) – Ruiz de Burton’s elitism and racial prejudice. But, her biographical sketch also offers us insight into her socio-spatial identity politics. Ruiz de Burton perceives herself as a descendent of bajacalifornio and alta californio patriarchies and matriarchies. From her geographical familial network that extends throughout the Baja California peninsula, from La Paz to La Frontera, and into Alta California, emerges, in the words of Benedict Anderson, an “imagined community” (6-7). However, Ruiz de Burton’s is an imagined transnational Californio community that she describes for Bancroft thirty years after the Mexican-American War cleaved the Californias.

Ruiz de Burton was displaced from Baja California in 1848, since her family sought political asylum as “refugees” in Monterey, California after acquiescing to U.S. occupation, in a Mexican-American War that proved as much of an international affair as an internal civil embattlement, with bajacalifornio insurrectionists rising to challenge U.S. troops and traitors. Her marriage to northeasterner Captain Henry S. Burton displaced her from the California borderlands and thrust her in the national epicenters in the northeast, where she consorted with national political figures from Presidents Buchanan and Lincoln to Jefferson Davis’s wife. Yet, despite these multiple displacements and accommodations to Anglo society and U.S. nationalism, Ruiz de Burton maintained her transnational Californio identity within the company and correspondence of her fellow “paisanos.”
As Sánchez and Pita point out, for Ruiz de Burton, these “socio-spatial relocalizations” throughout the U.S. nation-state heightened her frontera identity as a Californio from Alta and especially Baja California and “brought on a keen awareness of unequal power relations toward Californios” and the Mexican nation-state, which she also came to identify with after traveling to the east coast (86, 105). While Lower and Upper California constituted one region for Ruiz de Burton, “relocation to Alta California” and later the east coast, “made Ruiz de Burton hyperconscious of the political boundaries separating nation-states” (105). Ruiz de Burton “lived in two worlds, represented by the two Californias, Anglo-Saxon California and the underdeveloped, defeated Mexican California,” where on each side of the geo-political divide, she and her landed transnational Californio community suffered the ill effects of Manifest Destiny (105). For Ruiz de Burton, Manifest Destiny was “none other than a Manifest Yankee trick” and a “malevolent phrase intended to rob,” as she told Vallejo in the winter of 1869. She experienced firsthand, and witnessed through the troubles of Vallejo and Pio Pico, the disenfranchising effects of the California Land Claims Act of 1851 that reinforced squatterdom with its mutual appeals process and often resulted in Californio bankruptcy and land loss due to tremendous legal costs, all of which is a nation-based topic of concern taken up in *The Squatter and the Don*. Later, as Ruiz de Burton expanded her socio-spatial worldview by including amongst her network of paisanos Mexican diplomats she fraternized with in Washington D.C., she was privy to the Manifest Destiny’s transnational reach and learned of U.S. socio-economic and political policies in Mexico that she recognized as advantageous only to “the terrible Yankee giants.” Yet, in what she reasoned was a last resort, an “only hope” for her “Poor Mexico,” “Poor Frontera,” and “Poor San Diego,” in a move to economically, and on some level, culturally suture the Californias,
Ruiz de Burton needed Manifest Destiny to perform a trick manifesting a second transcontinental railroad with transnational effects.\textsuperscript{16}

As Jesse Alemán suggests, Ruiz de Burton’s “life and works cannot easily be cast as proto-Chicana,” since both her novels “play out problematic ethno-racial romances that claim white racial identity for Californios at the expense of the nonwhite racial Others …” (60, 61). However, it is vital, for the sake of reading Ruiz de Burton’s life and works more fully, to critique her identity and cultural production not only in terms of race and class, but also geopolitical space. We cannot deny that Ruiz de Burton’s frontera identity and her transnational commercial and cultural mindset “anticipates a type of ethnic intellectual with bi-national concerns” (Sánchez and Pita xvii). Nor can we deny how her frontera identity, a type of ethno-spatial romance in itself, demonstrated by Ruiz de Burton’s intimate discourse of space, place, and community, informs her novels, especially \textit{The Squatter and the Don}. Just as Ruiz de Burton’s life “calls for a historiographic figuration that is spatially and temporally transverse that necessarily breaks conventional disciplinary borders,” so too does \textit{The Squatter and the Don}, a work of historical fiction that, on its surface, documents the fall of Californio patriarch Don Mariano Alamar due to disenfranchising land policies and railroad monopolization (Sánchez and Pita xviii).

Yet, the majority of Chicano literary scholarship views \textit{The Squatter and the Don} within the purview of the U.S. nation-state. Case in point: José Aranda historicizes the text in light of the May 11, 1880 events at Mussel Slough, where Anglo-American vigilantes died while challenging mandates by Californian Southern Pacific Railroad monopolists. Aranda notes that Ruiz de Burton initiated the novel two months after Mussel Slough and argues that the novel, in addition to populism, “supports a political future where the … educated
California citizenry takes as its founding mythos the nostalgic embrace of Californio ranch culture” (15). Indeed, Ruiz de Burton references Mussel Slough in the final pages of the novel: what better way to provoke the sympathies of her Anglo readership than by comparing Californio plight to Slough victims? But, what do we make of Ruiz de Burton’s textual evocations concerning the Mexican origins of Alta California and the U.S.’s historical amnesia regarding the Mexican-American War?

Outside of the field of Chicano/a Studies, Thomas Brooks argues “we need to bring the resources of Reconstruction Studies … to bear on [The Squatter and the Don], a work whose criticism has been dominated by those trained in Hispanic/Latino or Western Studies” (874). Like several Chicano scholars, Brooks asserts the novel “clearly sympathizes with the South,” since Ruiz de Burton “champions the Texas-Pacific Railroad, which was designed to connect the South with San Diego” (873). Interestingly, Brook’s Reconstructionist purview, which utilizes Southern socio-economic histories, brings forth the historical fact that Tom Scott, the Texas-Pacific’s promoter, whom Ruiz de Burton supports in The Squatter and the Don over Central Pacific and later Southern Pacific monopolists Leland Stanford and Collis P. Huntington, was a monopolist in his own right with intentions to open up new global markets (888). Brooks, thus, points out Ruiz de Burton endorses an economy developed through the transnational circulation of capital, evident in her portrayal of the banking industry in the novel (888). Brooks writes:

…New York bankers made lucrative profits financing the Civil War debt. Using connections forged while financing that debt, they managed foreign investments of the sort Scott sought to build his railroad. Assuming the Texas Pacific will be a success, Clarence plans to link San Diego to this global
network of capital by starting a West Coast bank that will employ members of
the Mechlin and Alamar families. (889)

Troublingly, however, Brooks’ interpretation of Ruiz de Burton’s transnationalism only links
San Diego to a global network of capital. Brooks concludes that *The Squatter and the Don* is
nothing more than a “black and white romance about the westward course of Reconstruction”
(892). But, what do we make of the transnational windfall between San Diego and Northern
Mexico Ruiz de Burton perceives when Mr. Holman, friend of Don Alamar, tells Governor
Leland Stanford, “take into consideration, as a businessman, the immense benefit…of the
trade which will be the result of uniting Southern California with Arizona, with the Southern
States and Northern Mexico [my emphasis], and developing those vast countries now lying
useless, scarcely inhabited” (292)?

The answer to each of these questions is quite simple. Ruiz de Burton’s novel looks
South (of the Border) to imagine a transnational space uniting the California frontera along a
north-south axis that reconnects Alta and Baja California and links the region further south
into Mexico. Mussel Slough may have functioned as a type of traumatic trigger that
prompted Ruiz de Burton to begin the novel, but the seeds for responding to what can be
described as a space-shattering event for Ruiz de Burton – the failure of the Texas Pacific –
germinated well before 1880. Five years prior, in 1875, after Rosecrans’ and Tom Scott’s
efforts to bring San Diego a transcontinental railroad failed, Ruiz de Burton met with
Huntington to express her desire for a railroad into San Diego that he dismissed. Likewise,
her sympathies for the former Confederacy are textually evident, but it is her transnational
Californian community of Mexican origin that demands attention. (Alta) Californian and
Southern concerns come secondary for what was Ruiz de Burton’s primary geopolitical
objective in *The Squatter and the Don*: to rejoin San Diego with Baja California and the “Mexico Beyond.”

In the climactic scene in *The Squatter and the Don*, one that has already been partially described because of its significance, Ruiz de Burton depicts Californio patriarch and protagonist Don Mariano Alamar along with his associates Alfred Holman and James Mechlin in a calamitous meeting with California Governor Leland Stanford. After dashing their hope for making San Diego the western terminus of a second transcontinental railroad, Holman, attempting to appeal to Stanford “as a business man” asks him to imagine the control of the trade he would have by uniting the immense region comprising California, Arizona, the Southern States and Northern Mexico (292). However, Stanford renders the region unimaginable. Speaking as a monopolist out of concern for his San Francisco terminus and his Central and Southern Pacific railroads, Stanford replies, “Oh yes; we have thought of that, I suppose, but we are too busy up here. We have too much business on hand nearest us to think of attending to those wild countries” (292-3).

In this exchange, Ruiz de Burton illustrates a geo-spatial hierarchy defined by Governor Stanford, a representative of both Anglo corporate, governmental, and social dominance. Stanford reinforces the financial importance and civility of Northern California while relegating what amounts in large part to the U.S.-Mexico borderlands as un-incorporable “wild countries.” Socio-political unrest along the California borderlands, historically in the form of William Walker’s filibustering expedition in the 1850s and Feliciano Ruiz de Esparza’s takeover in the 1860s, was a concern Ruiz de Burton shared with potential Yankee investors eyeing the frontera. Nevertheless, her fictionalization of Stanford’s dismissal of the borderlands also showcases what Michael Velez notes regarding
this crucial part of the novel, namely that the “huge area encompassing multiple regions appears invisible to Stanford” (231). In tandem with California pioneer societies of Ruiz de Burton’s day that, as Michael Scott Van Wagenen puts it, “aggressively staked their claim in California’s landscape of memory” by ignoring southern portions of the state, Stanford’s mapping is nothing more than a blank canvass for Southern California and the U.S.-Mexico borderlands (108). Visible merely as “wild countries,” Stanford’s myopia makes invisible the geopolitical definition, historicity, and peoplehood of the frontera. However, as Henri Lefebvre suggests, a counter-space can insert itself into spatial realities constructed by dominant forces, and in the case of The Squatter and the Don, it does so largely through Ruiz de Burton’s characterization of Don Alamar (382). For in this space-shattering scene that Ruiz de Burton loosely based on her own experiences with members of the Big Four, she counters Anglo California’s landscape of selective memory with the presence of Don Alamar, a subject of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, whom she encodes within the novel, more precisely, as a frontera patriarch.

The Alamar family’s racial identity has dominated critical discussions of the novel. With descriptions of the Don’s “mild and beautiful blue eyes” that mirror the eye color of his beloved daughter Mercedes, and his “light” skin tone that he passed on to his sons, which begs Clarence and the squatter Romeo to compare the patriarchs to Englishmen and Germans, there is little wonder why Ruiz de Burton and the text have been judged as using “whiteness as a performed identity category” (Alemán 63). Indeed, as Alemán observes, in addition to phenotypic constructions of whiteness, The Squatter and the Don uses “strategic ethno-national distinctions and alliances that allow Californios to reposition themselves as white citizens in the United States at the expense of racial Others” (63). Who can forget the “lazy
Indians” and dutiful mozos that serve to distinguish by class and caste the Alamares? Who can forget the narrator’s final words of the novel, a desperate plea “for a Redeemer who will emancipate the white slaves of California”? No doubt, this statement is a parting sentiment that aligns Californios nationally with the defeated Southerners. But, we should also remember the narrator’s informative remark, delivered earlier in the novel, that reveals the Don’s and his progeny’s transnational frontera heritage.

Stated much like a cryptic aside, at the end of Chapter II, which is significantly titled “The Don’s View of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo,” the narrator discloses:

The Alamar family was quite patriarchal in size, if the collateral branches be taken into account, for there were many brothers, nephews, and nieces. These however, lived in the adjoining rancho, and yet another branch in Lower California, in Mexico. (68)

Ruiz de Burton may whiten the Don and his family and Europeanize their ethnic origins by referring to them as “Spano-Americans” with Germanic and Anglo-Saxon features, but the Alamares’ socio-spatial frontera lineage complicates their racialization. To consider the narrator’s conditional phrase “if the collateral branches be taken into account,” means repositioning the Don and his family from nationally inscribed (Alta) Californios to part of a frontera familial network, or imagined transnational community that extends from San Diego to Baja California. Thus, the novel not only works to tie the Alamares and Californios, in general, horizontally to the Southerners of the fallen Confederacy, but also vertically to the Southerners of their Mexican kindred. This vertical genealogy, in which the Don serves as one of several patriarchs throughout the Californias, works to recuperate the California borderlands and Californios of the conquered genteel class from being erased by Anglo
landscapes of memory. Precisely because the statement is brief, it works, in the words of Genero Padilla, “like a flash through the dense texture of language and reified memory” to “voice itself against the imperial ‘Other’ (44). The “imperial ‘Other,’” in the case of Ruiz de Burton’s novelistic purview, can primarily be considered Stanford, with his effacing perception of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands as mere “wild countries.” Therefore, from the start of her effort, Ruiz de Burton makes a subtle but revealing move to remap the borderlands and its Californio population with the Don’s vertical lineage.

To take into account the “collateral branches” of the Don’s identity and the border-crossing element it brings to The Squatter and the Don also entails recognizing that Ruiz de Burton inscribes the Don and the Alamares with her frontera identity. Most scholars assume Don Mariano Alamar is a fictionalization of Mariano G. Vallejo. Vallejo may appear as the model for Ruiz de Burton’s protagonist, considering both share a name and experience land loss and financial destitution. However, Vallejo’s view of Californio community upsets easy correlations with Don. We learn from Vallejo’s “Recuerdos históricos y personales tocante a la alta California” that he faults persons from Mexico with “inundat[ing] us with a wave of gamblers,” and thus corrupting Californio patriarchal customs during the California gold rush, (qtd. in Pérez 48). Vallejo’s comments, much like the title of his “Recuerdos,” showcase his view of a socio-spatial community that by no means branches into the Mexican nation-state. Instead, Vallejo contains his Californio community within the geographic region of Alta California. The Don’s “collateral branches” that extend into Lower California, in contrast, reflect Ruiz de Burton’s family ties, which run the length of both Californias from San Diego to La Paz. Therefore, Ruiz de Burton bases the Don and the Alamares more so after her socio-spatial sentiments and thus her perception of a transnational Californio
community that delves into Mexico. By assigning the Don her socio-spatial identity, Don Alamar and his immediate family are not merely Alta Californios. Rather, Ruiz de Burton marks the Alamares as Peninsulars that migrated northward through the historic cultural space of the Baja California peninsula and maintained their regional kinship, despite the Mexican-American War, within a transnational network of families.19

As part of the transnational Californio community based on her own familial heritage, Ruiz de Burton endows the Don with characteristics that pay tribute to her Mexican birthright. Particularly, she assigns Don Alamar a birth-year that honors an important date of Mexican nationalism and patriotism in her familial heritage. In 1822, Ruiz de Burton’s grandfather, Don Jose Manuel Ruiz, governor of Baja California, swore allegiance to Mexico’s independence and to Iturbide (Conflicts of Interest 2,7). The Don, it can be deduced, was born in 1822, as he is fifty years old at the novel’s starting point of 1872.20 With Ruiz de Burton being “hyperconscious of political boundaries separating nation-states,” this character-developing maneuver that binds the Don’s existence with a significant year in her family’s history takes on a special meaning. The Don’s positioning as an Alta Californio is, again, checked by a socio-spatial identity marker, the year 1822, which patriotically ties him to the Mexican nation-state, since Ruiz de Burton embeds the Don’s birth-year with a biographical relevance that functions on historical, cultural and spatially symbolic levels.

Ruiz de Burton amplifies these subtle signifiers of the Don’s transnational identity by accounting for his view of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the peace treaty that was signed in 1848, which ended the Mexican-American War and ceded Mexico’s northern provinces, the lands that now comprise the U.S. Southwest, to the United States. For, in the same chapter Ruiz de Burton’s narrator positions the Don beyond fences of his hacienda as part of
a transnational patriarchal space, Ruiz de Burton counters the proverbial “blank canvas” of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands by telling the lost historiography of the region. In order to imagine a transnational space where Californio families reside on both sides of the U.S.-Mexico border, Ruiz de Burton has to put flesh back onto the object of a forgotten landscape and people. Thus, through an act of transgender ventriloquism, Ruiz de Burton asserts her frontera identity as a troubled Mexican-American subject and her historical knowledge of the Border’s creation with Don Alamar’s soliloquy that informs the chapter’s name:

“I remember,” calmly said Don Mariano, “that when I first read the text of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, I felt a bitter resentment against my people; against Mexico, the mother country, who abandoned us – her children – with so slight a provision of obligatory stipulations for protection. But afterwards, upon mature reflection, I saw that Mexico did as much as could have been reasonably expected at the time. In the very preamble of the treaty the spirit of peace and friendship, which animated both nations, was carefully made manifest. That spirit was to be the foundation of the relations between the conqueror and the conquered. 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? The treaty said that our rights would be the same as those enjoyed by all other American citizens. But, you see, Congress takes very good care not to enact retroactive laws for Americans, laws to take away from American citizens the property which they hold now, already, with recognized title. But they do so
quickly enough with us – with us, the Spano-Americans, who were to enjoy equal rights, mind you, according to the treaty of peace. This is what seems to me a breach of faith, which Mexico could neither presuppose nor prevent. (65)

The Don refers to himself as a Spano-American, which can be considered a move by the author to entreat her Anglo readership for sympathy. However, considering the cultural and bi-national rhetoric of the speech, Ruiz de Burton inscribes the Don with a Mexican American subject-position that casts him as an “abandoned” child of Mexico with no representation within the newly acquired region, which is a narrative move that parallels her own experience. The Don recognizes he is an outcast, pseudo-citizen of the United States. By characterizing Don Alamar in this light, Ruiz de Burton assigns the Don a socio-spatial outlook that recovers the historical moment of conquest and its aftermath, which writes the border and the plight of members of the Californio transnational community into existence.

Unlike Chapter I of the novel, entitled “Squatter Darrell Reviews the Past,” where the Don’s secondary rival William Darrell essentially fails to perceive the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and hence misunderstands the region and the rights of its conquered occupants, “The Don’s View of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo” serves to correct this Anglo misrepresentation of the space. Darrell’s perception of the past upholds the Anglo frontier mythos. We learn from Chapter I that he views California with a pioneer’s eyes as he recalls for his wife “cross[ing] the plains,” in 1848, “with our three babies, in our caravan of four wagons” to what he believed was a vacant region for his “settlement” (56). However, the Don’s view of the past proves the frontier mythos to be just that, a popularized myth, as he revises the historical and spatial significance of 1848. By remembering the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the Don positions California not as the westward culmination of a new
frontier, but as a frontera. The Don’s soliloquy evokes California’s Mexican past that combats Anglo historical amnesia regarding the formation of California and, at large, the U.S. Southwest. Cartographic imaginings of “wild countries” and a vacant frontier dissipate, since the Don, a la Ruiz de Burton, views California as a part of a newly minted borderland cleaved from “Mexico, the mother country,” where members of the transnational Californio genteel class north of the border struggle to survive as Mexican-American subjects.

As José David Saldívar asserts, “In Ruiz de Burton’s hands, the U.S.-Mexico border contact zone outlined in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo is a signifier […] of political struggles to define the local as a distinctive community in the historical context of displacement” (180). Like Ruiz de Burton’s biographical experience, the Don endures socio-economic instability as a member of the United States citizenry, with squatters running amuck on his lands and draining him of his financial resources due to laws like the 1851 California Land Act, which “in congress assembled,” dispossessed the landed gentry of their holdings. Consolidation within the national community is far from a state of contentment for the Don. However, in addition to impending land displacement, we must understand that the Don, as a frontera patriarch with collateral branches of his family in Lower California, has experienced growing vertical displacement with Mexico in the aftermath of the Treaty resulting from “spatial and demographic change accelerated by the Gold Rush” (Sánchez and Pita 36). Rather than marking persons of Mexico as foreign and a threat to Californio patriarchies, like Vallejo, Don Alamar targets the “horde of land sharks, all possessing the privilege of voting” (66). Land sharks like Darrell who signify the spatial and demographic change of California threaten to disrupt the Don’s socio-spatial position as a frontera patriarch, while connections with Northern Mexico reinforce his transnational Californio
patriarchy. The Don, like Ruiz de Burton, does not attempt to beat the system of spatial change in the new social order, though. In the historical context of displacement, Ruiz de Burton makes it her political struggle within the novel to assert her transnational developmental vision of the borderlands that would suture the Californias and its genteel Californio community to the Baja California frontera and beyond, into Mexico.

In 1852, the same year Ruiz de Burton and her husband relocated to San Diego, the United States’ Coasts Survey examined the San Diego shoreline and yielded favorable results (A.B. Grey Report 109). The following year, Col. Henry S. Burton purchased Rancho Jamul, twenty miles east of San Diego while Ruiz de Burton moved on what was to later become a controversial matter, procuring the title to her family’s ancestral land claim seventy miles south of San Diego in Northern Baja, La Ensenada, from her mother and aunts. With Col. Henry S. Burton’s military and political connections, there is little doubt the couple anticipated an attempt to construct the first transcontinental railroad with San Diego as the western terminus, which nearly came to fruition with Andrew Belcher Gray’s encouraging 1854 Report on the “first transcontinental survey along the thirty-second parallel for a feasible railroad route” (xvi). (See figures 7 and 8). Not only does Gray suggest San Diego’s harbor superior to harbors on either of North America’s coasts and “beneficial to the construction of the railway along the thirty-second parallel, but he also views the railway as a transnational operation (110). Gray sees what he refers to as the “Pacific Railroad” “radiating branch lines” from Tubac, Arizona to Guaymas, Sonora, in addition to branches from San Diego to Los Angeles and San Francisco. He also projects “it will not be long after this main stem is established, that these branches will be formed, opening new channels of intercourse and trade” (121). Considering the land purchases and claims Ruiz de Burton and her husband
made, it is probable, especially in Ruiz de Burton’s case, that she, too, imagined radiating branch lines, but from San Diego southward toward her own “collateral branches” at her family’s land claim at La Ensenada and further south along the peninsula to her family in La Paz.

The advent of the U.S. Civil War halted plans for a southern transcontinental railroad into San Diego. But, in 1871, Pennsylvania railroad tycoon Col. Tom Scott received Congressional approval to charter the Texas Pacific Railroad. Ruiz de Burton, returned from the east coast, widowed with surmounting debt, and facing squatters on her lands, knew that Scott’s Texas Pacific was her salvation. Aside from making San Diego a westward terminus, Scott also had interests in linking the Texas Pacific to Mexican railway systems, making him an ideal tycoon to economically link Ruiz de Burton’s California frontera.23

Figure 7. Preliminary Map of the Texas Western Railroad as depicted in the original A.B. Grey Report. Scott’s Texas Pacific would have follow a near identical path as he inherited land deeded to its predecessor. Courtesy of the University of New Mexico Center for Southwest Research.
The Panic of 1873 sunk the United States into a deep depression and again stalled Scott’s plans for what now would have been the nation’s second transcontinental railroad, but Ruiz de Burton continued to bank on Manifest Destiny in the form of the Texas-Pacific’s arrival. In 1874, with loans and dwindling finances, she planned to build a reservoir on her Jamul Rancho for city water and for what she foresaw as an agricultural shift in the region (Conflict of Interest 392). During the same year, Ruiz de Burton cultivated castor beans and wrote an article for the San Diego Union aiming to convince readers of the prospects and advantages of this cash crop. But, of course, with her money tied up in land litigation, she could not see these projects to fruition. Ruiz de Burton knew her economic survival on both sides of the borderlands depended on the transcontinental railway. As she told Vallejo, in
January of 1874, with regard to her Jamul water project, “Si Tom Scott resucita el S.P.R.R. entonces sera diferente, pero entonces habrá otros proyectos que rivalicen.” “If Tom Scott revives the S.P.R.R. then it will be different, but then there will be other projects that vie.” [my translation] The projects Ruiz de Burton imagined in competition with Jamul, should Scott’s railroad arrive in San Diego, lay across the border in Baja California at La Ensenada and the San Antonio mines.

Of course, as history dictates, and The Squatter and the Don records, the Big Four [Huntington, Stanford, Crocker and Hopkins] defeated Scott’s Texas Pacific through Congressional bribery.24 With the Big Four’s monopolization of the Central and Southern Pacific secure and San Francisco the epicenter for transport by land and sea, Ruiz de Burton’s transnational hopes for San Diego were dashed, as evinced through the eyes of her narrator:

… this order of things, (or rather disorder) could not have been possible if the Texas Pacific Railroad had not been strangled, as San Diego would not then be the poor, crippled and dwarfed little city that she now is. (314)

In the words of Jennifer M. Acker, who provided the historical notes to the Modern Library edition, “the economic anticipation of the Texas Pacific is a central theme in the novel” (397). However, in light of Ruiz de Burton’s transnational developmental vision, the failure of the Texas Pacific is the central source of conflict as its defeat renders socio-economic as well as socio-spatial “disorder” for Don Alamar and Ruiz de Burton alike. Both author and protagonist face financial loss, land loss, and displacement from Baja California without the Texas Pacific. Thus, Ruiz de Burton’s desire for a southern transcontinental railroad and its transnational impact on the California frontera colors Don Mariano’s
economic dreams. Ultimately, Don Alamar, too, hopes to utilize Manifest Destiny in the form of the Texas-Pacific to secure his and the Alamar family’s standing by developing both sides of the California frontera, as the novel registers the significance railways play for transnational unification of the Californias.

For the majority of the novel, Don Alamar, his immediate family, in-laws, children’s love interests (namely Mercedes’s Clarence) and rivals (squatters) anticipate Scott’s Texas Pacific and can only “hope and wait,” as the Don’s son-in-law George Mechlin tells Clarence (152). In fact, as early as the third chapter, three of the most obstinate squatters residing on the Don’s land, Gasbang, Mathews, and Darrell, discuss San Diego’s prospects in light of Tom Scott’s impending visit to the city (70). Whereas the title of the text indicates division between Don Alamar and squatter Darrell, it also signals unison, since both the squatter and the Don eagerly await the Texas Pacific Railroad. For Gasbang, Mathews, and Darrell, a transcontinental railroad spells the solidification of Anglo colonization in the national sense. However, a transcontinental railroad for Don Alamar, a frontera patriarch, spells a means to undermine socio-economic and spatial displacement.

Don Alamar understands the Texas Pacific Railroad is integral to transforming his virtual capital landholdings in San Diego into liquid profit. This is most evident when Don Alamar tells Governor Stanford “…I have only my land to rely upon for a living – and nothing else. Hence my great anxiety to have the Texas Pacific. My land will be very valuable if we have a railroad and our county becomes more settled…” (292). The Don’s statements, especially his declaration, “I have only my land to rely upon for a living,” should not be misconstrued as indicative of his wanting to hold on to an archaic, outmoded, haciendado past. To borrow an assertion from Susan Gillman, “Ruiz de Burton takes neither
a naïve antiquarian view of the mission past nor presents the Don as an idealized figure of a pastoral arcadia” (150). Indeed, Don Alamar does recall happier times prior to Anglo westward expansion. The rodeos, which the narrator describes as a “gay and boisterous gathering of other years,” are a far cry from the detrimental state of affairs Don Alamar faces with his cattle being killed off by belligerent squatters (208). Yet, Don Alamar illustrates no desire to return to a hacienda system, for his solution to socio-economic and cultural revival rests in the present modes of development. When Don Alamar says, “I have only my land to rely upon for my living,” he is not only referring to his rancho, but more importantly, his newly acquired lots of land in the San Diego townsite. After a reassuring visit from Col. Scott to San Diego, which Ruiz de Burton bases on historical fact, Don Alamar along with James Mechlin and Alfred Holman “bought block after block of building lot, and only stopped when their money was all invested … to wait for the railroad to bring population and prosperity” (115). Paraphrasing the narrator, what was proven to be folly, was at the time a wise investment. Anticipating the Texas-Pacific Railroad and the boom economy it would bring with population surge, Don Alamar invests in land. For Don Alamar, land is a commodity that will pay out profits in the near future according to the economic model of supply and demand.

Don Alamar’s ranch-lands located outside the San Diego townsite would also profit from the Texas Pacific. While the Don desires to keep his cattle, he sees that in addition to cattle grazing land, his landholdings and those the squatters have claimed are ideal for fruit-based agriculture. In an attempt to save a few cattle for profit in northern markets and share his economic vision of the region, Don Alamar tells the squatters, “…it is a mistake to try to make San Diego County a grain-producing county. …This county is, and has been and will
always be, a good grazing county – one of the best counties for cattle-raising on this coast, and the very best for fruit-raising on the face of the earth” (87). As a “native” Californio, Don Alamar understands the squatters are misusing the land and climate for ill-supported grain crops. He emphasizes livestock and fruit-growing industries as key for utilizing the environment and, as demonstrated in the next passage, maximizing profit through export:

So I say, plant vineyards, plant olives, figs, oranges; make wines and oil and raisins; export olives and dried and canned fruits. I had some very fine California canned fruit sent to me from San Francisco. Why could we not can fruits as well, or better? Our olives are splendid – the same our figs, oranges, apricots, and truly all semi-tropical fruits are of superior quality. When this fact becomes generally known, I feel very sure that San Diego County will be selected for fruit and grape-growing. In two years grape vines begin to bear; the same with figs, peaches, and other fruits. At three years old they bear quite well; and all without irrigation. So you would not have to wait very long to begin getting a return from your labor and capital. (88)

Don Alamar’s speech, which, in part, resembles Ruiz de Burton’s agricultural opinions published in her *San Diego Union* article on the benefits of castor bean planting, also inspires Holman’s developmental sentiments. It is clear Holman takes his cues from Don Alamar’s developmental vision of San Diego when he speaks to Governor Stanford on the necessity of the Texas Pacific, “If our county does not take the lead as wheat growing, it certainly can take it as fruit growing. …for grapes, figs, and in fact all semi-tropical fruits, there is no better country in the world” (290).
However, it should be understood that Holman also echoes Don Alamar’s development of the Mexican frontera. When Holman demands before Governor Stanford that “by right, San Diego is the terminal point of a transcontinental railroad and ought to be the shipping point for all that immense country comprising Arizona, Southern California, and Northern Mexico,” images of the Don’s transnational Californio community come into view (291). For if we continue to take the narrator’s conditional statement to heart (“The Alamar family was quite patriarchal in size, if the collateral branches be taken into account…in Lower California”), then the Don’s “land to rely upon,” which would also benefit from the Texas Pacific Railroad, includes his extended family’s adjoining rancho in Southern California and the ranchos in Baja California. Although Don Alamar’s brothers and sisters are arguably the most peripheral characters in the novel, what glimpses Ruiz de Burton does present of them showcase a unified family that relies upon each other for economic gain and during economic hardship. Don Alamar tells the squatters that since 1850, he has been driving his cattle and herds belonging to his brothers to the northern counties for “a handsome profit” (90). “I took nearly six thousand head,” Don Alamar states, “three thousand were mine – and the others belonged to my brothers” marking a transnational sojourn for his brothers’ cattle in order for his brothers to turn a greater profit (90). We also learn that Don Alamar depends on his sister at the adjoining rancho for migrating what is left of his cattle after the squatters retaliate upon hearing word that the Government approved the Don’s title. The narrator tells us “Don Mariano and his two sons would ride out everyday to superintend personally the collecting of the cattle and sending them off to his sister’s rancho to the valley, where the rendezvous or depot had been established” (208). “By right” San Diego ought to be the shipping point for Southern California and Northern Mexico because,
as the novel suggests, the Don sees transnational economic opportunity for himself, sister, and his brothers in Lower California should the Texas Pacific come to pass. Since the Alameres are accustomed to doing business within the family, a branch road of the Texas Pacific from San Diego into Northern Mexico/Baja California would certainly benefit Don Alamar and the “collateral branches” in Lower California. The value of the Alamar lands in both Californias would increase as well as the feasibility of conducting vertical commerce within the transnational Californio family unit, as Scott’s railroad would have economically, culturally, and spatially sutured Southern California with Northern Mexico.

Moreover, Holman uses an interesting choice of words when he, in all probability echoing Don Mariano, says, “by right [my emphasis] San Diego is the terminal point of a transcontinental railroad and ought to be the shipping point for all that immense country comprising Arizona, Southern California, Northern Mexico” (291). For Holman, a newly relocated denizen of San Diego, these rights are solely due to proximity, as he demonstrates in his argument, “we are more than five hundred miles nearer to those countries than San Francisco, thus you will be making people travel six hundred miles more than is necessary to get to a shipping point on the Pacific” (291). But, when taking Ruiz de Burton’s and the Don’s Californio frontera heritage into account, in addition to rights determined by the logic of distance, we must also consider rights determined by the historical logic of cultural-economic space.

According to Bibiana Santiago Guerrero’s work, “Mercado y medios de transporte como referentes a la apropiación del territorio en Baja California, 1850-1919,” which gives a historical account of how economic means of transportation by land and sea were established in Baja California, San Diego was a socio-economic epicenter for the Southern California-
Northern Baja region. In the initial section of her work “Ganadería: exportación de cueros vía el Puerto de San Diego,” Guerrero explains how, in the mid-nineteenth century, ranchers in Northern Baja California drove their livestock to San Diego where they would sell meat and hides locally and for trade with merchant vessels coming into the Port (68-69). Guerrero significantly notes that “en realidad, la Alta California, en la parte sur, y la Baja California, en la parte norte, formaban una región económica, pues ambas fureron zonas Mexicana y su centro económico se encontraba en San Diego” (69). However, this unified economic region was disrupted during the Gold Rush. As Guerrero discusses in “La diligencia: los gambusinos y el camino del Fuerte Yuma a San Francisco,” Baja California ranchers near the U.S.-Mexico border set up posts along wagon roads that developed to accommodate migrating miners’ on their northward trek. Also, the establishment of Fort Yuma in 1850 acted as a midpoint where goods from San Francisco were stored and then distributed throughout the region (70-71). Historically, where it was once San Diego’s “right,” to be the economic shipping point of the frontera, by 1850, the Gold Rush shifted the flow of trade to Fort Yuma and San Francisco, therefore disconnecting San Diego from its economic network with Baja California.

 Ruiz de Burton evokes this spatial history when the narrator, speaking of yesteryear, remembers, “when “the boys” of the surrounding ranchos all assembled at Alamar to separate their cattle” (208). It is apparent that Don Alamar’s rancho functions as a central point for rancheros and their cattle drives. However, the historicity of San Diego’s spatial shift crystallizes when Don Alamar tells the squatters, “We raised cattle and sold hides and tallow every year, and made money. When gold was discovered, we drove our stock north…” (89). With San Diego as the western terminus of the Texas Pacific, and thus an epicenter of
regional and international trade, the Don and his brothers would no longer have to drive their
cattle to northern markets, as he says they have been doing “since ‘50” (90). For Don Alamar,
the Texas Pacific Railroad, or any transcontinental railroad that makes San Diego its western
terminus (since near the novel’s end the Don, Holman, and Mechlin ask Stanford to build a
railroad out, if not Tom Scott) is capable of restoring San Diego’s “right” as an economic
center of the frontera and the greater region comprising Arizona, Southern California, and
Northern Mexico. The Don knows entrusting Anglo-America is detrimental to Californios, as
he tells Clarence, “Their very contact is deadly to us” (165). Yet, being a frontera patriarch,
Don Alamar is willing to ride the rails of Manifest Destiny to reconnect San Diego with Baja
California. Therefore, it is no coincidence that Ruiz de Burton names the Don: Mariano
Alamar. It is a name, in itself, which symbolizes Manifest Destiny. Mariano A-la-Mar, or
sea-to-sea, evokes Ruiz de Burton’s developmental vision for utilizing a transcontinental
route connecting the Atlantic and Pacific to transnationally link the Californias.25

Railways, thus, are not the extent of Ruiz de Burton’s developmental vision for
suturing the Californias. The novel also imagines waterways as an alternative link of the
Californias with Mexico’s Pacific coastal mainland. As Ruiz de Burton well knew, the Texas
Pacific would restore San Diego’s right as a commercial-cultural epicenter by land and by
sea. In 1854, Col. Henry S. Burton was one of the directors of the San Diego railroad
corporation, which was an organization promoting “the construction of the line that promised
to be the shortest east-west route arriving at a Pacific port” (Conflicts of Interest 100). As a
western terminus of a transcontinental railroad, the corporation’s directors, and no doubt
Ruiz de Burton and other civic-minded citizens, understood that transnational commerce
would be conducted as much by waterways as by railways. Consequently, when Holman tells
Stanford “by right San Diego … ought to be the shipping point for all that immense country comprising Arizona, Southern California, and Northern Mexico,” because San Diego can provide “a shipping point on the Pacific” [my emphasis] that is “five hundred miles nearer to those countries than San Francisco,” we must understand the novel is registering Ruiz de Burton’s desire for maritime linkage with Mexico and, arguably, oceanic linkage with “those countries” farther south in the Latin Americas (291). Therefore, Ruiz de Burton embeds Don Mariano Alamar’s name with a second spatial symbolism. The sea-to-sea in Don Alamar’s name also evokes a desired Californio Destiny that represents reunification with Mexico by linking the coastlines of the Pacific to the Sea of Cortes.

Naturally, Ruiz de Burton’s maritime dreams were stopped short. For when the Big Four denied San Diego Scott’s Texas Pacific, the monopolists also denied the mature development of San Diego’s harbor into a commercial port for high traffic trade.\footnote{26} Nevertheless, and, in fact, all the more, for the reason of a maritime dream deferred, The Squatter and the Don charts Ruiz de Burton’s attention to San Diego’s harbor, Pacific ports, and waterways. Both Ruiz de Burton and her novel desire San Diego as a western terminus that would create an international seaport reconnecting San Diego not only micro-spatially with the frontera region, but also macro-spatially with the entirety of the Baja California Peninsula and continental Northwestern Mexico via the Sea of Cortes.

Although the Texas-Pacific Railroad is the most anticipated mode of transportation in The Squatter and the Don, the dominant mode of transportation for the majority of the novel along the California coast is by oceanic steamer.\footnote{27} Nearly all the characters, at some point in the storyline, are whisked away by steamers largely going to and from San Francisco. In fact, one of the steamers Ruiz de Burton mentions by name, the Orizaba, was an actual ship that,
according to Jerry MacMullen’s study on San Diego maritime history, “left her mark” on the city with over twenty years of service running the coast from San Diego to San Francisco. But, aside from historicity, the Orizaba in name may have left its mark on Ruiz de Burton. As a learned and well-traveled Californio unwilling to relinquish her ties to Mexico, Ruiz de Burton knew that the Orizaba’s namesake is both a city and the highest mountain peak in Mexico located in the state of Veracruz, as evinced later in the novel when Clarence travels through Mexico’s interior. She also may have been privy to Orizaba’s meaning, which derives from Nahuatl and significantly translates to “the waters that give joy.”

Indeed, making San Diego an international seaport where “traffic across the continent should bring through San Diego the commerce between Asia and the Atlantic seaboard, between China and Europe” and between Northern Mexico would give joy to the Alamares and their Anglo affiliates. As we see from a conversation among Don Alamar’s son-in-law, George Mechlin, and future son-in-law Clarence, while they sail out of San Francisco’s bay, part of the anticipation associated with the Texas-Pacific Railroad is the seaport it would establish in San Diego:

“There is plenty of room here for all the navies in the world,” George observed, looking at the harbor.

“Yes, I believe the bay is forty miles across,” replied Clarence. “For all intents and purposes at present, however, San Diego Bay is as good as this.”

“Yes, I only wish we had commerce enough for ships to be crowded there.”

“If Colonel Scott succeeds in constructing his railroad, there is no doubt that San Diego will be a large city in a few years.” (151)
Reflecting the discourse in the *A.B. Grey Report*, George and Clarence view San Diego as having an equitable bay to San Francisco. The commercial-driven gaze each character casts across San Francisco Bay and correlates with San Diego’s are part of the developmental maritime dream of the novel.

Besides the economic joy San Diego’s commercial waterways would provide, there is, of equal significance concerning the Californios of the text, a cultural joy that could be gained. It is a cultural joy that stems from alleviating the sadness of geopolitical separation rooted in Anglo colonialism by suturing San Diego’s port with those in Northern Mexico.

Aside from Mercedes Alamar’s evident love of the Pacific Ocean, which she illustrates while sojourning in San Francisco and Newport, the narrator’s affinity for the ocean and coastline are unrivaled. From the ocean, Ruiz de Burton’s narrator takes an intimate approach to describing the San Diego coastline that bears cultural consideration. In Chapter III, which tells of the arrival of squatters Darrell, Gasbang, and Mathews to San Diego, the narrator says:

> It was a bright morning of January, 1872, when [Darrell] stood far forward, watching the course of the steamer *Orizaba*, as she made her way around Point Loma, then between Ballast Point and the sandy peninsula, and passing by La Playa, came in sight of San Diego city. (70)

This description reveals a double act of seeing in which the narrator watches Darrell watching the “course of the steamer” as it glides passed Point Loma, Ballast Point, the sandy peninsula, and La Playa before the municipal-scape of San Diego comes into view. We know that Darrell, a newcomer to San Diego, would not know the place names of the coastal landscape. Thus, it is Ruiz de Burton’s Californio narrator that defines the coastal names by
way of, arguably, her local knowledge as she watches Darrell watching her coast. This double gaze involving Darrell and the coastal landscape warrants what Chicana/o cultural critic, Tey Diana Rebolledo, says about landscape and colonialism. Rebolledo writes, “the perspective on landscape – from the edenic past to a disintegrated present – is not only evidence of a vanishing cultural scene but also a symbolic representation of the loss of … control of the land to Anglo domination” (46-47).

I have argued that Ruiz de Burton did not want to return to a hacienda or isolationist past. Even though that Californio past would have recognized her as a heredera, Ruiz de Burton ultimately desired to financially and culturally succeed as a transnational capitalist using modern methods and means. However, the narrator’s description that superimposes Darrell into what can be construed as the Californio cultural coastline, with historic place names originating from the Spanish/Mexican periods, does evoke an anxiety of a former era being disrupted or disintegrated by an Anglo colonial present, for the novelistic scene symbolizes a perspective on landscape that juxtaposes a Spanish/Mexican coastline with a representative of Anglo domination responsible for socio-spatial change. While Darrell may not be directly responsible for upsetting San Diego’s chance to be an international seaport, by racial association and within the context of the Californio coastline, he represents forms of Anglo dominance disrupting San Diego’s maritime linkage to Mexican ports.

The Big Four’s development of San Francisco as the epicenter on the Pacific coast for international maritime commerce rendered San Diego, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, with little or irregular contact with Mexico’s Pacific seaports. Interestingly, this irregularity is documented in the novel, when newly wedded couples George Mechlin and Elvira Alamar, along with Gabriel Alamar and Lizzie Mechlin, deciding to honeymoon in the
Mexican coastal cities of La Paz, Guaymas and Mazatlan, must “write to have the steamer [coming from San Francisco] stop for them on her way south” (116). As Stuart Daggett notes in his historical study of the Southern Pacific, “one of the most important conditions affecting railroad business in California is the ease with which freight and passengers may take advantage of water routes” (223). With San Francisco as the hub of the Central and Southern Pacific Railroads, it “is a focus for ocean lines connecting the Pacific Coast … with the Atlantic seaboard, with Europe, with South America, and with the Orient” (223). However, San Francisco was also a focus for ocean lines connecting to ports along the Baja California Peninsula and Mexico’s Pacific coastline. Drawing again from Guerrero’s historical study on Baja California’s merchant routes, in the early 1870s, with the discovery of gold and other minerals in Northern Baja and the industrialization of Arizona, Baja California’s most prominent seaports engaged in trade with San Francisco. According to Guerrero, with self-sufficiency difficult in these regions, goods were supplied from San Francisco (72). “La ruta,” Guerrero states, “era a través de una línea de barcos que transitaba por el golfo y llegaban cada 20 días … La red de puertos por la que se transitaba eran Guaymas, La Paz, Río Colorado, Cabo San Lucas y después retornaba a San Francisco” (73-74). San Diego, as Holman points out in the novel, is hundreds of miles closer to the Northern Mexico region. But, without the transportation infrastructure to support maritime trade, the town (as it was) was essentially de-spaced from commercial networks with Baja California ports. (See figure 9).
Moreover, by 1882, with the Texas-Pacific’s ambitions for San Diego to be its western terminus “killed” by the Big Four, a small seaport opened in the Northern Baja
California town of La Ensenada to haul metals and minerals to San Francisco (Guerrero 76). Although the seaport was near Ruiz de Burton’s ancestral landholdings, with her liquid capital going toward fighting land claims and New England investors not coming through to back her developmental projects, Ruiz de Burton could not be part of La Ensenada’s slow but steady growth. Thus, while Ruiz de Burton was in the thick of writing *The Squatter and the Don*, the Port of Ensenada exported its goods to San Francisco and also “linked with markets in Northwestern Mexico,” as ships circumnavigated around the Baja California peninsula and into the Sea of Cortes conducting trade with the Ports of Mazatlan, Guaymas, and La Paz (Guerrero 77). Don Mariano Alamar’s spatially symbolic name coupled with the voice of the novel’s narrator demonstrates that Ruiz de Burton’s developmental vision dared to imagine what she knew was a dream gone awry – the transnational linkage of San Diego with Mexico’s maritime ports. This is perhaps best understood with two scenes in the novel. The first of which involves the narrator opining about San Diego’s coast. However, instead of the underlying cultural anxiety emerging from juxtaposing Darrell with the shoreline, we see the narrator imagining, if not reconciling, what amounts to San Diego and the Californio population’s connection with Mexico. With Mercedes, Elvira Mechlin (née Alamar), Clarence, and George bound for San Francisco, the Alamares bid them farewell from the wharf. As we see from the narrator’s description of adieus:

Don Mariano and Gabriel lifted their hats in congratulatory salutation; … In a few minutes [the steamer] had made up for lost time, and was heading for Ballast Point, leaving San Diego’s shore to be merged into the blue hills of Mexico beyond, as if obeying the immutable law which says that all things must revert to their original source. (121)
This time, from the narrator’s southward gaze, Don Mariano and Gabriel meld into San Diego’s shoreline. As the steamer makes its northbound trek, the Alamar men along with the coastal landscape are “merged into the blue hills of Mexico beyond,” which is an optical imagining from the vantage point of the open ocean that sutures the San Diego coastline and its Californios with the Baja California Peninsula. As this passage illustrates, Ruiz de Burton wants to reclaim traditional geopolitical space prior to the Mexican-American War, again evoking rights or “immutable law” for doing so. But, it is a vertical spatialization that could only be achieved by engaging in modern economies, since Ruiz de Burton knew the Texas-Pacific Railroad was key to developing San Diego’s port and making it the shipping point for “that immense country comprising…Northern Mexico” (291).

The second and final scene that bears discussion returns us to the newly wedded couples George Mechlin and Elvira Alamar, along with Gabriel Alamar and Lizzie Mechlin, and their sojourn in Mexico. Though much has been made about the romance between Clarence and Mercedes, considering Ruiz de Burton’s love affair with transnationally uniting San Diego to the Baja California frontera and the “Mexico beyond,” the particular romances of the Alamares and Mechlins ought to be taken into account. While I have noted that Ruiz de Burton historically marks San Diego’s disconnection with Mexico’s seaports with the couples’ journey, it is important to also comprehend the spatial allegory represented in the context of their romantic travels. As Sánchez and Pita state in the introduction to the Arte Público edition, “the novel … calls for a double reading … as it is both romance and history, and functions as a socially symbolic act, that is, a narrative process wherein an imaginary resolution to a social contradiction is posited” (8). This imaginary resolution to historical and, equally important, spatial displacement, however, is not Clarence’s marriage to Mercedes.
Too often, we get caught up in this “romance” and forget that Clarence, as a self-proclaimed “money-making Yankee,” “trying to make money out of [Doña Josefa],” as he tells her by novel’s end, removes Doña Josefa and her children away from the frontera to San Francisco after Don Alamar’s death (332). Therefore, in the context of Clarence and Mercedes’ union, Ruiz de Burton’s romance with the frontera and Mexico, to use the words of George Mechlin, “is spoiled” (132).

Whereas Clarence and Mercedes’ union fails to offer an imaginary resolution to spatial displacement, the marriage travels of Gabriel and Lizzie and George and Elvira delivers. Bearing in mind that “the romance can be read allegorically,” as Sánchez and Pita assert, in a way that “serves to counter dominant historical discourses,” then we must consider these honeymooners and how their travels into Mexico counter dominant spatial discourses and historical outcomes affecting San Diego. Rather than remain locally to celebrate their double wedding, Elvira and Lizzie at first desire to “hide for a month in a fashionable hotel in San Francisco” (116). But:

…they came to the conclusion that they didn’t want to go to a hotel, so Gabriel proposed that they take the steamer that goes to Mazatlán, and Guaymas, and La Paz, thus to visit all of those places on their wedding tour.

…As George had been wanting to see the Mexican coast, this plan suited all very well. (116)

Because the characters snub San Francisco in favor of honeymooning along the Mexican coast in Mazatlán, Guaymas, and La Paz, this turn of events can be read as a socio-spatial symbolic act that unites the San Diego denizens, especially the Californio Alamar sibilings, with the Baja California and northwestern Mexican coastline. That the son of Yankee
investor James Mechlin, George, also wants to see the Mexican coast, the honeymoon is as much an economic suturing as it is a cultural one, which in the context of a matrimonial tour, symbolically “weds” San Diego to Mazatlán, Guaymas, and to Ruiz de Burton’s Baja California familial base, La Paz. Don Alamar initially wishes his children to celebrate the days after their marriages locally, but, he naturally “became reconciled” to their decision (116). In a fleeting narrative moment, Ruiz de Burton enacts her maritime transnational desires and imagines a scenario where love follows culturally significant waterways that circumnavigate the Baja California Peninsula into the Sea of Cortes. With such transnational attentiveness to her Mexican cultural roots, it is no wonder that Mexican poet and literary critic Gabriel Trujillo Muñoz has called Ruiz de Burton “la primera escritora bajacaliforniana” (97).

Ruiz de Burton and *The Squatter and the Don* must be understood with a transnational scope. A national positioning of author and text is too limiting, for as biographical and textual analysis make obvious, Ruiz de Burton had an acute awareness of border-crossing commercial and cultural mobility, which was ever present on her mind. Contra to other Californio discourses, like Vallejo’s “Recuerdos,” Ruiz de Burton’s novel needs to be considered for its frontera vision and instillation of a transnational Californio community that generates alternative readings of the text. As *The Squatter and the Don* demonstrates, Ruiz de Burton reasoned the socio-spatial suturing of the California frontera could be achieved by utilizing Yankee Manifest Destiny in the form of the railway. However, the novel must also be understood for the way it imagines waterways as an additional link of the Californias with the Mexico mainland. Maritime routes that would open out of San Diego’s port with the railway’s arrival compliment terrestrial roads of economic expansion in
the text, thus illustrating that Ruiz de Burton perceived what Frederick Jackson Turner failed to see – the frontier, “the area of free land” and its “continuous recession” with advancement westward, had not “gone,” rather it had shifted southward (9, 20). It was this southward course of empire that Ruiz de Burton imagined harnessing to undo the economic and cultural displacement of San Diego and its genteel Californio community. The novel, ultimately, looks to locate the California frontera within a global network of commercial transport and capital, as its maritime dreams map a worldview that prefigures contemporary constructions of the Global South for the sake of linking with the “Mexico beyond.”
Chapter II

Reorienting Northern New Mexico: Fray Angélico Chávez’s Short Fiction and the Production of a Spanish Borderlands

In late August of 1928, Fray Angélico Chávez, a man of artistic talent and letters whose mammoth literary legacy would cast him as “New Mexico’s Renaissance man” as well as an expounder of the Spanish “fantasy heritage,” was just a youth of eighteen returning to Santa Fe from a Franciscan seminary school in Cincinnati. The closing days of August were significant for the culturally-minded Chávez, as Santa Fe geared up to commemorate with its annual Fiesta the 216th anniversary of Spanish colonizer Don Diego DeVargas’ reconquest of the city from the Pueblo. Chávez was still going by his given name, Manuel Ezequiel Chávez. It was not until the following summer upon entering Saint John the Baptist Province OFM in Cincinnati that he received his Franciscan habit and his religious name, Fray Angélico, after medieval Italian painter and saint Fra Angelico de Fiesole. Using his given name provided by his father and mother, whom Chávez would much later describe as people “conscious of their own Spanish heritage,” Chávez published a poem titled “‘Foreign’ New Mexico” that appeared in the final pages of the Official Santa Fé Fiesta Program of 1928. The following are excerpts from some of its more significant stanzas:

Before the galleys of the roving Norn
Had slipped their anchors by a western world;
Before the ancient Pilgrim Father fell
Upon his knees on famous Plymouth Rock
There was a Land, a Race, a Cult, a Faith, …
Before the foreign ore from alien mines
Had poured into this melting pot of ours;
Just when our glorious flag existed high
Upon the starry skies, on spangled snows
And red wild blossoms – far from the dreams of men.
This was a kingdom

Full three centuries
Have flown since the Conquistadores came,
Brave armoured soldiery, the golden might
That then was Spain; brown-robed, rope-girded souls, …
They came, they saw, they conquered all – but death
Yet, left upon their path a heritage, …
The child of the Conquistador grew on
And clung to every priestless mission wall,
Through centuries forgotten, and unsung. …

Behold, therefore,
Ye hosts of steely metal, mighty girders
Of our grand sky-seeking edifice;
Behold, thou alien ore re-melted here
Within the mighty cauldron, see and think.
Let justice judge this land, untainted thus
By kindred neighbors. See the Spain
Of centuries agone, untouched withal
By e-en her distant Mother. See the State
Least foreign to our glorious country now,
NEW MEXICO, the eldest, yet, most young

The poem had first debuted in the Santa Fe New Mexican newspaper over three weeks earlier and must have caught the eye of Alice Corbin, Witter Bynner, Ina Sizzer Cassidy or some other member of the Santa Fe Writers Colony involved in the planning of the 1928 Fiesta and wanting to give the Program a bit of Spanish flare in the way of authorial voice. Nearly all the program contributors listed that year, (minus Chávez and long-deceased conquistador Don Diego DeVargas, named for the recount of his Entrada speech to the Pueblo) were Anglo.34

Chavez’s poem upon first read captures the driving historical force behind Santa Fe’s Fiesta – Spanish colonization – but it is clear from Anglo writers’ contributions that the 1928 Fiesta marked a double colonizing act. As Lynn Cline notes in Literary Pilgrims, “writers of every ilk started trekking to northern New Mexico… They believed this part of the country offered an antidote to America’s focus on urbanization, industrialization, greed, commercialism and preoccupation with military power starting in the World War I era” (1, 5). Though the “ilk” did vary, writers were mostly Anglo-Americans migrating westward during and after the unsettling years of World War I. In the late teens, both Alice Corbin Henderson and Mabel Dodge migrated, and by the mid-1920s, their respective Santa Fe and Taos arts colonies were well established. These Anglo-American writers and the artists and intellectuals that also trekked to Northern New Mexico desired to preserve local Spanish and
Native cultures. But, as has been discussed by Cline and to a greater extent Audrey Goodman, their presence and activity altered regional customs. This cultural alteration to the region, though, was not always unconscious.

In the opening pages to the Santa Fé Fiesta Program of 1928, Editor E. Dana Johnson remarks that while the Fiesta encourages “the perpetuation of the old customs of the Spanish-speaking people of New Mexico … Joined to the old Fiesta … is the carnival spirit brought by the artists and writers of Santa Fe.” Adding to Johnson’s opener, poet Witter Bynner, in his short piece titled “Artists and the Fiesta,” addresses the impact Anglo writers and artists had on the “Spanish element” and Fiesta tradition. Bynner moves between tones of self-aggrandizement and ethnic prejudice to express an overall opinion of bi-cultural harmony:

> With the advent and increasing proportions of Anglo-Saxons it may be surmised that a growing self-consciousness on the part of the Spanish element interfered with as free and natural conduct of the fiesta as had marked earlier years. … At first the natives may have had doubts as to this new fiesta being their own kind, but owing largely to the presence in Santa Fe of a colony of artists and writers, and to the kinship in spirit between that colony and the natives, and to the increase each year of a Spanish complexion in the fiesta, the Spanish part of the population now throws itself whole heartedly into the festivities. It is no reflection upon the townspeople who are not artists and writers to say that the latter have contributed an invaluable part to the success and revitalization of the fiesta. Their imagination, their sense of beauty, and their willingness to make monkeys of themselves are qualities more Latin than Anglo-Saxon … (17)
I would be remiss to dispute Bynner’s atmosphere of bi-cultural camaraderie. As scholars of Chávez know, Chávez did not limit his participation in the Anglo-contrived Hysterical Pageant to the costumed parade around the Santa Fe Plaza, where he dressed up as a gaucho. He also formed friendships with Bynner and members of the Santa Fe Writers Colony that would help him, in the years to come, publish his poetry and most of his short fiction in secular venues catering to a predominantly Anglo readership. However, I cannot neglect Bynner’s mono-cultural colonizing register when he mentions “the advent and increasing proportions of Anglo-Saxons” in Santa Fe. Like the Anglo traders and frontiersmen and women trekking westward on the Santa Fe Trail decades prior, this newest wave of writers fueled a socio-spatial shift that altered the region’s cultural traditions in the early twentieth century.

They furthered the transformation of Northern New Mexico – which its Mexican and Hispano locals perceived as a regional space on the northern borderlands of Mexico and New Spain – into an Anglo Southwest. Like their literary forefather Charles Lummis, who definitively stated in his most renowned work, The Land of Poco Tiempo, that “sun, silence, and adobe … is New Mexico in three words,” writers like Mary Austin, Willa Cather, John Gould Fletcher as well as the aforementioned Corbin, Sizzer Cassidy, and Bynner, perceived with their northeastern eyes a region that was an isolated expanse where indigenous and Spanish-speaking cultures were dislocated from the modern world (3). As Melina Vizcaino-Alemán aptly asserts, Austin, Corbin and their circle often display “modern regionalist discourses that isolate the Southwest” (4). A study of Corbin’s edited collection of poetic works, The Turquoise Trail, that was “just off the press” according to its advertisement in the Program, shows how members of the Santa Fe and Taos Writers groups repeated themes of
sun, abode, and silence by casting Hispano and Native peoples in decline, vanished, and
estranged from contemporary times. With these directional and socio-spatial markers as
key components to imagining Northern New Mexico, it comes as no surprise that the
accompanying image to Bynner’s article correlates the Anglo writers and artists of the Santa
Fe Fiesta to westward travelling pioneers moving through a vacant land. (See figure 10).

Indeed, as Chávez later observed in a 1970 exposé on his life and times, “[New
Mexico] changed after World War I” (20). This change, specifically to the landscape,
geography, and peoplehood is what the youthful Chávez took aim at with his poem. Within
the pages of the 1928 Santa Fe Fiesta Program an intertextual and intercultural dialogue
ensues where Chávez speaks back to Anglo orientations of Northern New Mexico at the
moment of increasing change to the cultural landscape. Chávez historically reorients New
Mexico from Nordic and Anglo-Saxon geo-colonial heritages to the northern outposts of
New Spain. He proclaims “Before the galleys of the roving Norn,” “Before the ancient
Pilgrim Father fell,” “Before the foreign ore from alien mines,” “There was a Land, a Race, a
Cult, a Faith,” therefore emphasizing the rootedness and longevity of New Mexico as a terrain and its people as inhabitants over those Chávez implies are the true foreigners – Anglo Americans. His assertion “This was a kingdom” effectively remaps New Mexico away from the eastern seaboard of Plymouth Rock and places it within the geographical northern territorial boundary of New Spain.

Moreover, Chávez confronts themes of cultural silence and decay in the modern era. While he states the Conquistadors came, saw, and “conquered all – but death,” he reminds his readers “the child of the Conquistador grew on” to cling to “every priestless mission wall/Through centuries forgotten, and unsung.” Ironically, with regard to this line, Chávez remembers and sings the lives of those omitted from dominant representations of the region as he produces a geographical and cultural counterspace to the Anglo Southwest. In this vein, what Mario T. García states about Chávez’s later historical works Origins of New Mexico Families (1954) and My Penitente Land (1974) provides insight to his early creative pursuit: “Displaying what Herbert Eugene Bolton called the concept of “Greater America,” Chávez … emphasize[d] the longstanding Hispanic presence in the region. This was looking at American history from a south-to-north perspective, opposing the standard narrative that American history begins with the original thirteen colonies” (28). (See figure 11).
Figure 11. “A Map of New Spain/drawn from astronomical observations at Mexico in the year 1804 by Alexander Van Humbolt.” Library of Congress Geography and Map Division.
However, within this counter-current is a crosscurrent that makes Chávez complicit with dominant literary mappings of New Mexico. Following Vizcaino-Alemán, we must be careful not to over-emphasize Chávez’s resistance to dominant culture. The cultural and literary atmosphere in Santa Fe may have been ripe for Chávez, a representative of the “Spanish element interfered with,” to remap the landscape of Northern New Mexico. But, this poem also exemplifies his perpetuation of a Spanish fantasy heritage that Chávez would, to varying degrees, replicate in his later creative works. After all, that same Santa Fe atmosphere – that return to the Fiesta ambiance, to the spatial core of Anglo writers colonies and his Spanish-minded parents – caused Chávez to produce a particular region. It is one, in this case, that is devoid of Mexican influence, indigenous influence, and racial-cultural mestizaje that occurred throughout the centuries after Spanish conquest of the region, as people continued to traverse a historic south-north axis coursing from Mexico City to El Paso del Norte to Santa Fe despite changing geo-politics. Chávez’s poem paints a geo-spatial portrait of New Mexico as a modern-day fringe of New Spain where Spanish citizenry converses and thus comes in contact with Chávez’s poetic addressee “ye hosts of steely metal,” a metaphor for Anglo America. But in doing so, he repeats Hispanophilic discourses used by one-time New Mexico Governor Lebaron Bradford Prince, Lummis, and Mary Austin, among others, when he asserts to his Anglo readership that New Mexico is a “land, untainted thus / By even kindred neighbors,” which is no doubt a reference to Mexicans and Mexico.38

It is Chávez’s contradictory production of New Mexico’s geographic and socio-spatial landscape that informs my interests, specifically in his short fiction. Between 1928 and 1956, Chávez published thirty-seven works of short fiction in addition to a serialized
novella, *Guitars and Adobes*, which was published in eight installments, from November 1931 to June 1932, in *The Saint Anthony Messenger*, a Catholic literary magazine based out of his vocational alma mater, the Province of St. John the Baptist. In this near thirty-year span of short fiction production, Chávez relocated from Ohio to Michigan and to Indiana in completion of his Franciscan theological studies. He returned to Northern New Mexico to begin his first assignment as a missionary priest, in 1937, only to leave five years later when he was called to active duty in the U.S. Army as a chaplain and survived several bloody battles in the South Pacific theatre of World War II. After receiving an honorable discharge in 1946, Chávez made his way back to the Santa Fe area, where he returned to his priestly duties and developed an active interest in New Mexico history, which led him to archives in California and friendships with accomplished historians Frances V. Scholes and Herbert Eugene Bolton. Chávez was uprooted once more, in 1951, when he was reactivated and sent to Germany during the Korean War, but he made his way home for a final time, in 1952, and settled permanently in Santa Fe to research, publish and preach. All throughout his extensive travels that spanned the continent and the globe, Chávez’s short fiction remained steadfast in its regional devotion, as he nearly always centralized New Mexico’s landscape and Spanish-speaking people.39

Scholars of Chávez’s short fiction have picked up on his “regional consciousness,” to use Genaro Padilla’s words. But, most have not addressed Chávez’s penchant for remapping the geography of the region or evaluated Chávez’s short fiction as a contradictory genre. Padilla positions Chávez along more dissident lines as a Chicano precursor and states that Chávez’s short fiction “systematically examines the social, cultural, and moral evolution of Hispano life in New Mexico” (41). While this is true, Padilla does not recognize the attention
Chávez gives to the actual geography of New Mexico and its orientations in historic and modern eras. From childhood to old age, Chávez had an affinity for geography and geopolitical spatiality. As a young boy, Chávez voraciously read *National Geographic* and as a seventy-five year-old man, with a “trembling old hand,” as Chávez describes himself, he penned his ideas for an alter screen or “reredos” in Santa Fe’s Saint Francis Cathedral depicting the saints of the Americas, whom he pitched should be “presented more or less geographically … and with an eye to color balance.” This statement, indicative of Chávez’s willingness to blend his geographically attuned mind with his artistic side, also suggests his inclination to blend his geographic mindset with his creative writing. According to Ellen McCracken, even when working at the “strongly verbal end of the cultural continuum,” Chávez “relies on several varieties of visual language” (55). The geo-spatial variety is one of them. Moreover, nor does Padilla recognize the contentious and inconsistent socio-spatial landscape Chávez produces between Mexico and Mexicans in his short-fiction. This particular intra-cultural conflict, as it mostly plays out in Chávez’s New Mexico through geopolitical and geo-cultural isolation and disconnection, is a telling factor for precisely why we cannot, on the whole, place Chávez’s body of short fiction as proto-Chicano.

In addition to assessing Chávez’s fiction for its verbal/visual collaborative strategies, McCracken addresses the importance of region in Chávez’s creative works. However, rather than casting Chávez as a Chicano precursor, she situates him and his works within the Anglo-Southwest end of the geo-cultural spectrum. McCracken states that Chávez’s work, during the 1920s and 1930s, was “strongly influenced” by “the famous writers and artists who had settled in Santa Fe” as well as “his separation from the Southwest” during his theological study (12). Because of his “temporary absence from the [Southwestern] geographic and
social space that had nurtured and formed him,” McCracken argues that Chávez “reterritorializes” himself as an ethnic subject of the region through his literary work (12). Indeed, Chávez incorporates Southwestern literary themes that align New Mexico as a regional Southwest and a space for the westward arrival of Anglo newcomers. Early short stories like “The Tesuque Pony Express,” “The Dude of Anchor Ranch,” and “Notch Twenty-One” respectively include a helpful member of the Santa Fe arts colony, a greenhorn arriving to improve his health, and icons like Billy the Kid all of which interact with the Hispano population in a New Mexican space that is clearly a regional Southwest. But, McCracken ignores Chávez’s subversive yet contradictory remapping of the region as something more than a Southwest in the majority of his short fiction. His tendency for being critical of the region and challenging spatial and cultural representations by his Anglo counterparts in many ways mirrors an incident that occurred while Chávez was in seminary school. Literally putting his mark on an environment that was racially prejudiced against him, Chávez painted over a portrait of Saint Anthony’s face with the image of Mexican movie star Dolores del Río to the astonishment of the students and faculty.41 While McCracken calls this action a “playful replacement,” it is actually a subversive alteration of space that interjects a Mexican female presence over the study hall of the seminary, where the image of the Anglicized Portuguese saint once hung.

Instead of situating Chávez and his production of New Mexico along these polarizing lines, Vizcaíno-Alemán moves us in the most sensible direction of literary analysis. Vizcaíno-Alemán argues that Chávez’s perception of the Southwest “is local, national, and even global,” and she asserts that Chávez’s short fiction “is not wholly Southwestern, not entirely Mexican, but somewhere in between the two” (9, 104). That geographic space “in
between,” I argue, is the Spanish borderlands. This Boltonian space, overall, most accurately describes Chávez’s reorientation of New Mexico. Like Chávez, Herbert Eugene Bolton sought to remap the “Southwest” as something other than a regional product of the westward course of empire, but unlike Bolton, Chávez’s Spanish borderlands were culturally and spatially vexed.

In 1902, Bolton studied archives in Mexico and recognized their significance for illuminating histories of lands now in U.S. possession. Because of this ideologically shifting archival experience, Bolton understood the Frontier Thesis perpetuated by his former-mentor Fredrick Jackson Turner could not adequately account for the region. With his publication of The Spanish Borderlands in 1921, Bolton provided a historical counter-narrative to Turner’s westward advancing, Anglocentric frontier, its “retreat,” and closure. In a few quick lines of his preface, Bolton positioned regions deprived of Spanish influence along a north-south axis of movement, culture, and geography, asserting:

This book is to tell of the Spanish pathfinders and pioneers in the regions between Florida and California, now belonging to the U.S., over which Spain held sway for centuries. These were the northern outposts of New Spain maintained to hold the country against foreign intruders and against the inroads of savage tribes. … The rule of Spain has passed; but her colonies have grown into independent nations. From Mexico to Chile, throughout half of America, the Spanish language and Spanish institutions are still dominant. Even in the old borderlands north of the Río Grande, the imprint of Spain’s sway is still clear. (vii)
According to Pekka Hämäläinen and Samuel Truett, Bolton’s Spanish borderlands are an “imperial fringe” privileging Spanish voices that “played out on a more open-ended, hemispheric stage” (341). This hemispheric and perhaps even implied multidirectional transnationalism ascribed to Bolton is evident in his passage. For with Bolton’s anti-Native discourse comes an image of Spanish outposts north of the Rio Grande that were engaged in historic cross-cultural contact and conflict as well as present cultural survival, since “Spain’s sway” still dominates. As scholars of Bolton have figured, whereas Turner’s frontier ends with national consolidation, Bolton’s Spanish borderlands echoes the untidy open-endedness of the nation, which is a differentiation that unsettles centrist Turnerian paradigms that anchor much of canonical Southwestern history and literature. In short, to cite John Francis Bannon, Bolton’s student who revived his mentor’s ideology in the 1960s, Bolton’s Spanish borderlands “broadened the concept of the West by adding another American frontier to the dimensions of the story” (4).

Whether he writes about New Mexico in historic or modern times, Chávez desires to “reterritorialize” the region as the Spanish borderlands in orientation and culture. As evinced in his poetry and in the discussion of his literary work to follow, it is not practical to align Chávez and the majority of his corpus of short fiction within the Southwest or Greater Southwest, which are geo-spatial representations rooted in Turnerian thought. Nor is it practical to align Chávez with Greater Mexico spatial conceptualizations, since his historical, temporal, and national interests do not lie with the Republic of Mexico. Refraining from associating Chávez’s work with Bolton’s Greater America is reasonable as well. Although Bolton’s later historical approach takes a north-south purview, which is why Mario T. Garcia sees “Greater America” as a suitable comparison to Chávez’s efforts, its emphasis on
hemispheric unity of the Americas overshadows the prominence of the region north of/along the Rio Grande. Chávez wanted to broaden conceptions of the region, but not at the expense of having Hispano landscape and peoplehood play second fiddle to the hemisphere. For Chávez, the story of the Northern New Mexico was primary. Rather, similar to Bolton’s recognition of the complex movements and meetings of the Spanish on the northern outposts, Chávez understood and wrote about New Mexico’s interconnectedness throughout the duration of his short fiction production, however to varying and vexing degrees. Even when he complicity adopted isolationist policies for Hispano folks and customs, like in his poem, Chávez positions New Mexico beyond the nation-state and demonstrates that the region and its (primarily) Hispano peoplehood did not function in complete isolation but operated on transnational and global circuits historically and within the wake of the Spanish borderlands.

During his years at seminary school, in the Midwest, Chávez’s literary mind was occupied with narrations of Hispano New Mexico. In his “semi-exile” state, in the long winters of the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes region, Chávez’s imaginings of New Mexico as a regional Southwest were increasingly complicated by his representation of the geography as a Spanish borderlands. Fictions of this period, such as “The Blasphemer,” “Romance of El Caminito,” and the serialized novella *Guitars and Adobes* situate Northern New Mexico as a historic Spanish outpost transnationally and globally connected, albeit in desirable and undesirable ways depending on the social and cultural circumstances. In “The Blasphemer,” for example, Chávez portrays the small Northern New Mexico town of Buena Vista as a Spanish Catholic religious stronghold after one of its townsmen trounces the “intruder,” Zapata, a Mexican cow-herder from “Old Mexico” who spouts blasphemous remarks and makes obscene gestures against the Church (196). Considering the socio-spatial significance
of the story, Chávez’s inclusion of Zapata among the Hispano denizens of the isolated, pine-scattered town of Buena Vista nestled at the “foothills of the Rockies” casts the region as a historic “del norte,” of the Spanish and (seemingly) Mexican periods. Additionally, in the contemporary setting of the early twentieth century, the transnational trek Zapata makes from Old Mexico to the northern point of Buena Vista recalls centuries of geo-cultural movement along a north-south axis of travel from the Mexican interior to the northern outposts.

However, Zapata’s brief tenure in Buena Vista symbolically reveals Chávez’s disfavor for transnational connection with the Mexican nation-state and its citizenry, specifically during Mexico’s anti-clerical reformations of the early twentieth century. Written at the conclusion of the Cristero Wars, in 1929, “The Blasphemer” is ultimately a socio-spatial outburst that disconnects Northern New Mexico and its Hispano population from Mexico’s anti-Catholic socio-political climate while it seeks to reform the region according to the religious morals of the Spanish borderlands. Chávez creates a lethargic community of cowpunchers led by Hispano saloon owner Don Sabino who encourages “these sons of pious Spanish mothers” to drink their Sundays away and “let the old women go to Mass if they want” (195). It is not until Don Sabino hears the newcomer Zapata rail against priestly greed, call the Catholic Church “nothing but a creed of lies,” and yell “Pooh! On the Sacrament!” that he and the hung-over cowpunchers in his saloon undergo an ethnic-religious awakening that makes “the richest part of their mothers’ [Spanish] blood” begin “to boil in their veins” (196). Zapata, who comes to represent Mexican anti-clericalism in the form of Plutarco Calles’s policies as well as those Chávez assumed of his namesake Emiliano Zapata, gets knocked out for the count by Don Sabino, as the Hispano barkeep, taking on the role of community father-figure, yells at the story’s end “Come on, sons of mine, we’re going to
Mass” (196). For the Hispano and Franciscan-minded Chávez, regional order in Northern New Mexico is restored with the symbolic dismissal of transnational Mexican influence and a return to Spanish, maternal, Catholic heritage practiced since the days of New Spain. Regional order, however, also comes in the form of discontinuing operations at the saloon (at least on Sundays). As seen in other works of Chávez’s short fiction, like “Wake for Don Corsino,” the saloon symbolizes Anglo infiltration and the establishment of a drinking culture that ostensibly did not exist until Northern New Mexico became nationalized as a U.S. Southwest. With the saloon’s closure in “The Blasphemer,” Chávez additionally combats against Anglo Southwestern representation and influence in New Mexico. Clearly, the narrative geo-culturally responds to Hispano religious decay with an isolationist policy of its own that guards Buena Vista’s Catholic practices, emanating since the days of the Spanish borderlands, from their “neighbors” to the south, as well as to the east.

Showcasing Northern New Mexico as a historic Spanish borderlands that is globally connected in the modern era, Chávez puts a positive spin on transnationalism in “Romance of El Caminito,” a story published by the *St. Anthony Messenger* in March of 1930. Far from Lummis’s Southwestern land of “sun, adobe, and silence,” Chávez positions Santa Fe and its Hispano populous as part of a global circuit through the budding romance of two young stamp collectors, Mercedes and Pancho. Chávez’s tale of local romance with global designs focuses Mercedes’s affections for Pancho, a boy new to Santa Fe, whom she meets every morning on their way to school at El Caminito, a popular but narrow path lined by “pesky willows and prickly wildrose bushes” that connects “the ancient plaza to the many homes at one end of the city” (189). Despite El Caminito’s limited width, Mercedes is determined to get the timid Pancho to walk beside her rather than adhere to his usual “You lead and I
follow” routine (190). Eventually, she succeeds by sparking Pancho’s interests with her large, blue stamp book, as the narrator interestingly proclaims “there is surely more than one stamp-fiend in the Southwest” (190). In the shaded path of El Caminito, the tale of blossoming romance ends with the young lovers viewing stamps from “Austria, Spain, the British Isles, Japan, and Denmark” in “nervous excitement” and the shy Pancho offering Mercedes his “triangle stamp” to complete her “Liberia set” (191-192).

While Chávez uses the term “Southwest” to classify the region in name, it is evident from the title and role of the pathway in the plot that El Caminito is the central geo-spatial signifier in the story. The narrative focuses on Mercedes and Pancho’s stamp interests to situate Santa Fe’s Hispano populace transnationally, but it centers on El Caminito, a residual space of the Spanish period, to reinforce Santa Fe’s historic Spanish borderlands identity. El Caminito, a part of the Santa Fe cityscape that Anglo writers would have merely described as quaint, takes on geo-cultural significance under Chávez authorship. It is a historic Hispano space that survives despite modernization to the Santa Fe cityscape and resists nomenclatural assimilation as well. As Chávez asserts at the story’s start, “El Caminito … is not a boulevard, nor a street, nor a road; but neither can it be called an alley. … The only term for it is “El Caminito,” the Spanish diminutive for “road,” and this also would be too big, were it not that in this case the thoroughfare makes the name, and not vice-versa” (189). Chávez offers a unique perspective of Santa Fe’s geo-spatial history, from historic Spanish borderlands to modern-day transnationally linked city, which remaps the region contra to representations by Anglo members of Santa Fe’s Writers Group. But, it would be false to suppose Chávez resigns El Caminito to only a historical relic. El Caminito, as the saying goes, not only survives, but thrives in modern Santa Fe as “lines of people use it day after day,” like the
young lovers, “despite all its obstructions” (189). The bustling little thoroughfare stands as a metaphor of movement that opens out onto the worldly stage of the far away places mapped by the stamps. As such, Chávez triangulates El Caminito’s use and presence in modern Santa Fe, along with his young Hispano lovers, to the world beyond New Mexico. Triangles are reoccurring symbols in “Romance of El Caminito” and exceed the shapes of stamps and young love. The “romantic dream triangle of El Caminito,” as the narrator calls Mercedes’s wish to attract Pancho with her stamp book, can also be read as a geographic triangulation. The stamps that link the young lovers globally also link El Caminito and the two points it connects, the residential area and the ancient plaza, within multiple triangulations of transnational circuits. As Chávez profoundly deduces “wherever there is mail, there are also stamps, and the “Amalgamated Stamp Corporations” of distant cities are sure to follow with their far-reaching tentacles” (190). For Chávez, this process of transnationalism includes Santa Fe and its ancient spaces of the Spanish borderlands that thrive in its present cityscape.

Chávez continues his reorientation of Northern New Mexico as a geo-cultural Spanish borderlands in Guitars and Adobes, a work published in eight serializations within the St. Anthony Messenger from November 1931 through June 1932. The novella, devoid of Southwestern tropes and references to New Mexico as a “Southwest,” is the most profound example of a regional revision in his earlier literary works. Guitars and Adobes was Chávez’s retort against Southwestern literary titan Willa Cather and her regionally definitive canonical text Death Comes for the Archbishop. J. Frank Dobie heaped praise for Cather’s novel, which celebrates Frenchman Father Latour’s successful organization of the Catholic Church in New Mexico, as a gold standard of Southwestern literature in his Guide to Life and Literature of the Southwest. However, while Dobie cited Cather’s work as the “finest …
known novel concerned with the Southwest” and a “classical historical fiction on New Mexico,” Chávez always saw passed Dobie’s Anglo-perspective “truisms” (27, 99). In My Penitente Land, Chávez asserts that Cather’s novel “is indeed a masterful painting of my Penitente land, but with penitential strokes that hurt. For Cather’s attitude as well as her information had its source … in what the civil newcomer had been writing…[and] in the letters which the new clergy had written back home … which were replacing the story of the land’s hesed with their own “Aryan” history” (258).\(^49\) Sensitive to Cather’s racial, cultural, and regional representations that cast a dark and degenerate pall on Spanish peoplehood and culture in New Mexico akin to the Black Legend, Chávez understood that Death Comes for the Archbishop was equally about the death of regional Hispano history and cultural geography. Chávez could not ignore Cather’s championing of Father Latour (a character that she bases on Santa Fe vicar Father Lamy) as the bearer of regional revival with his superior French ways while she portrays Hispanos as subhuman or docile, to recall Cather’s ogre-like descriptions of Padre Martinez with “shoulders…like a bull buffalo’s” and a “Spanish face – so unusual … with a high and narrow forehead and brilliant yellow eyes … [unlike] Anglo-Saxon faces” (140). We must also recall her ideal Spanish/Mexican subjects, Tranquilo and Fructosa, Bishop Latour’s housekeeper and gardener, whose names essentially translate to “quiet” and “sweet” (201). Nor could Chávez ignore Cather’s Conrad-esque location of New Mexico as being in the “middle of a dark continent,” cut off from “wagon roads, canals, and navigable rivers,” where the Christ-like Latour arrives from the east, before making his way to Santa Fe along the Rio Grande valley (7, 21). Guitars and Adobes delivers a solution for what Chávez insinuated years later as Cather’s Aryan replacement of Hispano land. Chávez’s novella re-spaces New Mexico as a Spanish borderlands and revises New Mexico’s
geography as one of historic Spanish movement, where strong-willed Hispanics staked a historical claim to the region. Other scholars, like McCracken, have argued that Chávez’s novella “presents an alternative picture of the Southwest to Willa Cather’s *Death Comes for the Archbishop*” (15). But, *Guitars and Adobes* does far more; it reorients the region all together.

Chávez achieves this reorientation from a Francophilic region to a geo-cultural Spanish borderlands by centralizing in his plot the superstitious folk-legend that surrounds an “old and queer-looking Spanish guitar” (61). The guitar has travelled from Spain to Mexico City and up to Santa Fe during Spanish colonial times and is said to kill any who play it. At the novella’s opening, on the fourteenth of February 1888, we learn the guitar’s current owner Doña Genoveva Ortega is in a frenzy because she discovers Santa Fe’s first Archbishop dies, which is a demise she correlates to his playing the guitar months earlier on a visitation to her house. In a moment of flashback, Doña Genoveva recalls the Archbishop’s curiosity with the “guitar of amber sides, and yellow front, with a tattered red ribbon around its short neck,” how he decoded its Spanish language Hebrew script, and triumphantly repeated the phrase “La muerte canto – tócame y mueres!” (56). However, this is the extent of agency Chávez assigns the Archbishop, who has symbolically been silenced by a guitar emblematic of the Spanish flag. Signaling his intertextual response to Cather, Chávez’s narrator states, “This is no sequel to a certain great story of a great prelate. It just so happened that death came at a time, and attended by certain circumstances, when Doña Genoveva’s mind was in the vein for linking events and interpreting them for herself” (49). That Chávez situates the death of the Archbishop within the legend of the Spanish guitar decentralizes the importance of his character in the scope of New Mexico. The Archbishop is
no better than the questionable deaths preceding his or those that will follow in the guitar’s wake. Furthermore, and most significantly for reorienting New Mexico, Chávez uses the Archbishop’s death as a springboard to remap the region according to Hispano perspective, since Doña Genoveva was in the mindset “for linking events and interpreting them herself” (49). Through Doña Genoveva’s remembrances of the guitar’s travels told to her in a letter written by the fictionalized, controversial New Mexico matriarch Doña Tules Barcelona, the region is resituated as a Spanish borderlands.

While the Archbishop lies in stasis, the narrative moves through time and geopolitical space, as the guitar’s movement charts routes of Spanish colonization and historic Hispano figures, to recuperate a history of culture and peoplehood omitted from Cather’s telling. According to legend, the guitar and its cryptic curse originates in Sevilla, Spain, at the height of the Inquisition, in 1491, when the son of a “shifty Jew” burned at the stake enacts his murderous vengeance on a young Spaniard strumming ballads that mocked his father during the incineration (59). It is speculated the guitar makes its way to the Américas either with “an adventurous don on one of Columbus’ later voyages,” or “that it had come to Mexico in the great expedition of Cortez” (60). In each of these transatlantic voyages the accursed guitar receives blame for various misfortunes and deaths occurring in the Indies and Mexico such as Montezuma’s downfall and La Noche Triste. After being in the Barcelona family in Mexico for several generations, the guitar is brought northward to Santa Fe with the family’s migration to the outposts of New Spain. Although Doña Genoveva blames the guitar for her husband’s death by the Navajo, she will not part with the “treasure” she and her husband found after the first year of their marriage, when they bought an old saloon in downtown Santa Fe that once belonged to Doña Tules Barcelona and discovered the “dust-loaded
package” and letter unveiling the presumable origins of their mysterious find (51). Even when the Archbishop, leery of superstition in the face of Catholicism, tells Doña Genoveva to “put it away or destroy it,” she does not obey precisely because the guitar is a culturally significant object/subject. For Doña Genoveva, a woman “proud of her Spanish ancestry,” “sprung from Don Juan de Dios Lucero de Godoy, a dashing captain under the Reconquistador DeVargas,” the guitar, ironic as it may be, not only “sings death;” it also sings life (50). We must be careful not to draw binaries that assume the guitar symbolizes “death/thantos.”50 The guitar’s travels across an ocean, a sea, and northward up the continent, enlivens the narrative of Spanish people and cultural geography and is Chávez’s primary vehicle for reorienting Northern New Mexico as the center “of a dark continent” to a historic Spanish borderlands.

That Chávez makes Doña Tules a sympathetic epistolary narrator whose voice has come down from the annals of the past, entwined with the history of the guitar, also speaks to his reorientation of Hispano reputation in New Mexico. Countering Josiah Gregg’s and Shelby Magoffin’s nineteenth century descriptions of Doña Tules that degraded her historical personage as a licentious gambler in the chronicles of Southwestern literature, Chávez humanizes Doña Tules as a repentant character who states in the letter’s closing “I have played the guitar – and in more ways than one! May the Lord spare me!” (60).51 Reclaiming Doña Tules’s morality is more of a collective reorientation of Hispano New Mexico, for as Chávez would assert in the decades following, such an “accepted indictment” of Doña Tules is an “indictment of a whole people” (qtd. in Briggs, 11).

Five years after Guitars and Adobes appeared in serialized form in the St. Anthony Messenger, in 1939, Chávez returned to Santa Fe for his first priestly appointment and
solicited the advice of friend and member of the Santa Fe Writers Group, John Gould Fletcher, on how to make his novella publishable. Un-attuned to Chávez’s intertextual politics and injection of Hispano geo-cultural perspective, Fletcher stated “the story lacks atmosphere” and instructed Chávez to omit the phrase “This is no sequel to a certain great story of a great prelate,” since he felt “there is no need … to apprise the reader of that fact.” Moreover, Fletcher saw the guitar as “an inanimate object” and suggested that Chávez “might even have Doña Genoveva try and sell it.” Chávez did not publish the novella in his lifetime, leaving it to McCracken to recover it from obscurity in 2010. But, like Doña Genoveva, nor did Chávez listen to the advice of an Anglo authority and destruct, in his case, a discursive material object representative of New Mexico’s Spanish borderlands history.

Nevertheless, with Chávez’s remapping of New Mexico geography, culture, and history in *Guitars and Adobes*, it is also important to recognize how he trades Cather’s Francophilia for his own Hispanophila. The purity of Doña Genoveva’s lineage combined with her bellicose nature whenever she hears easterners call her people “Mexicans” signals Chávez’s unwillingness to acknowledge that Northern New Mexico, as a historic outpost of the Spanish borderlands, was influenced by the Mexican interior’s distinct racial and cultural developments. However, Chávez’s presentation of the Spanish borderlands takes on more complex and diverse forms in the years following his return from the Midwest. Isolationist policies against Mexico and elements of the Spanish fantasy heritage, like racial purity, regress in the short fiction Chávez wrote while serving as a priest at Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe and after serving as an army chaplain in the South Pacific theatre during World War II. The result in stories like “Maná Seda,” “The Colonel and the Santo,” “The Black Ewe,” and “A Romeo and Juliet Story in New Mexico,” is a counterspatial literature, ranging
from 1939-1951, that embraces geo-cultural heterogeneity and transnationalism in ways that redefine New Mexico regionalization in historic and modern eras.

“Mana Seda” initially appeared in the May 1939 issue of *The Missionary Catechist*. Although Chávez would change the name of “Mana Seda” a year later to the “Hunchback Madonna” and include it as one of three stories in his most popular fictional work *New Mexico Triptych*, its representation of the New Mexican Spanish borderlands is most significant when one evaluates the story in its original and individual form. The story, which relays the prominence the Virgin de Guadalupe plays in an elderly woman’s life and in the Northern New Mexican community where she emigrated, “bears the markings of [Chávez’s] first year of ministry at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church” in Pena Blanca, a social space south of Santa Fe that informed Chávez of Mexico’s cultural influence in the region (McCracken 137).

As in his previous short fiction, Chávez reorients Northern New Mexico away from social and geographic markers of the Anglo Southwest. Before he begins his tale on Mana Seda, the elderly woman and story’s namesake, Chávez works to historically position the region she and her community of émigrés inhabit as a northern outpost of the Spanish borderlands. According to the narrator, no one cares to know exactly when the village of El Tordo, that sits just below the snowcapped Truchas, “was born,” for “it was more thrilling to say, with the natives, that the first settlers came up from the Santa Clara valley long before the railroad came to New Mexico” (28). This statement counters southwestern Anglo advancements into Northern New Mexico via the Atchison-Topeka and Santa Fe Railway in the late-nineteenth century with the northern progressions of Spanish-speaking peoples centuries prior. Reorienting New Mexico’s geography was not only a priority in “Mana Seda,”
but also an outlet for Chávez’s anxiety. While he does not care to give historical dates, Chávez does care to have the narrator emphasize as part of the story’s historical background that this was a time when Santa Fe “looked no different from other northern towns,” which alludes to a geo-spatial anxiety and nostalgia triggered by the artists, writers, and tourists that infiltrated and altered Santa Fe during Chávez writing present (28).

However, the role of the Spanish borderlands in “Mana Seda” differs from earlier efforts, since the plot demonstrates geographic and cultural linkage with Mexico when it was a Viceroyalty under New Spain. In the early nineteenth century, the community of El Tordo eagerly awaits the arrival of a hand-painted Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe that the priest promises his parishioners at his own expense to hang in their newly built church. But, an image of the Virgin de Guadalupe will take time because the priest must wait for “the next trader’s ox-drawn caravan to leave Santa Fe for Chihuahua in Old Mexico” (28). If Chávez was in the mindset of portraying New Mexico as part of an isolated Spanish borderlands populated with pure-blood Spaniards, like Doña Genoveva or Don Sabino, he would not have evoked the Chihuahua Trail over the Camino Real, or the Virgin de Guadalupe over La Conquistadora. Instead, Chávez puts the New Mexican Spanish borderlands in connection with the Mexico interior geographically as he situates Northern New Mexico along the Chihuahua Trail, a five hundred and fifty mile commercial route extending from Santa Fe south to the City of Chihuahua. Chávez also culturally links Northern New Mexico’s population with the Mexican interior by having El Tordo’s community yearn for Mexico’s mestiza image of the Virgin rather than Spanish conquistador Diego DeVargas’ fair-skinned, Iberian Nuestra Señora de Rosario. Upon setting up this particular geo-cultural environment,
the narrative shifts its focus to Mana Seda, the female protagonist who embodies heterogeneity in the New Mexican Spanish borderlands.

Mana Seda, an old humpbacked woman born in the southlands along the “shores of the Rio Grande,” brings the religious practices of her birth region to El Tordo when she “cast her lot with the emigrants” moving north (33). During May devotions to the Virgin Mary, Mana Seda persuades the priest to “start an ancient custom prevalent in her place of origin” (29). The custom, which the priest allows, lets Mana Sena gather flowers to give to little girls dressed as queens, in honor of the Virgin, so they may present bouquets before the alter. Mana Seda’s humpbacked deformity disqualifies her from being chosen a “May queen” in her youth, which initially filled her with envy. However, she comes to believe “the Lord would be most pleased if [she] helped the other lucky girls with their flowers” (33). Mana Seda assumes this role of flower-bearer for “seventy-four Mays” until one May, while gathering flowers deep in the Truchas mountains, a storm catches her unaware. After praying to the Virgin for help, the storm passes, and she spots an adobe hut belonging to a young artisan specializing in religious carvings and paintings. At this point in the story, Chávez merges the iconic story of Mexican Indian Juan Diego with the narrative trajectory of Mana Seda’s character. Mana Seda tells the artisan about the painting of the Virgin de Guadalupe that the priest ordered, which was lost on its way from Mexico. In an act of kindness, the artisan offers to paint an image of the Virgin for Mana Seda’s church and exclaims “Why not let me paint one right now – on your shawl!” (32). Just as Juan Diego returns to the Bishop and shows him an image of the Virgin impressed on his tilma, Mana Sena returns to El Tordo with her shawl bearing the image of the Virgin de Guadalupe, albeit and most significantly, the image is transformed into a stooped position, since the artisan “absent-mindedly” paints
the Virgin’s shoulders according to Mana Sena’s likeness. The narrative ends on warm-hearted note when the artisan, who accompanies Mana Sena to El Tordo, informs the priest of Mana Sena’s youthful desire to be a May queen, and the following evening, at the priest’s insistence, Mana Sena leads the May queens in processional to the alter.

While Mana Sena’s story certainly is one of faith and redemption, its geo-spatial politics are hard to ignore. The spread of Mexican Catholicism comes north with Mana Sena into New Mexico, as customs and rituals travel from Mexico’s interior along the Chihuahua Trail into the Spanish borderlands. Chávez also alludes that religion in Northern New Mexico is a mestizo faith. Aside from the Virgin de Guadalupe’s presence, mestizaje in the Spanish borderlands is symbolized with the union of Mana Sena’s brown pigmentation and an object of religious Hispanicism. We learn, during Mana Sena’s redressing as she prepares to lead the May queens, that the Padre “pressed a big basket filled with flowers in [Mana Sena’s] brown hand” and the artisan “took off her black shawl and dropped over her grey head and hunched form a precious veil of Spanish lace” (34). In this tale, which is also one of double transformation, since the Virgin embodies Mana Sena’s image and vice versa at the story’s conclusion, Chávez emphasizes the Virgen de Guadalupe’s historic tenure in a Spanish borderlands with a mestizo populous culturally connected to Mexico.

If “Mana Sena” bears the markings of Chávez’s first year of ministry at Peña Blanca’s Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, then “The Colonel and the Santo” bears the markings of Chávez’s service as an army chaplain stationed in Guam and the Philippines. The narrative details the visit of an unnamed Anglo Colonel, chauffeured by a local army chaplain, who comes to Northern New Mexico to inform the mother of Acacio “Cash” Atencio, one of his fallen soldiers killed in combat on a South Pacific island, of his death.
When the Colonel arrives at Cash’s home, he is surprised to see a religious image on a cross, surrounded by “six painted miniature soldiers,” that looks eerily similar to Cash when the Colonel’s unit recovered his body, which the chaplain explains is San Acacio. However, the Colonel is equally impressed at Cash’s mother’s resolve, when she, upon receiving a ribboned metal recognizing Cash’s bravery, pins it on the image of San Acacio. Although Chávez penned “The Colonel and the Santo” almost five years after returning from the South Pacific while researching for his article “Saints’ Names in New Mexico Geography,” it is clear Chávez’s global experience at war influenced his remapping of the region in the story. McCracken contends that the moral of this story “is to allow faith in a patron saint to help cope with a loved one’s death” (277). But, in terms of “The Colonel and the Santo’s” politics, the story is a larger tale of geographic and cultural connection that situates New Mexico’s historic Spanish borderlands and its Hispano peoplehood on a global nexus in the past and present.

It is no coincidence that Chávez makes the Colonel out to be “a landscape painter as well as an amateur geologist … interested in bits of history connected with each phase of the landscape” (131). This choice of characterization simultaneously allows Chávez to speak back to dominance while he historically situates Northern New Mexico as a Spanish borderland region. The army chaplain, a Hispano local called “Padre” elsewhere in the story, and no doubt Chávez’s fictional double, “knows what words to use” to pique the Colonel’s interests on their drive through the Santa Clara Valley to Cash’s home (132). Instructing the Colonel on the historical geography of the landscape they pass, the chaplain recounts “the strategy used by a Spanish Captain-General of long ago in dislodging the Tewa Indians from the Black Mesa of San Ildefonso on their left” (132). The situation of the Black Mesa as a
marker of Spanish colonization plus the chaplain’s history lesson of the region that asserts “New Mexico was a Spanish colony long before New England and existed two centuries before there ever was a Republic of Mexico” remaps the region before an Anglo presence (134). With the landscape repositioned as part of the Spanish colonial empire rather than the Southwest, Chávez then works to showcase New Mexico’s transnational connection to the events of World War II in the Pacific theatre. Acting as a geographic signifier linked to the past as well as the present, the Black Mesa of San Ildefonso that the chaplain directs the Colonel’s attention towards breaks the Colonel of his silence, as he says the mesa “reminded him of another bluff on a far Pacific Island,” and “the one purpose of his visit to New Mexico” (132). “The scape and sky, triggered by the sight of that bluff,” Chávez writes “brought [the Colonel] back to Cash … for Cash had always talked with a touch of homesickness about his blue sky back home” (132). Because the New Mexico landscape functions as a double trigger evoking the Colonel’s memories of the South Pacific and Cash, the narrative sets up a transnational triangulation involving Cash, the Pacific islands, and New Mexico. Since the narrative correlates New Mexico’s Black Mesa of San Ildefonso with the “bluff on the far Pacific island” and positions Cash as the go-between in his trans-Pacific travels, the story ultimately showcases Chávez’s “transnational imaginary” as he insinuates relations among New Mexico and global theatres of war at a time when New Mexico and its Hispano population were seen in isolation.

It is thus most appropriate to understand Chávez’s linkage of Northern New Mexico to the South Pacific islands in terms of Ramón Saldívar’s transnational ideology. Not only does Chávez, to apply Saldívar’s definition of the transnational imaginary, “imagine [his] social surroundings in a transnational context,” but the narrative itself serves as a “spatial and
temporal indicator of a real contact zone that is historical and geographical, cultural and political” where “transnational persons” living in the residue of the Spanish borderlands lead lives that “form an experiential field within which monologically delineated notions of political, social, and cultural identity simply do not suffice” (62). Chávez sees the role descendants of the Spanish borderlands play in Far East theaters of war, which is a vantage point that shatters Anglo American literary perspectives that inscribe Hispanos as subjects (or objects) to be encountered through eastern eyes in the “Southwest.” Even in what is seemingly the most desolate and remote region of Northern New Mexico, the land gives up its Hispano sons to fight and die in multi-national warfare. However, Chávez is also keen to point out that New Mexico’s landscape not only provides its Hispano flesh for global war, but destructive technology born in its space. For when the chaplain mentions Los Alamos, the place-name triggers the Colonel to reflect on the Atomic bomb and how “if they had dropped that thing a couple months before they did, Cash wouldn’t have died” (132).

Incontestably, “The Colonel and the Santo” moves New Mexico and its Hispano populace into a larger global narrative as Chávez connects the landscape that bespeaks the history of the Spanish borderlands to South Pacific islands where battles raged during World War II. Yet these twentieth century transnational linkages are additionally complimented with global connections of the past that Chávez achieves through religious iconography in the narrative. The old “two foot wooden panel” depicting the image of San Acacio crucified, which initially startles the Colonel since he associates Cash’s corpse that lay “face-up… with arms stretched out, and a bayonet through each hand pinning him to the ground” with the icon, takes on geo-cultural importance (138). As the chaplain explains to the Colonel, San Acacio or St. Achatius, was a Roman army officer who died during the fourth century
fighting to spread Christianity in Asia Minor, and is Cash’s namesake (138). However, the chaplain notices that the panel painting of San Acacio had been modified throughout the centuries of its ownership. The Roman army officer was initially portrayed as a Spanish officer wearing a Colonel’s uniform of the early 1800s. But, what were military boots had been altered into cowboy boots, and “a much later hand drew curved tops and Western-wear grab” (138). Cash’s mother continues these cultural-historic updates as she “took the decoration from the Colonel’s fingers and stuck the pin in a crack over San Acacio’s heart.” The story ends with the revealing line, “It covered most of his blue blouse.” These actions taken by Cash’s mother and other family members of the fallen Atencio men work to make the religious icon of San Acacio a transformative artwork and a symbol of transnational Hispano cultural significance that places Cash and his military paternal forbearers as part of a colonial lineage of global movement.54 Cash does not “become San Acacio” as others have argued (Steele 50). There is no religious transfiguration. Rather Chávez, always with an eye for painting the New Mexican landscape beyond the confines of dominant representations, orients Cash and the region in contact with the world.55

Chávez’s “The Black Ewe” and “A Romeo and Juliet Story in Early New Mexico” return readers from transnational associations with the far-off island of the South Pacific to a historic and heterogeneous space of the New Mexico Spanish borderlands. Both works of short fiction exhibit the influence of Chávez’s historical research conducted with notable historians Francis V. Scholes and Hubert Eugene Bolton after his return from war. The result of reading numerous archival materials revealed a Spanish borderlands where socio-cultural diversity and racial mestizaje stemming from continuous movement and contact with people from the interior provinces of Mexico and the Great Plains were the norm. In January of
1950, while researching at California’s Huntington and Bancroft libraries, Chávez met Bolton, whom he was thankful for his “most generous and courteous helpfulness.” Archival assistance from Bolton resulted in the recovery of several hundred manuscripts from Santa Fe and Northern New Mexico that detailed the region’s geo-cultural mestizaje while it was an external province of New Spain. Chávez’s article “Some Original Documents in California Libraries,” which sums the contents of manuscript boxes he encountered, shows Chávez absorbing historical documents that repeatedly described New Mexico as a land of heterogeneity with genizaros, mestizos, criollos, and indigenous peoples interacting in troubling and celebratory ways.

Indeed, the years 1947-1951 were points of cultural and geographic awakening for Chávez that translated into his “The Black Ewe” and “A Romeo and Juliet Story in Early New Mexico,” which he significantly chose to publish in the secular New Mexico Quarterly in the Spring and Winter of 1950. Taking an overall perspective of the region similar to J. Frank Dobie, the New Mexico Quarterly during Chávez’s time often wrote of New Mexico using the typical scope and tropes that define the Southwest. As contributor Lyle Saunders surmised, the region is “the land of cactus and rattlesnakes, of Judge Roy Bean and Geronimo, of adobe and poco tiempo” (247). Chávez’s “The Black Ewe” disrupts illustrations of the region based on the lingering power of Lummis, vacancy, and bi-racial Anglo lawmen versus Indian lawlessness. Speaking toward the troubling interactions that ensued among the diverse peoples of the Spanish borderlands, “The Black Ewe” tells a tale of adultery, female violence, and vengeance that unfolds in the sheep-grazing lands of San Blas during the mid-eighteenth century. Resembling a judicial grievance Chávez encountered in the archives bringing forth a complaint by “José Maria Montano and Gertrudis Cuellar,
genízaro man and wife, against Juan Bautista Montaño for peonage, rape, and mistreatment,”
the story narrates the adulterous behavior of a Spanish patrón taken with a young genízara
woman who was “the child of a Pawnee squaw captured on the bison plains and a Spanish
soldier (74). Chávez is quick to point out that genízaras “were often prettier and more
appealing than the Spanish women,” as he is also quick to note that the community of San
Blas, the patrón’s wife, and the old, peon sheepherder Agapito knew the wrongs the patrón
and the married genízara committed when he came from his hacienda to his vast rancho at
San Blas (74). An act of vengeance and violence targeting the genízara ensues, which to
paraphrase Genaro Padilla, exposes New Mexico’s peonage system for its inhumanity,
although Chávez refrains from narrating this violence directly. Instead, Chávez plays off the
idiom of “the black sheep” (or in this instance “the black ewe,”) and literally associates the
genízara with the patrón’s favored black ewe to momentarily deflect aggressions against
genizaras in the Spanish borderlands. Chávez has Agapito fall into a trance one night when a
Spaniard disguised as a Navajo approaches with orders supposedly from the patrón to shear
the prized black ewe. In his hypnotic state, Agapito believes to be clipping the ewe’s black
wool while the “Indian’s” massive arms pin her to the ground. However, the next morning, as
the patrón is overcome by a frenzy over the condition of his lover, Agapito discovers it was
the genízara he sheared. As Agapito treats her battered and broken back, the genízara’s towel
“fell from her head, revealing a close-clipped scalp, chaffed and bruised in several spots,”
while outside “was the black ewe with all her wool” (74).

In “A Romeo and Juliet Story of Early New Mexico,” set in 1733, Chávez continues
to paint the Spanish borderlands as a geo-cultural space of mestizaje. However, like “Mana
Sena,” Chávez emphasizes Northern New Mexico geographic position on a north-south axis
with the interior provinces of Mexico, when it was a Viceroyalty of New Spain. Geographical orientation is primary in this regional tale of love and marriage that almost was not, as Chávez bases the story on the triangulation of archival materials between Mexico, Spain, and New Mexico which he learned was necessary under Scholes to produce a more complete history of the region. Before Chávez proceeds to the plot proper, he makes certain that his readers understand “A Romeo and Juliet Story of Early New Mexico” for more than its semi-Shakespearean structure. Emphasizing that this Romeo and Juliet tale is made possible by the recovery of archives from Santa Fe, Seville, and Mexico City, Chávez asserts:

We owe the New Mexico version, however, not to some professional or amateur purveyor of romances who wished to regale posterity with a delectable scandal, but to a court clerk in Mexico City who sandwiched the incident, as a case in point, between dry and drawn-out legal proceedings regarding ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Other ancient archives from Sevilla, Mexico City, and Santa Fe, help us in identifying the chief person of the play. (38)

With this statement, the narrative becomes a vessel for Chávez to deliver his geopolitical and geo-cultural agenda. Just as archives from Seville, Mexico City, and Santa Fe are needed to identify the “chief persons in the play,” documents from these same locales are needed to construct New Mexico’s history, or so the story allegorizes. The region’s historical narrative cannot be told properly in the twentieth century, its “chief persons” prior to Anglo occupation cannot be identified, without the transnational triangulation of archives from
Mexico and Spain. New Mexico cannot merely be historically constructed as a geo-political space within the U.S. nation-state without considering its Spanish borderlands history.

Using these sweeping geopolitical moves, Chávez delves into a plot that mocks pure Spanish heritage and promotes mestizaje from the Mexican interior. The point of conflict lies with the “Juliet” of the story, Francisca Baca. Baca’s family and their Santa Fe social circle, believing they are direct descendants of Spanish conquistadors, disapprove of Francisca’s lover Manuel Armijo whose family “casually admitted they were mestizos from Zacatecas” (39). Chávez derides Spanish lineage purisms, since he proves the Baca’s “pure” Spanish heritage to be, indeed, a fantasy. A New Mexico del Norte emerges that is culturally reinforced by mestizos from the Mexican interior, which includes those, like the Bacas, who think their blood is “untainted.” Challenging the Spanish purity of Santa Fe’s populous, Chávez writes Francisca’s father Don Antonio Baca, “believed himself to be, though mistakenly, a descendant of Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca” (38). Taking a more critical jab at Francisca’s mother and insinuating her mestiza heritage, Chávez says “Doña María de Aragón … arrived with her parents in 1693 at the time of the Reconquest of New Mexico by Don Diego de Vargas; this lent luster to her own family of the Aragón and Ortiz clan, over and above the important fact that, like the Baca, it passed for pure Spanish, although previously established in the Valley of Mexico for some generations” [my emphasis] (38). Despite the fact that Francisca and Manuel share similar racial and geo-cultural heritages, since both families trekked north from Mexico to Santa Fe, the Bacas and their Spanish heritage-believing social circle try to bust their love match. Francisca, however, to does not abide, and she is banished to her Aunt’s in Albuquerque. On Francisca’s southward trek by “ox-drawn carreta,” Chávez carefully narrates each village and landmark on the trail, which
yet again points to his geo-cultural concerns. Citing elements of the New Mexican landscape that hardly differ from a modern-day drive along Interstate 25 between Santa Fe and Albuquerque, Chávez recounts the Sierra Madre/Sangre de Cristo mountains, La Cienega, and “the black volcanic boulders of La Bajada” (42). Chávez mentions that Francisca’s carreta passed Santo Domingo pueblo, Bernalillo, and the Sandia Mountain before making its way down the broadening valley to Albuquerque, in a move that positions modern roads of transportation within the historical routes of the Spanish borderlands.

Fortunately for Baca and Armijo, Francisca’s Aunt, Doña Josefa Baca, a woman with a “strong willed nature,” who defies gender norms and is not one for protocols of purity (she develops her inheritance into a prosperous hacienda and has six children out of wedlock) clandestinely arranges for her niece and Armijo to be married in Albuquerque. Chávez chooses to end the story by recollecting the last wills and testaments of Don Antonio Baca and Doña Josefa Baca, which significantly demonstrate purity is a farce in the Spanish borderlands, as well as among those who claim to have inherited pure lineages in the present-day. Antonio Baca accepts the mestizo Manuel into his “Spanish” family as he lists Armijo among his six sons-in-law. As for the “strong willed” and “genius” Doña Josefa Baca, which are narrative descriptors indicative of Chávez’s admiration for her character/historical personage, Chávez writes “she asked God’s mercy for her sins by having, though unwed, the six children who inherited her property in the order named” (45).

In the final years of Chávez’s short fiction production, his stories return to isolationist geo-cultural policies similar to his early narratives. Whether we can attribute this shift to Chávez’s trip to Spain while he was stationed in Europe during the Korean War is not so much the focus as is the fact that upon his return, in 1952, Hispanophile homogeneity
dominated topics of his literary works. In “The Ardent Commandant” and “Wake for Don Corsino,” Chávez continues to reorient Northern New Mexico as a historic Spanish borderlands and a space of transnational and diverse social contact, but Chávez’s Hispanophile outlook advocating racial, cultural, and spatial separatism is evident. “The Ardent Commandant” displays Chávez’s geo-spatial concerns so much so that before he begins his late-eighteenth century tale about a widowed Spanish woman’s run-in with the devil, he asserts “antique landmarks and objects, or the historical personages, connected with [the story] … cannot be ignored; in fact, they have to clutter up the tale, like so many stakes holding a great tent taut and fast, otherwise the whole story flies off madly into space” (75). Unlike “A Romeo and Juliet Story in Early New Mexico,” where the narrative depends on the spatial movement of archives and people, Chávez’s illustration of antique landmarks as “stakes holding a great tent taut and fast” signals his desire to batten down the region and drives at the deeper political message beneath an otherwise local rehashing of a cultural cuento – keep Northern New Mexico and its Hispano population to itself; connections with other nations and nationals are dangerous.

On its surface, the narrative is a cautionary social and gendered tale that uses the structure of the popular “Dancing with the Devil” folk legend. However, its interstitial narrative layers reveal a cautionary spatial/regional allegory that warns New Mexicans of dealing with “strangers” during an era of New Mexico history, in the late eighteenth century, where transnational movement between France and Central American burgeoning nation-states threaten, from Chávez’s perspective, the folkways and economy of the New Mexican Spanish borderlands. Regional warning comes in the form of Doña Casilda, a thrice-widowed Hispana, not yet forty, and the descendent of favored captains serving DeVargas’s
Reconquest, who has inherited a fine house in Santa Fe near the Palace of the Governors. Because of her age and widowed status, Doña Casilda can be considered a sexually available subject, or an object to partner. This, combined with the notion that Chávez characterizes her as the heir of a long-standing Hispano family of Santa Fe, makes Doña Casilda emblematic of the region, its availability, and vulnerability during an era when transnational contact proved altering, if not overthrowing. Symbolically, Doña Casilda lives in between two potential suitors that occupy emblematic spaces of their own. To one side is a customs house where Captain Salazar, a customs officer and relation of Doña Casilda, lives. Salazar guards Northern New Mexico’s economic trade and ensures “the collection of duties whenever traders’ wagons arrived from Chihuahua, or less often and against royal law, from New Orleans” (76). On the other side of Doña Casilda is “a gloomy store” owned by a Canadian whom everyone called “The Frenchman” (76). Doña Casilda’s home is filled with French tapestries and has a “large store of old French and Spanish wines in a dark room off the kitchen” (78). Her father, years ago “bought the contraband Burgundy from New Orleans; while the legal Spanish wines had come in casks from Jerez to Mexico City … and up to Santa Fe” (78). Thus, the narrative engages in a commentary on trade legality between the Spanish and French empires that opposes the smuggling of French goods, which have the potential to harm the collection of duties (customs), in addition to altering regional customs, in the sense of Hispano traditions. That Chávez positions Doña Casilda caught amongst her just kinfolk Captain Salazar and the “Frenchman” storeowner, who is also called “a foreign merchant” and suspected “spy,” appeals to this issue of transnational trade in the eighteenth century Spanish borderlands. Doña Casilda, like many across the globe in her time, desires French fineries that were en vogue. However, Chávez’s acerbic tone for describing the
Frenchman indicates that he saw French influence as detrimental to Northern New Mexico for reasons of protecting regional economy and culture from what was a Francophile century if we consider the transfer of the Spanish crown to the Bourbons in the earlier half and the French Revolution in the latter.

Adding yet another “stake” to secure the Northern New Mexico from outside influence, the narrative soon warns Santa Fe against non-regional Spanish officials. Since Doña Casilda loses the attentions of Salazar and the Frenchman after having words with Salazar, who questions if she is helping the Frenchman smuggle goods into Santa Fe, she finds herself alone, until a dashing Spanish Commandant arrives with the party of the new Lord Governor from Mexico City. Unlike the local Captain Salazar, Doña Casilda swoons over the Spanish Commandant and fantasizes as to whether the Commandant is “from the Court of Madrid” since she reckons “a Spaniard from Europe was a greater prize than a Creole from New Spain” (83). The Commandant, named “Commandante del Fuego,” woos Doña Casilda and captivates her with his worldly travels to the point where she allows him to visit her at night. The Commandant charms Doña Casilda with stories of Marie Antoinette at Versailles, before seeing a candlelit painting of Our Lady of Light, one of Doña Casilda’s personal treasures given to her by the Bishop of Durango when she was a child. While the religious image ultimately expels the Commandant del Fuego, who transforms into a cloven-hoofed devil and disappears into the night, the painting is also a regional image representative of the Spanish borderlands that triumphs over the worldly Spanish and demonic Commandant. Chávez ends this story that promotes regional isolation with Captain Salazar inspecting Doña Cosilda’s quarters after hearing a loud boom. In an allegory that warns against the influence of burgeoning Central American nation-states, Captain Salazar
tells Doña Cosilda he was occupied with an incident in the presidio involving a drunken
soldier from Guatemala, “a son of the devil,” who shot himself in the head after yelling
blasphemies and curses at the Padre and company men (89).\(^58\)

Chávez’s final work of short fiction, “Wake for Don Corsino,” which was originally
titled “Little Poor Man” and published in the \textit{St. Anthony Messenger} in February 1956,
exercises an isolationist agenda for Spanish folk and folkways in the face of defiling socio-
spatial change during the modern era. The narrative tells of Don Corsino, who becomes a
drunkard after his wife dies. Chávez sets this tale in the early twentieth century, in the small
town of El Piojo, New Mexico, which is part of an area experiencing rampant alteration due
to the train that “had lately spun its thread of steal across San Miguel County.” Chávez
strongly insinuates this westward bound Americanizing course of industry is responsible for
corrupting Don Corsino, the descendant of Spanish forefathers. Chávez writes “[Don
Corsino] had lost all his big herds since he became a daily customer at the saloon, another
institution that came with the railroad to Las Vegas and spawned little off-shoots in scattered
villages.” However, in addition to faulting Americanization, modernization, and
transportation, Chávez condemns the mixed-blood genízaro population of El Piojo who
bartered with Corsino for his deceased wife’s treasured Spanish cultural belongings and thus
enabled his drinking. Through this and other illustrations of immoralities, Chávez takes a
negative stance against the mestizo/genízaro population and makes sure to draw a hard
genealogical line differentiating Don Corsino’s pure Spanish heritage from “the rest,” who
were “a mixture of Plains Indian tribes whose forebears” had been “captured in battle and
reoared in Spanish families” (94). Sympathies shown for genízaros and mestizos in “Mana
Sena,” “The Black Ewe,” or “A Romeo and Juliet Story in Early New Mexico” vanish in
“Wake for Don Corsino.” Adding to hereditary difference, Chávez assigns the genízaro population a modern-day Mexican-American identity upon historically constructing their lineage: “The parents and grandparents of these people had become Mexican citizens when the New World broke away from Spain, and now their children were American voters” (94).

Fortunately for Don Corsino, as the narrative goes, with the help of a supernatural visitation from his wife after he undergoes a near-death experience and the help of his boyhood friend, the Spanish stalwart Don Felipe, Don Corsino’s life becomes poised to turn for the better. Don Felipe, a member of one of only a handful of families in town “that could be called Spanish,” devises a plan to get Don Corsino’s belongings back from the “warped minded” genizaros. Afterwards, Don Corsino heeds his wife’s advice to “go away from El Piojo forever” and retreats to his boyhood home of San Miguel del Vado, a site of his Spanish family heritage punctuated by a socio-spatial marker and remnant of the Spanish borderlands, an old Spanish fort where his grandfather was the first commander. Once at the Spanish stronghold of San Miguel, Don Corsino’s wife also advises him to get “another good woman to be your help and companion,” which is a narrative move that starkly illustrates Chávez’s disapproval of marrying and mixing with the Mexican American/genízaro population. The story symbolically ends with Don Corsino putting all his belongings in a wagon and starting out for San Miguel, a spatial relic of the Spanish borderlands in contemporary times, where Don Corsino can start anew, with a wife of his status, removed from “the rest.” Considering that these final two stories were penned in 1954 and 1956, one wonders to what degree the anti-Mexican atmosphere of Operation Wetback and the desegregationist judicial outcome of Brown v. the Board of Education may have influenced Chávez? Like other New Mexican writers publishing in the mid-1950s, namely Fabiola
Cabeza de Baca, Chávez’s later short-story output troublingly articulates a return to Spanish racial purity and undiluted folkways as a kind of imaginary consolidation of whiteness during a turbulent period of racial tension. Strikingly, at a time marking the initiation of mass deportation for bracero Mexican America and educational desegregation for Black America, Chávez adopts a narrative policy of racial (and hence spatial) segregation.\(^{59}\)

In conclusion, it is apparent from Chávez’s short fiction that he sought to do more than inscribe an alternative “Southwest.” His production of the Spanish borderlands, to cite Juan Bruce-Novoa, became “a literary space for responding to chaos” of social, cultural, and regional change affecting his Northern New Mexico (96). Indeed, the Spanish borderlands was Chávez’s counterspatial response in his short fiction, whether he preferred it as an isolated geopolitical entity, or a desired transnational space in connection to the world. Chávez’s vexed orientations of the region and its Spanish-speaking peoplehood simultaneously conjure comparisons with isolationist purveyors of the Spanish heritage fantasy such as Mary Austin, Aurelio M. Espinosa, Nina Otero-Warren, and Fabiola Cabeza de Baca as well as authors who readily acknowledged cultural movement from Mexico’s interior like Cleoflas Jaramillo and the contemporary Pat Mora. For this reason, we cannot position Chávez and his fiction, overall, as proto-Chicano, since much of his work is oppositional to Anglo and Mexican America. The multidirectional foci his work takes upsets a tidy fit within the proto-Chicano paradigm and its spatial orientation. However, we must also recognize his era of short fiction that does paint the region as a mestizo geo-cultural space in connection with Mexico. The Aztlán-like geopolitical and cultural space of the Spanish borderlands Chávez evokes in “Mana Sena” and “A Romeo and Juliet Story in Early New Mexico” that details movement from the Valley of Mexico predates as it resembles the
spatial politics of El Movimiento. Ironically, this is part of the reason Chávez must be included in the Chicano literary canon and why, though perhaps controversially, I include him in a study of early “Mexican-American” writers. He constantly produces a geographic space in his short fiction vital to the historical understanding of the contemporary U.S.-Mexico borderlands and Mexican-American culture. The other part of the reason simply stems from the fact that, like the other authors of this study, Chávez re-members the region as an inflection of transnational and global phenomena.
Chapter III

Recovering Memorias (Trans)Fronterizas:

Federico Ronstadt’s Memoirs of “Southern Arizona”

On July 8, 1948, while temperatures soared outside his home in Tucson, Arizona, Federico Ronstadt (1868-1954) warmly responded to a letter from an old friend. “There are so few of the old timers living,” Ronstadt writes, “that it makes one feel good to know that some old friend is still living and remembers us. It would take a book to tell you what has happened …” However, as the eighty-year-old typed his seemingly softhearted epistolary opening, unbeknownst to his friend, Ronstadt was at work on his memoirs. Ronstadt was not one to leave remembrance to chance. Urged by his extensive family, the likes of whom include his daughter Luisa Espinel international folksinger extraordinaire in the 1930s, and son Gilbert, father to Ronstadt’s granddaughter, contemporary singing sensation Linda Ronstadt, Federico Ronstadt committed to writing the stories he shared at family gatherings of his boyhood in Sonora, immigration to the United States, and early life in Tucson. In a ten-year effort, from approximately 1944 to shortly before his death in December 1954, Ronstadt penned his memoirs while vacationing in California and in Tucson, his adopted home since he first rode into the south edge of town with his father by stagecoach on April 23, 1882. Ronstadt wrote on the backs of his successful enterprise’s letterhead, The F. Ronstadt Hardware Co., his self-started business that had weathered political revolution, economic depression and evolved with changing technologies. Writing in English, in large cursive script, often using a blue ink that matched the stationary’s bold blue illustration of his two-story hardware store, Ronstadt’s aged hand detailed a mobile world where people,
commercial goods, and cultural components traversed the Sonora-Arizona borderlands in the last and first quarters of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Nearly forty years after Ronstadt’s passing, his son Edward spearheaded the transcription, editing, and arrangement of his father’s loose-leaf memoirs, and in 1993, his memoirs, aptly titled *Borderman*, were published. *Borderman* is the materialization of the “book” Ronstadt referred to in 1948. As a memoir, it offers an unparalleled telling of the sociopolitical, cultural and historic conditions in the Arizona-Sonora borderlands in the fin de siècle. However, Chicano/a literary critics have slighted Ronstadt’s memoirs.

Because Ronstadt reveals his bourgeois origins at the start of his memoirs (we learn Ronstadt’s German-born father was an engineer, military man and friend of Sonoran Governor Ignacio Pesqueira and his mother was descended from a longstanding landed Sonoran family of Spanish origin), one might be compelled to situate Ronstadt within a corpus of elite, early Mexican American/Hispana autobiographers and memoirists such as Mariano Vallejo, Cleofas Jaramillo, and Fabiola Cabeza de Baca.61 Genaro Padilla and Tey Diana Rebolledo, in their works *My History, Not Yours* and *Women Singing in the Snow*, respectively argue that Vallejo and Hispana writers “display asentimental attachment for the past, generally a nostalgic edenic one” as a discursive resistance strategy to disenfranchising Anglo American rule (Rebolledo 31). Thus, according to Padilla and Rebolledo, Vallejo, Jaramillo, and Cabeza de Baca are cohorts as each fits within a paradigm of Anglo opposition by recalling a pre-1848 or pre-Anglo modernity that nostalgically trumps their dispossessed present.

Yet, Ronstadt’s pre-Anglo American past is not entirely an “edenic” one. In his memoirs, Ronstadt’s descriptions of state violence are directly leveled against warring
Sonoran factions, specifically the government funded Pesqueristas, whom Ronstadt describes as “the sacking Red Shirt soldiers” (12). Rather than an avaricious U.S. government dispossessing the landed gentry, Ronstadt recollects a land-grabbing Mexican government and citizenry that through lengthy litigation, mounting legal fees and unfulfilled claims caused his family’s loss of property in Sonora (83-84). On a sociopolitical plane, Ronstadt’s Mexican national past is the culprit of calamity and his family’s financial distress, not the U.S. Government. Therefore, Ronstadt’s circumstances as a Mexican immigrant undo immediate correlations with Padilla’s and Rebolledo’s paradigm. To use the reverse of an old Chicano adage, Ronstadt crossed the border; the border didn’t cross him, and for scholars focusing on native literary subjects, Ronstadt’s immigrant status plays a role in his memoir’s negation.62

Ironically, Ronstadt memoirs are overlooked in the Hispanic immigrant literary front, as well. Nicolás Kanellos’s Hispanic Immigrant Literature: El Sueño del Retorno offers a necessary corrective for the tendency of literary critics to ignore “practically the entire corpus of works written in Spanish by immigrants” (13). But, even as Kanellos resuscitates immigrant texts, the fact that Hispanic literature for his definitive purposes “is literature created orally or in written form... using the language of the homeland” denies Ronstadt’s English-written memoirs entry into Kanellos’s work (7). Furthermore, because Kanellos’s definition of Hispanic literature also stipulates an oppositional impulse in the form of an “unmeltable ethnicity” which “generally does not support the myths of the American Dream,” he creates a second paradigmatic parameter that discredits Ronstadt’s memoirs from consideration (7).
Ronstadt makes no secret about his patriotism and gratitude for the United States in his memoirs with an overt discourse that appears warranted considering memories of sociopolitical turbulence and financial loss in Mexico give way to a more stable environment in Tucson. Explicit, pro-American statements like the following reveal Ronstadt’s endorsement of the American Dream:

As we crossed into the United States of America, my father told me, “Now you are in the United States of America, without any question the greatest nation in the world. You will enjoy great liberty and protection under the American Government and you must always feel and show deep appreciation for that. When you become a man (I was fourteen at the time), you may want to establish yourself in the United States and see that your life and conduct is such that will entitle you to the privilege of American citizenship.” I was impressed by my father’s words. (57-58)

This statement coupled with other pro-American statements, such as Ronstadt’s comparative architectural recollections that proclaim his awe of the “perfect lines on the corners, doorways, and roofs” in Tucson versus the houses “[his] eyes were used to seeing in Sonora,” illustrate an American national superiority and betterment of life unattainable in Mexico (77). By the time an elderly Ronstadt penned these lines, he had ensured his life’s conduct entitled him to the “privilege of American citizenship.” Active in local and national fraternal organizations like the Arizona Pioneers Historical Society, Knights of Columbus, Elks, American National Red Cross, and Rotary Club, all the while being an entrepreneurial capitalist, Ronstadt embraced the American Dream as much as it embraced him, on account of his fair complexion and Anglo/Germanic surname. From the standpoint of social
ascension, Ronstadt’s memoirs, as Bernard L. Fontana states in his “Forward” to
_Borderman’s_ 2003 edition, are “a preamble to his later success in achieving the American
Dream” (xxii). As such, Ronstadt’s text runs counter to Chicano/a literary history and the
way it informs the recovery of early U.S. Hispanic writings. That Ronstadt was born into a
landed family, was dispossessed and reclaimed his bourgeois status from modest conditions
with a solid work ethic befits the plot in the _Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin_ more than
the outcomes in Daniel Venegas’ _The Adventures of Don Chipote_ or Mariano Vallejo’s
“Recuerdos históricos y personales.” Consequentially, Ronstadt has fallen through the cracks
of the recovery project.

However, we must continue to follow Rebolledo’s prudent warning: “to ignore the
writings of the middle and upper class is to ignore literary history” (31). Ronstadt’s memoirs
are no exception to this cautionary wisdom. To ignore the memoirs of a bourgeois Mexican
immigrant turned American citizen, writing in English, who seemingly achieved the
American Dream is to ignore literary history and silence a unique cultural voice that upon
closer inspection has more in common with oppositional politics than presumed.
Ronstadt’s brand of textual opposition reveals itself in the spatial poetics of his business office (see figure 12). Offering a photographer a candid snapshot of routine business conducted in his manager’s office, a relaxed but pensive Ronstadt took a few moments to pause from dictation given to his secretary. Amid the notices, bills, and ledgers of the F. Ronstadt Co. are four significant objects visible to Ronstadt when facing his work-desk. Nearest him, atop his desk is a propped white frame with photos of his German-born father, Fredrick A. Ronstadt and his Mexican Sonoran-born mother, Margarita Redondo. Fastened to the wall are three maps. The left map with the aid of a digital zoom shows the topography of Tucson, while the larger map occupying the center of the wall space details the Union
Pacific’s expansive track system and that of its acquisition, the Southern Pacific. However, it is the smaller map of Mexico on the right, seemingly out of balance because of its odd lower placement, which occupies the most prized wall space. Closer to Ronstadt’s direct line of sight when seated, the map of Mexico inclusive of the unmarked U.S. borderlands acts as a second frame to Ronstadt’s family photos, where from Ronstadt’s perspective an act of superimposition occurs. A central and most significant plane, to use mathematical terms, emerges in Ronstadt’s office space, which enables Ronstadt to visually orient himself and his heritage to a preferred geographical backdrop – Mexico and the Sonora-Arizona borderlands.

This fascinating spatial poetics turned spatial politics within Ronstadt’s office illustrates the position he, an accepted member of Anglo society, took in terms of his identity, culture and its geopolitical associations. At the time of this photograph’s taking, Anglo and Mexican relations in Arizona, already strained by prior decades of conflict emanating from anti-Mexican groups like the American Protective Association, had intensified due to the Mexican Revolution. This context makes Ronstadt’s oppositional impulses more evident. As Tucson’s Anglo business community and perhaps even a client or two traversed Ronstadt’s office, and let their gaze wander to the images on his wall, a political message was subtly communicated. The Union-Pacific’s imposing cartography and heavily demarcated national boundary lines served as an accommodating visual, all the while Ronstadt communicated a disengagement from Anglo American and hence Southwestern cultural and geopolitical identity with his map of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands and its distinct spatial configuration.

As Mary Pat Brady reminds us in *Extinct Lands, Temporal Geographies*, “Producing the Anglo Arizona landscape entailed more than the manipulation of public policy” (17).
During the summer of 1954, while Ronstadt wrote the final sections of his memoirs, producing the Anglo Arizona landscape also involved the manipulation of fear. Operation Wetback, nothing short of an ethnocentric organization of space, took on an aura of militarization as the Border Patrol was reorganized into mobile task forces for roundup operations of “illegal aliens” across the Southwest (173). Juan Ramon Garcia, author of *Operation Wetback*, details that just prior to the “Operation’s” enactment the U.S. press sensationalized Border Patrol task forces to “create the impression that a veritable army was being assembled” (177). Although a full-fledged army of Border Patrol agents was an exaggeration, the transformation of civilian social spaces in Arizona took on the form of militarized ethnic cleansing. By July 25, over 38,000 “aliens” were transported to Nogales by Greyhound bus and then sent by train into Mexico’s interior (193).

It is precisely anti-Mexican conditions such as these that fueled Ronstadt to endow his memoirs with a dissenting, or perhaps better stated, “warring” register that sutures the land, culture, and people geopolitically cleaved by the Gadsden Purchase. Ronstadt’s memoirs must be positioned as an extension of the complying and dissenting spatial politics in his business office. Like Ronstadt’s accommodating Union-Pacific map, we ought to read Ronstadt’s overt nationalistic statements and his endorsement of the American Dream as an accommodating discourse directed at the anti-Mexican forces that maintained a highly territorial and jingoistic imagining of Arizona’s geopolitical boundaries. Given Ronstadt’s aptitude for antagonistic spatial politics, I find it far from coincidental that Ronstadt would disclose in his memoirs a militarized description of his family as “an army of blood relatives (*parientes*)” that resided on both sides of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands. Read in the context of Operation Wetback and past ethnic conflict among Anglos and Mexicans,
Ronstadt’s transfrontera “army of parientes” is a spatially discursive challenge to the Border Patrol’s “veritable armies,” anti-Mexican vigilante groups and associations, (and even Hollywood) threatening to eradicate the history, livelihood, culture, and existence of peoples of Mexican descent in Arizona. Ronstadt confronts “armies” charged with policing the border with his own transborder forces. In short, Ronstadt’s text is a text at war that fights on behalf of a Mexican Arizona under erasure.

Like his map of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands, Ronstadt’s brand of textual opposition significantly reshapes southern Arizona from spatial associations with the Anglo Southwest. Although spatial theorist Edward Soja recognizes that “the Western map is becoming increasingly adopted,” Soja believes “there still exist many alternative maps which either remain predominant or are significantly reshaping the Western model” (11). Likewise, Brady too, in her study of Chicana literature’s spatial urgency argues “Chicana literature has consistently offered alternative methods of conceptualizing space … by seeing and feeling space as performative and participatory … by refusing a too ridged binary between the material and the discursive” to offer “entirely different conceptualizations of space altogether” (6). Borderman is a literary example of such a spatial alternative as it discursively performs and participates in a transfrontera narration that counters hegemonic geopolitics. Ronstadt’s memoirs are a spatial strategy of resistance that operates against nationally restrictive geopolitical and cultural forces by expressing transnational associations. They are a rearranging of the national legacy. In this light, I say that Ronstadt’s alternative spatial production precedes the spatial transfrontera politics in early 1990s Chicana literature, as illuminated by Sonia Saldivar-Hull and Mary Pat Brady. Chicana literature in the 1990s, Sonia Saldivar-Hull explains, “offered an alternative mapping of feminist literary
cartographies” via a “transfrontera feminism” that challenged “dominant patriarchal discourse” (251). While Borderman, indeed, does not predate the gendered transfrontera politics of twentieth century Chicana Literature, Ronstadt’s brand of textual opposition does offer an “alternative mapping” of Southwestern cartographies via transfrontera spatializations that challenge the predominant east-to-west Anglo perspectives of the region. Armed with this spatial strategy of resistance, Ronstadt disassociates southern Arizona from the Anglo Southwest and restores the fluid heritage of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands along familial, economic, and cultural fronts.

On December 1, 1916 Ronstadt became a member of the Arizona Pioneers’ Historical Society. The Arizona Pioneers’ Historical Society, like many contemporary pioneer societies, centralized Anglo historical settlement and culture with mediocre to little regard for other peoples who traversed the region. While a 1959 study on the Arizona Pioneers’ Historical Society indicates the Society acquired two eighteenth century journals from the Spanish Jesuit missionary period, the bulk of their archives preserved materials of Anglo settlers and military men (Sloan 69, 70). Following their edict, the Arizona Pioneers Historical Society was engaged in fashioning a “fact” based historical narrative founded on “territorial” parameters that situated Arizona’s “true” history of settlement as a result of the Anglo frontier, frontiersmen, and pioneer folk pushing westward. Although the Society by mid-twentieth century had acknowledged the presence of Spanish clergymen predating Anglo settlement, their archives failed to preserve and validate the anteceding existence of Spanish/Mexican family settlements.

While he did not openly challenge the Society in his thirty-eight years as a member, Ronstadt uses his memoirs to set the record straight. He rearranges southern Arizona’s
historical settlement by asserting the validity of his longstanding, transfrontera familial heritage. At the start of his memoirs, Ronstadt emphasizes the importance of his family and announces, “Before I say anything about myself, I wish to note down a few things about my father and my mother” (3). He then proceeds in restorative prose to document his maternal family’s settlement of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands:

My mother’s name was Margarita Redondo. Her great grandfather, Don Francisco Redondo, came from Spain and settled the Hacienda del Ocuca about 30 miles southeast of Altar. We have a record of his work while he developed his homestead and raised a large family. They had to produce all the principle needs of life like all the old pioneers. …

My mother’s father, Don José María Redondo, was a successful gentleman farmer, stockman, and merchant. He happened to be Prefecto of the District of Altar when the filibustering expedition of [Henry Alexander] Crabb invaded Caborca [in 1857]. He had a reputation for extreme kindness and patience. My mother’s mother, Doña Jesús Vásquez, died during the cholera epidemic in 1848 when my mother was only 2 years old.

My grandfather Redondo died in 1879 at the very advanced age of 92. His brothers and cousins were many. Some located in Yuma, Ariz. The Martins and Rebeils of Tucson are descendants of these Redondos on their mother’s side. (6)

In these paragraphs, Ronstadt establishes a maternal Spanish/Mexican familial presence traversing the Sonora-Arizona borderlands, which has been stricken from record by the Arizona Pioneers’ Historical Society’s archival practices. His preoccupation with
longevity and landscape emerge when he details his mother’s “great grandfather, Don Francisco Redondo, came from Spain and settled the Hacienda del Ocuca 30 miles southeast of Altar.” Based on the genealogical and geographical scope that appears in his memoir, Ronstadt illustrates how his maternal descendants, originating with his mother’s great grandfather in the eighteenth century, spread throughout the borderlands region, residing from the Altar district in northern Sonora northward into Yuma and Tucson. Conjoining genealogy and geography are narrative/spatial strategies of resistance that have been noted before in productions by peoples of Mexican descent. Rebolledo has noticed Nuevomexicana writers “name heritage” by specifying family names and landmarks as if to “show a cultural pedigree that claims a traditional space” (31).

However, unlike some Nuevomexicana writers who associate heritage and landscape within national boundaries, Ronstadt deploys this resistance strategy within a transnational space. He geographically triangulates the Redondos of Altar, Sonora and Yuma, Arizona, along with the Rebeils and Martins of Tucson to show a maternal cultural pedigree that claims the Sonora-Arizona borderlands for his Spanish/Mexican heritage. Furthermore, although Ronstadt does not state the term outright, his geographical parameters evoke the Pimería Alta. Once a seamless expanse of land established at the onset of Spanish rule in the region, the Pimería Alta has defied emergent geopolitical boundaries by the continual northern and southern movement of people, commerce and culture across Sonora-Arizona borderlands. By situating his maternal heritage and in essence himself within the transfrontera bounds of the Pimería Alta, Ronstadt remaps southern Arizona from a region associated with the western frontier to a cultural and historic landscape associated with the
Sonoran borderlands, which his parientes and their descendents occupied long before border patrolling “armies” of Operation Wetback and nineteenth century pioneers.

Moreover, Ronstadt validates Spanish/Mexican family “record” and their documented settlement of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands. While he says elsewhere in his memoirs that “many tales” about famous pioneers “may be found in the archives of the Arizona Pioneers’ Historical Society,” Ronstadt states his family has kept a “record” of his great-great grandfather’s “work while he developed his homestead and raised a large family” (76). In an era of Spanish/Mexican archival exclusion, Ronstadt affirms the existence of truer archival spaces, such as the one he safeguards in his home, which accounts for his family’s stake in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands. They are Spanish/Mexican domestic archives that predate and authenticate Spanish/Mexican homesteaders as the first settlers of the southern Arizona, who pushed northward from Sonora, not westward.

In addition, Ronstadt’s passages complicate the notion that pioneers were the definitive Anglo presence in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands equally as much as they redefine the positive connotation of the term “pioneer.” Ronstadt notes his grandfather Don José Maria Redondo was the “Perfecto of the District of Altar when the filibustering expedition of [Henry Alexander] Crabb invaded Caborca [in 1857].” Ronstadt’s historical evocation of Crabb, a post-Gadsden Purchase filibuster who led a private army into Sonora in hopes of annexing more of the state for the U.S., functions in two spatially significant ways (Sheridan, 1986). First, Crabb as filibusterer reinstates an Anglo antithesis of the dominant and preferred pioneer image perpetuated by the Arizona Pioneer’s Historical Society. Second, Crabb embodies the “invading” presence of all Anglos in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands, which Ronstadt contrasts with his grandfather, the Perfecto of Altar, who
signifies pre-established government and societal order in a claimed space that nullifies the very meaning of the term “pioneers.”

Ronstadt also spatially ascribes his father as a border-crossover of global reach and a constituent in the flux of the Pimería Alta, rescuing him from national associations:

My father, [Col.] Frederick Augustus Ronstadt, was born in Hanover, Germany, and educated in the university of the same city. … He came from Germany with a group of engineers to Buenos Aires, from there by muleback across the Andes to Chile and by water to San Francisco; from San Francisco overland to San Diego and Arizona & Sonora in the early fifties.

In Sonora my father found ready occupation, not only in mining work but in managing the large haciendas for some of the leading men of that state at that time. … He served as an officer in the Mexican army during the French invasion when Maximilian tried to establish his empire …

When General Pesqueira, then Governor of Sonora, General García Morales and their staff had to change the state capital from Ures to Tubac on account of the Maximilian supporters [1865-1866], my father came with them … It was here [in Tubac] that Governor Pesqueira commissioned my father to negotiate a loan from the people of Tucson … My father obtained some $24,000 from Sam Hughes, Tully & Ochoa, Hiram Stevens and other Tucson citizens. (3-4)

Col. Ronstadt has been recognized by Arizona state historians as one of the earliest pioneers who helped develop southern Arizona’s copper industry in the 1850s (Sheridan, 1995, 162). However, Ronstadt announces his father does not follow western patterns of movement
expected from pioneers. In terms of his father’s immigration, occupation, and regional allegiance, Ronstadt reorients his father within the spatial bounds of Sonora-Arizona borderlands like he did once before in his exchanges with longtime Arizona Senator Carl Hayden.

An avid state history buff, Hayden spent his time outside legislative politics amassing biographical data on the lives of Arizona’s pioneers. On March 21, 1940 Hayden sent Ronstadt a letter inquiring about Col. Ronstadt’s life in hopes of obtaining “some of the missing facts” (Hayden). While Hayden, like Ronstadt, believes “much has been written about the pioneers of [Arizona] which is not much more than fiction,” Hayden’s list of questions posed to Ronstadt about the Colonel suggest he assumes Ronstadt’s father made a transatlantic voyage from Germany to the United States and moved westward in typical pioneer fashion. A spatial orientation similar to the movement of Manifest Destiny emerges, based the chronological order of content, when Hayden asks:

1. When and why did [Col. Ronstadt] leave Germany and where did he land in the United States?
2. When and how did he first enter Mexico?
3. How did he first get to California, by land or sea?

In a follow-up letter to Ronstadt, dated April 13, 1941, Hayden expressed his gratitude for “all the trouble” Ronstadt took to supply him “with such interesting information” relative to the life of his father (Hayden). Although Ronstadt’s response to Hayden’s initial letter is yet to be located, based on Hayden’s statements in his follow-up letter, it appears Ronstadt seized this opportunity, made a detailed effort (one which Hayden thought involved much “trouble”) and supplied Hayden with “interesting information” about his father that
fascinated Hayden’s historical expectations. The lines about his father that appear in Ronstadt’s memoirs, which may mirror the discourse enclosed in his letter to Hayden, can be read as correctives to Hayden’s spatial assumptions and the pioneer histories that claimed his father. Ronstadt tells his father circumvented the eastern seaboard of the United States in favor of a pan-hemispheric Latin American route that ultimately ended in an overland sojourn from San Francisco to “Arizona & Sonora.” Mindful to marry the geographies of “Arizona & Sonora,” Ronstadt positions his father and southern Arizona macro-spatially within the Latin American hemisphere and regionally within the economic rhythms of the Pimería Alta. Then, like a historical revisionist, Ronstadt documents the socio-political connections maintained by Sonora and southern Arizona during the French-Mexican War. He historicizes how the Sonoran state capital temporarily moved, to evade French forces, from Ures to Tubac, a city over 200 miles north, and well inside what was then Arizona territory. He also records the extent Tucson citizens were involved in Sonoran affairs. It is not donations to Yankee or Confederate efforts in the chronologically overlapping U.S. Civil War that Ronstadt documents, but the investment and support Tucson citizens such as “Sam Hughes, Tully & Ochoa, Hiram Stevens and other[s]” staked in their transfrontera relations. And, in the midst of this historic episode, is Ronstadt’s father, a transfronterizo by his son’s account. Ronstadt historicizes his father as a two-way border crosser who comes to Arizona with General Pesqueira’s troops and obtains a “$24,000” loan for use in the Sonoran war effort against Maximilian. Such historical documentation counters the pioneering Anglo chronicles that keep his father and southern Arizona within Southwestern history. A son of the Pimería Alta, on both maternal and paternal accounts, Ronstadt’s memoirs open a
transfrontera historical space as he counts his father among his “army of blood relatives,”
that settled, traversed, and warred the Sonora-Arizona borderlands.

Asserting his transfrontera familial heritage was but one tactic Ronstadt deployed to
shift space away from the national towards the transnational. Transfrontera economies
presumably weighed heavily in Ronstadt’s mind during his writing of Borderman, for the
composition of his memoirs restores economic ties between Sonora and Arizona via
transfrontera railroads and contraband activity. In Ronstadt’s day, much ceremonial grandeur
was made over the arrival of the transcontinental Southern Pacific Railroad in Tucson. While
Ronstadt’s memoirs are not devoid of the Southern Pacific (he notes working as a mechanic
for the S. P. and using it for travel to California), he is more concerned with documenting the
construction of the transnational Atchison, Topeka Santa Fe Railroad (AT&SF) and the
borderlands space it traversed.67

In what can be described as a doubled spatial production, Ronstadt twice recalls that
the Santa Fe Railroad (his reference to the AT&SF) “was being built from Guaymas to
Benson” during his adolescence (55). Always attentive to space and place in each account,
Ronstadt persistently names townships either near or directly along the AT&SF’s trackage
that evoke the broader realm of his transfrontera cultural pedigree born of U.S. expansionism
in the nineteenth century. The first account reads:

…the Santa Fe Rail Road camp was located then near La Noria south of Santa
Ana. This Railroad was being built from Guaymas to Benson [ca. 1881]. My
father’s driver, Juan de Dios, drove the team, and I was invited to go along.
We arrived at the camp after dark. I was surprised to find the rails made as
they were. I had imagined the railroad rails to be channeled. … When the
work train came in about midnight, the locomotive appeared to me as a
tremendous monster … . When I got over my surprise I walked close enough
to notice the wheels had no channels or rims. It was a great puzzle for me. The
train kept moving until it backed away toward Guaymas. … We went right
back to Magdalena and my father had to explain to me what it was the kept
the train wheels on the track. (55-56)

Rebolledo argues that writers who have “a consciousness of being colonized and the struggle
to retain their ethnic heritage” will list cultural signs, usually in the form of landmarks (hills,
routes, valleys, names) to engrave their cultural identity (31). Similarly, Ronstadt engraves this
transnational space onto the AT&SF, making the Train emblematic of the region’s
longitudinal heritage. He grafts the townships of Guaymas, La Noria, Santa Ana, Magdalena
and Benson onto the AT&SF and produces a transfrontera spatial cartography absent from
U.S. railway maps, like the imposing Union Pacific–South Pacific that hung on his office
wall. Additionally, considering the historical context in which he wrote these lines, Ronstadt
remembrance of the AT&SF’s two-way track system is particularly significant. It would not
have escaped Ronstadt’s attention during Operation Wetback that the former AT&SF railway
was politicized as a one-way ticket out of the state for predominantly Mexican “illegals.”

Countering the expelling role assigned to the Railroad in the early 1950s, Ronstadt’s
remembrance that “This Railroad was being built from Guaymas to Benson” assigns a
northward motility to the Railroad. He showcases the movement of people and economy
toward Arizona. It is a spatial and mobile recollection that literally brings up to speed the
bounds of his family’s agropastoral past and historicizes the fluid northward movement
between the Sonora-Arizona borderlands at the inception of modern transportation and economy.

Interestingly, because Ronstadt understands the AT&SF as a spatially unifying force, his representation of the Railroad parallels Ruiz de Burton’s narration of the Texas Pacific. Like Ruiz de Burton’s beneficial representation of the Texas Pacific in *The Squatter and the Don* due to its economic and cultural suturing of the California borderlands (see Chapter I), Ronstadt’s recollection of the AT&SF initially begins as a monstrosity, but ends as an inquisitive feat of modern engineering. It appears Ronstadt’s physical intimacy with the transnational AT&SF, demonstrated by his proximity to the Railroad when he “walked close enough to notice the wheels had no channels or rims,” encourages his realization that the train is less of a monster and more of a mediator as he sees it back away toward Guaymas and being built toward Benson. Therefore, just as the Texas Pacific functions as tool inciting border relations for Ruiz de Burton, Ronstadt’s remembrance of the AT&SF also acts as a suture that moves away, to and through locales within ancestral space of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands.

The second account Ronstadt gives of the AT&SF advances approximately nine months in the annals of his memory. It is April 1882, and he is immigrating to Tucson, escorted by his father in horse-drawn carriage. In the passage that follows, we see Ronstadt uses his memoirs to historicize the AT&SF’s progression toward the future city of Nogales, which he points out did not exist prior to the Railroad:

The first stop we made was at Las Casitas. The Santa Fe R.R. Co. was building the road from Guaymas to Benson. They had a camp of men cutting
railroad ties along the road from Imuris to Nogales. As a matter of fact, there was not any Nogales then in April of 1882. (57)

Walter Benjamin best expresses the historical, spatial, and economic urgency Ronstadt infuses in his writing. According to Benjamin, “the work of the topographical historiographer [is] to seize upon moments that are flitting from existence (86). “Only that historian,” Benjamin says, “will have the gift of fanning the spark of hope in the past who is firmly convinced that even the dead will not be safe from the enemy if he wins” (66). Benjamin ascribes significance to the “topographical historian” and their documentation of surface space in the face of eradicating forces. “Only that historian,” can give hope in the past under siege by the enemy. Writing in an era where the Southern Pacific was king and the only movement “the enemy” wished to recognize that involved Mexicans was southward expulsion, Ronstadt documents for a second time the transnational AT&SF and gives a historical account of the Railroad’s progress northward, the camp now at Imuris. However, this passage differs from the former. Ronstadt “seizes” upon another moment in his memory “flitting from [social] existence.” Acting as a topographical historian, he illustrates the AT&SF’s creation of Nogales, a trans-border, economically interdependent, municipal space shared by Sonora and Arizona that would not have developed without the transnational Railroad.68

Ronstadt’s adult memories further his restoration of transfrontera railroads. He historicizes his business, the F. Ronstadt Co., as one engaged in national and transnational ventures courtesy of U.S.-Mexican railways and clients in Sonora and Chihuahua. After achieving success in the first ten years (1890-1900) of operation, supplying wagons mostly to customers in California and Arizona, Ronstadt scaled his way back up the social ladder. A
rekindled member of the bourgeois, Ronstadt established business ties with friends, family
and Anglo-American investors and saw exponential growth in his business as a result.

Ronstadt writes:

By 1906, we had built up a good trade for custom wagons and other lines in
Southern Arizona and in the state of Sonora, Mexico. We had established an
agency in Cananea [Sonora] and also had subagents in Nogales, Hermosillo,
and Guaymas. Pepe [Rontadt’s brother] would travel over this territory and
made a good many friends and good customers. Our agent in Cananea,
Alfredo Pesqueira, a son of my godfather, General Ignacio Pesqueira, also
purchased 100 shares of our Treasury stock. … About 1906, Mr. William C.
Greene, the man who had developed Cananea to one of the largest copper
producing mines in the U.S., started to build a railroad from Chihuahua
toward Cananea. … He had in mind a separate transportation connection from
the eastern cities to Cananea through El Paso, Texas. We realized that a direct
line from El Paso through Chihuahua and Sonora to Cananea would place
Tucson at a disadvantage as a supply point. … We decided that El Paso was
the best location and we started a branch there … to retain trade. 69

His view of transnational railways in this passage noticeably contrasts with the cultural
intimacy he projected onto the AT&SF in his adolescent recollections. He speaks as a
capitalist, and if we take his words at face value, he evinces his own complicity with
transnational imperialism. Ronstadt illustrates his international business, at the time, is
spurred by the railroad-building actions of William C. Greene. Greene, perhaps just shy of
being a Yankee dictator, established a “fiefdom” at his Cananea copper kingdom, and several
years prior to 1906, Greene gave Ronstadt’s business one of its first substantial orders. That Ronstadt calls Greene “Mr.” and denotes him as “the man who had developed Cananea to one of the largest copper producing mines in the U.S.” indicates both Ronstadt’s respect for Greene and his disregard for Greene’s exploitive use of Cananea’s mineral wealth.

Yet, it is important to complicate Ronstadt’s spatial production according to the politics of his life and times. In his business’ advertisements, Ronstadt had to define The F. Ronstadt Co. according to his Anglo customer’s understanding and acceptance of the region as the “Southwest.” Although articles written about the F. Ronstadt Co. in the Spanish-language newspaper El Tucsonense hailed Ronstadt and his business as “una de las mas Fuertes en el Sur de Arizona … y en territorio de afuera inclusive el Estado de Sonora donde sus clientes son numerosos,” Anglo-run English-language papers, like The Arizona Daily Star situated Ronstadt as a “pioneering” Tucson businessman who achieved state-wide success. Ronstadt’s advertising campaigns obviously had a hand in perpetuating a Southwestern business identity to the English-speaking, Anglo public. But, Ronstadt also dissents from his former accommodations. Ronstadt states for the record, in English, that he and The F. Ronstadt Co. supplied a “territory” that transcended Tucson, state and national lines. He rearranges his business’ legacy away from the Southwest. In its place, he leaves a transfrontera legacy illustrating his American Dream was predicated on achieving a Mexican American Dream, as a bi-national businessman.

Unfortunately for Ronstadt the “Madero Revolution dislocated” [my emphasis] business in Mexico. But, this “dislocation” may have been seemingly for The F. Ronstadt Co., since Ronstadt advocates and legitimates smuggling in his memoirs. Colonel Fredrick A. Ronstadt advised his son to see that his life and conduct was such that would entitle him to
the privilege of American citizenship. Through his numerable municipal memberships, public offices, and his “Southwestern” serving wagon-shop and hardware company, Ronstadt established himself as a law-abiding American citizen and model capitalist, true as the red, white and blue U.S flag flying high atop the pinnacle of The F. Ronstadt Co.’s two-story brick building, an image he had printed on his business stationary’s letterhead. However, a son of the Pimería Alta, Ronstadt’s perception of economic space would not be dictated by national law. In what should be interpreted as a symbolic act that especially compliments his legitimizing smuggling between southern Arizona and Sonora merchants, Ronstadt writes his memoirs on the backs of his stationary. Whether this was a choice Ronstadt contrived consciously or unconsciously is of no account, since the act itself signifies a discursive about-face from nationally accepted forms of capitalism and commerce. It is here in this writing space, opposite the image of the F. Ronstadt Co. mounted by the U.S. flag, that Ronstadt shows his allegiance to the commercial welfare of the border. Where it would have been crazy for Ronstadt, a respectable merchant, to condone illegal commerce publicly, he uses the privacy of his memoirs to act on his truer motives to historicize and legitimate smuggling economies in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands.73

Two years after the U.S. Congressional ratification of the Gadsden Purchase, in 1856, newly minted Mexican Americans on the northern side of the boundary line and their fellow Sonorans lost the freedom to conduct unrestricted commercial trade, since “both Mexican and U.S. governments attempted to control burgeoning commerce and mining along the border” (Tinker Salas 85). Miguel Tinker Salas’ historical study provides an early Anglo/Mexican account illustrating how Anglo Americans and Mexican Sonorans circumvented the first customhouses. Tinker Salas notes an American collector at Calabazas,
Arizona complained about his inability to control contraband in a letter to his superiors in Las Cruces, New Mexico. According to the collector, smuggling “is carried on by all parties” (qtd. in Tinker Salas 86).

Adding to historical narratives expressing defiance toward commercial regulation between Arizona and Sonora, Ronstadt highlights the expertise, courage and wit belonging to those in the smuggling trade during the 1870s, however from a Tucsonense/Sonorense economic and cultural framework. Writing about his good friend and long-time business partner Rufino Velez, Ronstadt tells of Velez’s business ventures as a dry goods co-owner in Tucson and mentions that their main sales were made to merchants in Altar, Sonora, “who in those days,” Ronstadt writes, “used to transport their purchases in bundles covered in heavy white duck sewed tight to make them waterproof” (96). Explaining the finer details of bundle-making, Ronstadt continues:

They would use two-and-a-half yards of canvas for each bundle and would sell the canvas for sleeping cots. The merchants would charge 50 cents for the labor of making each bundle. Rufino was an expert at that and many days he would make twenty or more bundles. The bundles were made to weigh about 50 pounds so that a man on horseback could carry two of them on his horse. All these bundles of dry goods, shoes and all kinds of goods were smuggled across the Mexican line by expert horsemen. They had good horses, knew the trails away from the traveled roads, and were hard to catch by the Mexican customhouse guards. (96-97)

In addition to exposing how goods were transported and the physical process behind bundle-making in the late nineteenth century, Ronstadt’s recollections reveal the accustomed
cooperation necessary among Tucsonense merchants, horsemen and Altar merchants to side-step federal control in favor of a prosperous transnational economic alliance. Furthermore, whereas the Santa Fe Railway functions as a tangible historic tie unifying southern Arizona and Sonora, the unrestricted desert landscape Ronstadt evokes when he says the smugglers “knew the trails away from the traveled roads” operates as a reminder of the intangible, porous space granting economic fluidity in the borderlands and of the claims of prior occupancy namely by the Mexican horseman who now traverse the transfrontera soil. Therefore, he exposes, much like a photographic negative showing the light and dark parts of an image, the material and immaterial space uniting southern Arizona and Sonora. And, instead of peopling the border with late nineteenth century equivalents of border-patrolling “armies,” Ronstadt adds to his regiment of transfrontera parientes expert smugglers and their cohorts, whom he praises and legitimates:

The smugglers were considered legitimate traders. Most of them were men of great courage and the guards were not always anxious to encounter them. They had fine horses, good arms and friends among the ranchers. One of the outstanding smugglers was Damacio García. Several of his sons and descendants are living on the old ranch near Sasabe and in Arivaca. (97)

As in the previous passage, Ronstadt describes a communal network supporting contraband, but this time it is among the smugglers and the ranchers in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands. His remembrance of an indivisible Tucsonense-Sonorense community exhibits an ideological commitment to regional prosperity over respective national treasuries. Ronstadt’s proclamation that “smugglers were considered legitimate traders” profoundly indicates his and his fellow Tucsonense-Sonorense’s views on federal commercial regulation.
This statement legitimizes the smuggling economies of his transborder community and, by negation, makes illegitimate governmental restrictions by Mexico and the United States. This notion becomes most apparent when Ronstadt’s transfrontera communal smuggling alliance is placed within the history of La Zona Libre, Mexico’s free trade system implemented for its northern border states, which ironically catalyzed smuggling on both sides of the border and enraged government officials in the Mexico and the U.S. With unnerved U.S. federal policy makers and an irate Mexican interior lamenting losses (New York Times) “neither nation,” to borrow Daniel Margolies words, “could compel compliance in such a transnational quandary” (175). Ronstadt’s recollection of smugglers, perhaps better described as a commemoration of smugglers based on his honoring tone, clearly reinforces a transfrontera citizenry of Spanish-Mexican descents playing by its own definition of economic spatial legality.

Ronstadt is equally concerned with justifying the Mexican-American smugglers’ heroic existence, as he is concerned with validating the border economy in which they played vital roles. His explicit descriptions of Damacio García as an “outstanding” smuggler with sons and descendants residing “on a ranch near Sansabe and in Arivaca,” two locales on the Arizona side, situates the Mexican-American smuggler within a living transnational heritage, unlike the popular literature of Ronstadt’s day. Walter Noble Burns’ “Illiad of the Southwest,” Tombstone (1927), which has cemented southern Arizona within a popular national imaginary evoking the O.K. Corral, Wyatt Earp and Doc Holiday, exercises a particular ethnic rhetoric of riddance against people of Mexican descent, like its literary forebears. Many have addressed the veracity behind Burns’ lionization of the Earp clan and
demonization of the Clayton-McLowery clan, but far less has been said about Burns’ representation of smugglers and the spatial bounds he allows and disallows them to traverse.

When the Claytons are not feuding with the Earps, Burns demonstrates the Clayton clan’s own lion-like predatory prowess, with their penchant for killing Mexican smugglers. Drawing a racially calcified international boundary that describes Mexicans as the “dusky little people below the line,” Burns narrates Don Miguel Garcia’s (note the identical surname) exploits as the leader of a profitable smuggling expedition en route from Sonora to Tucson, until Garcia and his men cross paths with the Claytons stateside (122). For Burns, Mexican smugglers are naïve and no match for the quick drawing, “mountain lion-like” Claytons, who have notched nineteen dead Mexican smugglers and stolen $75,000 in Mexican silver as the result of one-sided ethnic carnage (104). On the one hand, Burns captures a Borderlands violence that Ronstadt’s memoirs largely omit, save for Ronstadt’s remembrance of Ildefonso Corrales. Corrales, a border-crossing, Sonoran wood-worker and Ronstadt’s employee, whose body, Ronstadt recalls, was “all scarred with bullet marks,” can be considered a manifestation of Borderman’s political unconscious regarding the transfrontera hardships endured by the working class (117). On the other hand, Burns continues in the tradition of Mexican-annihilationist narratives, as Tombstone assigns the role of a vigilante border patrol onto the Clayton clan, who successfully halts “Don Miguel Garcia” and his smugglers (contraband characters), killing off their smuggling ring and ridding their existence from the Arizona landscape.

Ronstadt’s memoirs contest Burns’ representation of failed Mexican smugglers by legitimizing Mexican-American smugglers’ skill, expertise, and above all their established livelihood in southern Arizona. Ronstadt’s commemoration of Damacio García, in particular,
reads like a heroic decree embodying features of the smuggling corrido, which mainly characterizes smugglers as courageous and showcases communal respect for their trade. Yet, defying even the smuggling corrido tradition, where the smuggler usually dies as a martyr, Ronstadt proliferates García’s descendents in the Sonora-Arizona borderlands, a truth crosschecked with the 1920 U.S. Federal Census that documents a Damacio García, his wife, and sons were living on a ranch in Arivaca, Arizona (U.S. Census).

For Ronstadt, proliferating transfrontera lives was of utmost importance in his reorientation of southern Arizona. His detailed documentation of his own border-crossing from Sonora testifies to his and the region’s transfrontera heritage. Such concerns evince why Ronstadt used his memoirs to make one final assertion against a hegemonic spatialization that hit too close to home. A reoccurring cultural nightmare that hounded Ronstadt throughout his life stemmed from a musical misunderstanding that led to his portrayal as a German “blacksmith musician” in the national media. Ronstadt records the incident in detail, which involved accusations of plagiarism and national composer John Philip Sousa, in Borderman:

[One] time a music teacher, Juan Balderas who played in our band, [Club Filarmónico Tucsonense] came in to show me a copy of piano music which one of his pupils had given to him. It looked yellowish and aged. The name on the cover was “Sirvase Ud. Pasar” [Please Come In] published by Wagner & Levin of Mexico City. The Music was a march written in 2/4 time, exactly the counterpart of the Washington Post March written by John Phillip Sousa, the well known band master of Washington. The Washington Post March had made a tremendous hit and Sousa was making a fortune out of it. Balderas
thought that the same march, only in 2/4 in place of 6/8 time, had been published in Mexico years before under the name of *Sirvase Ud. Pasar* and the name of the composer had not been printed in the copy.

While we were looking over the sheet, a young reporter of the *Arizona Star* came by and stopped as he used to do many times when passing by the shop. He was a friend of mine and joined in the comments regarding the music. I could not believe that John Philip Sousa could have used some one else’s music to publish it as his own, but the whole thing was puzzling. I suggested to Balderas to write Wagner and Levin and forgot all about it.

A few days later I received a copy of the “*Musical Courier*” published in New York with a paragraph copied from a Tucson newspaper relating that I had seen this *Sirvase Ud. Pasar* music sheet almost identical to Sousa’s march. The *Star* reporter had written a short ten or fifteen line news item about it and the New York magazine had copied it. It caused a bombshell in musical circles until Wagner and Levin of Mexico City gave the lame explanation that they had used the popular march as a souvenir to their patrons on the opening of their new store building. They had published this march for piano and whoever wrote the manuscript for them had forgotten the name of the march as well as the name of the composer.

The next thing was a short stereotyped article relating the incident and ending by saying that all the excitement had occurred simply because Mein Herr Ronstadt, a country band leader in Arizona, could not read Spanish.
This incident initially happened in 1896 but resurfaced in the *Arizona Republic* on February 2, 1942, in a column titled “Arizona: People, Places and Odd Things.” Ronstadt’s nephew, Rudolf Zepeda, thinking his Uncle “might be interested in reading it,” mailed him a clipping the day the article was printed (Zepeda). Portions of the article are as follows since both accounts demand a literary comparison:

The grave charge of plagiarism once hung over the head of John Philip Sousa, noted bandmaster, because of a piece of music which found its way into Southern Arizona from Mexico. He cleared himself of the charge; but for many years, because of it, Tucson evoked bitter memories for him. …

This is what happened: In 1892, Sousa wrote the “Washington Post March,” one of the most popular pieces of band music ever produced. Four years later Fred Ronstadt, one of Tucson’s prominent citizens, leader of one of two bands playing in Tucson at that time, and operator of a blacksmith shop, took to the editorial rooms of the *Arizona Daily Star* a sheet of music. It had an illuminated cover, and inscription on it in Spanish indicated it was a souvenir given away by a large music house in Mexico, D.F., on the occasion of its occupation of new and palatial quarters. The sheet of music bore no date. Mr. Ronstadt told the newspaper that he had received the music from a woman who was a resident of Mexico, D.F., and was present at the opening of the music house, in 1890.

Mr. Ronstadt’s interest in the sheet of music was that it appeared to be, almost note for note, Sousa’s “Washington Post March.” If this music had
been distributed in Mexico, D.F., in 1890, a strong finger of suspicion was pointed toward Mr. Sousa, the “March King,” …

The *Star* published the story, which was copied widely and was reprinted in the *Musical Courier*, at New York publication, with no comment except a suggestion that here was something worthy of Mr. Sousa’s attention and that a space would be given him for an answer if he cared to make one.

Mr. Sousa answered with a vigorous attack on the “blacksmith musician” of Tucson, and in the same issue the *Courier* expressed the hope that the mystery would be cleared up soon.

About two months later Mr. Sousa was cleared. A member of the Mexico, D.F., firm publishing the sheet identified its date as 1893, not 1890, and said readily that it was the “Washington Post March,” only slightly changed by his house for purposed of the souvenir. (Brinegar)

In each account, we must focus on cultural and spatial representation. That the *Arizona Republic* consigns this story to a column titled “People, Places and Odd Things” illustrates an Anglo-Arizona social structure literally at “odds” with the transnational cultural movement triangulating Sousa’s “March” from Washington D.C., to Mexico’s D.F., and into Ronstadt’s hands in Tucson. Furthermore, if we assign credibility to Ronstadt’s memoirs, both the *Star*’s original printing and *Republic*’s retelling are complicit in removing Professor Juan Balderas, a person of Mexican descent living in Tucson, and recasting his integral existence in the event as a female, native of the D.F. The eradication of Professor Juan Balderas from Tucson’s vicinity by the Anglo run press can be viewed as a destructive move, a journalistic rhetoric of riddance, against Tucson’s Mexican American community, since it erases
Tucsonense cultural presence from the story, southern Arizona, and the national consciousness. Lastly, Ronstadt’s account and the Republic’s showcase the power of continued cultural myth-making and identity construction according to a Southwestern frontier mythos upheld by the Anglo imaginary. The local story pinning “blacksmith” bandleader Ronstadt with “point[ing] a strong finger of suspicion toward Mr. Sousa” migrates eastward causing a national sensation upon reaching New York, where shortly after, according to Ronstadt’s account, a “stereotyped article” emerged blaming the event on a sensationalized version of himself. The national media typecasts Ronstadt’s identity based on his surname. The statement “Mein Herr Ronstadt, a country band leader, could not read Spanish,” over-represents his German heritage and, like the erasure of Professor Juan Balderas, strips Ronstadt’s Tucsonense cultural identity from himself and the Tucson landscape.

Faced with an omission of his Tucsonense existence, Ronstadt uses his memoirs to grant himself a discursive space extended only to Sousa at the time of the original event to answer back. Significantly, Ronstadt’s final concern does not fall with the plagiaristic charge, but the “stereotyped” misrepresentation of his cultural identity, making it clear he sought retribution (130). It is apparent his son Edward also wanted to vindicate his father from this wrongful cultural charge. In the published version of Ronstadt’s memoirs, Edward arranged this section as the conclusion, perhaps to leave the reader with a lasting and contrasting impression. However, in Ronstadt’s original manuscript, Ronstadt reveals this incident more toward the central part of his text, thus making cultural representation the literal crux of his memoirs. Both cases show culture is paramount. Consequentially, one will see that Ronstadt invests Borderman with a cultural charge that remaps his and Tucson’s identity. He reinstates
Mexican Tucson in the form of Tucsonense cultural spaces, which maintain strong ties to Sonoran/Mexican traditions.

Among his more personal vindications of Tucsonense transfrontera cultural space is Ronstadt’s remembrance of making his First Communion and confirmation at St. Agustín Cathedral:

During my first year in Tucson, Tía Chona saw to it that I made my First Communion and was confirmed. I was confirmed by Bishop Salpointe at the old St. Agustín Cathedral on Church Plaza. Part of the old building and the main cut stone entrance still stand. It is now used for a garage. This is a historical landmark that should be preserved. (80)

Ronstadt’s preoccupation with St. Agustín and its site “on Church Plaza” encompasses the Cathedral’s past, present, and future. In terms of St. Agustín’s past, Ronstadt, like so many other Sonorenses turned Tucsonenses, describes how he fulfilled his Catholic rites at the Cathedral after his immigration. Then, in what comes across as a sad but commanding tone, Ronstadt reflects on St. Agustín’s present state of decay and calls for futuristic change. He states, “Part of the old building and the main cut stone entrance still stand. It is now used for a garage” and asserts St. Agustin is a “landmark that should be preserved” (80). Like the previous sections attest, Ronstadt knew the region’s counter-history via lived experience, preserving family records and remembering stories of his parientes lives. Therefore, although he does not go into historical details asserting why St. Agustín should be preserved, it is reasonable to assume Ronstadt was knowledgeable of the Cathedral’s pre-national history and its significance as a Spanish/Mexican space that served a Catholic populous traversing the borderlands.
Cultural reclamation set within his first years in Tucson moves from religious preservation to nationalism. However, Ronstadt forgoes recollections of the Fourth of July in favor of documenting his first Mexican Independence Day celebration in Tucson. The militarized spatial discourse in the following passage is irrefutable:

My first 16th of September (Mexican Independence Day) 1882 in Tucson was celebrated with a great public feast. They had a number of floats in the parade, and a troupe of boys had been uniformed and drilled to act as a guard of honor to the queen and her court. I was a private in that troupe. The parade marched to Levin’s Park where the annual fiesta of St. Agustin was in full sway. ... The guard of honor was formed in a square along the back of both sides of the stage. The queen of the celebration and her maids of honor occupied the center and the members of the Junta Patriótica (the executive committee) and the speakers sat on the sides. (92)

Ronstadt’s remembrance of this performative act demonstrates how the Tucsonense public simultaneously upheld their Sonoran/Mexican national ties as they destabilized Anglo spatializations of Tucson. The ratifying stroke of President Franklin Pierce’s pen may have severed Tucson from Sonora in 1854, a mere twenty-eight years prior, but Tucsonenses and Sonoran immigrants replenishing Mexican culture in the city nourished Tucson’s southward nationalistic gaze. With regard to the performance itself, fittingly, Ronstadt’s description of the “uniformed and drilled” boys’ troupe that he partook, even if only a ceremonial “act,” opposes historical remembrances of Tucson’s takeover by U.S. troops. Where Mexican troops vacated Tucson to make way for occupying U.S. forces, Ronstadt’s boys “troupe” takes on the role of a troop marching around Tucson’s streets staging a Mexican national
reclamation of space, if only for the day (Sheridan 30, 1986). Moreover, Ronstadt continues this militarized reoccupation of Tucson with his description of Levin’s Park, the site at the parade’s end. Mexican celebratory forces occupy Levin’s Park, a public space used for U.S. celebrations, where just two years earlier in 1880 a welcoming banquet was held in honor of the Southern Pacific’s arrival (Roots Web). Ronstadt’s memoirs claim Levin’s Park as a Mexican/Tucsonense space where he, a “private,” the acting “guard of honor,” the queen, her maids, the Junta Patriótica, and the speakers publicly “occupied” the stage and its surroundings with a performance of patriotic significance to the Mexican public.

However, not all Tucsonense spaces are occupied without contestation in Ronstadt’s memoirs. Resentment and national rivalry, in the forms of Mexican and American allegiances, play key roles in the cultural space Ronstadt recalls during his time as a teenage laborer in his Uncle’s carriage shop. Ronstadt and his carriage shop mates, Santos Aros, Carlos Gastelum, Manuel Zuniga, and Irishman Frank O’Neil, were a crew of blue-collar young men who enjoyed each other’s company while vying for national superiority, as Ronstadt recalls:

Frank O’Neil, the horse-shoer, furnished the reason for sports. He loved to start contests of all kinds with us, wrestling, jumping, lifting weights, and sparring without boxing gloves, and using the fingers only for face slapping. … As a rule, he would lose most of the contests. He made a bet with us that the “Star Spangled Banner” was more melodic music than the Mexican National Hymn. I was to whistle the Mexican Hymn and he was to whistle the “Star Spangled Banner.” The rest of the shop boys were to be the judges. I whistled my hymn and, before starting the Star Spangled Banner, Frank
decided that he could not whistle as well as I and asked me to whistle his piece. I started it terribly out of tune to burlesque the music. Frank was so enraged when he realized my trick that he could not talk…. We all had a good laugh and paid no attention to his raging. (98-99)

Ronstadt’s recollections transform his Uncle’s carriage shop from a mere site of local commercialism to a culturally competitive space that stands in sharp contrast to other more accommodating American patriotisms in his memoirs. The quintet stakes national allegiances along Mexican and American lines, using national anthems to declare superiority, and by association one’s national loyalty. O’Neil bases his fraternization on competitive “contests” that desire to replicate Anglo superiority over Mexican peoples and culture. Although O’Neil and his shop mates share a similar economic status, hegemonic racial, cultural, and national forces in Tucson have pulled the Irish O’Neil toward a White identity and compelled his desire to make dominant the Red, White, and Blue. However, for Ronstadt, the spatial politics of this memory recapture his borderlands identity and uphold his Mexican/Sonoran heritage supreme. Within his Uncle’s carriage shop, Ronstadt puts on a bi-national exhibition, as he knows both national melodies well enough to perform. But in a show of national favor, Ronstadt’s patriotism resides with Mexico, as he purposefully botches the “Star Spangled Banner” in their whistling match, relegating the “raging” Irishman, O’Neil, to the butt of his joke. By the end of his recollection, Ronstadt turns his Uncle’s shop into a transfrontera social and cultural space where he, a bi-ethnic boy with the Germanic last name Ronstadt, can declare his allegiance to a transfrontera Tucson and the Red, White and Green.

Ronstadt’s adolescent recollections of Tucsonenses and their transnational cultural ties eventually culminate with remembrances of when he was in his early twenties leading
Club Filarmonico Tucsonense, the Arizona “country band” according to the national media (see figure 13). Ronstadt’s memoirs illustrate he was determined to get the final say to correct the rigid stereotypes fixing his band, his adopted city, and himself as podunk, provincial bumpkins.

Figure 13. Club Filarmonico Tucsonense circa 1890s. Ronstadt sits center with his clarinet. Rufino Velez, Ronstadt’s business partner, sits to Ronstadt’s left holding trombone. Richard (Dick) Ronstadt, Ronstadt’s younger brother, stands back row, center directly above Ronstadt.

Far from being a mere “blacksmith bandleader” conducting a “country band,” Ronstadt’s documentation of Club Filarmonico Tucsonense as an “institution” speaks to the cultural weight he believed the Club embodied as a representation of Tucson and Tucsonense
identity. As an “institution,” Club Filarmonico Tucsonense is one of Ronstadt’s most potent anamnestic weapons for writing Tucsonenses back into the Arizona landscape and establishing their dynamic culture. He describes a cultural mestizaje that illustrates how the transfrontera fluidity of the Sonora-Arizona borderlands came to define Tucsonense custom and practice. Ronstadt writes:

We would play for church socials, National holidays, Christmas, and New Year’s festivities, dances for our friends, and serenades gratis.

We would exact pay from political meetings and parades that would go into the band treasury. When we had accumulated several hundred dollars, we made a tour of Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Santa Monica, and Redondo (Calif.)…

One time we went to Nogales to celebrate a National holiday and remained there three days. We used to play for the dress parades of the Arizona National Guard and, before the Spanish-American War, our entire band joined the National Guard …” (126-127)

This passage emphasizes the Club’s bi-national movement as they fluidly performed within American and Mexican social spaces. Interestingly, Ronstadt’s trans-spatial discourse reflects a cultural defense mechanism noticed by Vélez-Ibañez. Peoples of Mexican descent embroiled in a struggle against oppression will “express many aspects of their condition and multiple dimensions of existence and culture” (213). Burns’ illustration of Mexicans as the “dusky little people below the line” dissolves when compared to the multiple dimensions of existence and culture Ronstadt retrospectively assigns Club Filarmonico Tucsonense.
Building on their multi-spatial performances, Ronstadt’s detailed expression of the Club’s genre-crossing musical repertoire also emphasizes a Tucsonense cultural identity in flux with other multinational cultural tides crisscrossing the Sonora-Arizona borderlands. He recalls that Club Filarmonico Tucsonense played “danzas, mazurkas, polkas, songs and serenades” (126). The danza, a creolization of Afro-European sounds originating in Puerto Rico, the mazurka, a type of folk dance deriving from Poland, and the polka, initially popularized in Central Europe, comprised a multinational musical base for the Club’s boundary-busting selections. A glimpse into the Club’s music archive shows they, nearly a century before Linda Ronstadt’s genre-crossing style, performed international songs that migrated into the Arizona borderlands. Sheet music for the Club and an inventory of some of Ronstadt’s original compositions entitled “Manuelita,” a polka, “Luchas del Alma,” a mazurka, and “El Fronterizo,” a schottische, indicates the transfrontera culture of the “Southwest,” a term that was surely a misnomer for Ronstadt. Ronstadt’s multidimensional expressions of Club Filarmonico Tucsonense shows their chameleon performance politics, which were a necessity for a historically transfrontera landscape where continuous connections with Sonora and the global heritages that migrated into the borderlands required the “Oxford Minuet” to split time with the “Mexican National Hymn,” and the “Japanese Polka.”

Upon Ronstadt’s death on December 13, 1954, the Arizona Daily Star ran a front-page obituary defining Ronstadt as a “pioneer Tucson businessman,” omitting nearly every trace of his transfrontera heritage. Firmly convinced that he in death “would not be safe from the enemy,” Ronstadt’s English-language memoirs remap Southwestern associations assigned to him and the southern Arizona landscape. Gloria Anzaldúa asserts that identity is
a “kind of stacking or layering of selves, horizontal and vertical layers, [a] geography of selves …” (238). On accounts of family, economy and culture, and his own self-identity, Ronstadt uses *Borderman* to challenge Arizona’s geography by especially enforcing the transfrontera “vertical layers” that combat against national geopolitics. Clearly his memoirs were a weapon to right the wrongs of the region.

Yet, rearranging the Southwest amid Arizona’s anti-Mexican environment was but one part of political concern mobilizing a Mexican American affront to the hegemonic rigidity of the region. Ronstadt, in his correspondence alludes to another. Telling a friend in 1952 about Tucson’s growth, Ronstadt remarks, “Tucson has grown like a mushroom.” In any prior era, a mushroom is simply a mushroom. However, a mushroom at this date conjures images of atomic and hydrogen bombs and the onset of national fear during the Cold War. It is in this era rampant with national fear, McCarthy hearings, and Reds to which the next Mexican American author exposes the undeniable transnational geopolitics of the south Texas borderland’s past, present, and future.
Chapter IV

Third Space Resistance in Américo Paredes’s *With His Pistol in His Hand* and *The Shadow*

In the early months of 1956, Don Américo Paredes began an arduous dual revision process. While he was revising his short novel *The Shadow*, he was also revising his dissertation, which would become the acclaimed Chicano text *With His Pistol in His Hand*. Both are works of social dissent that he initiated in 1952 and 1953 respectively, at the height of McCarthyism. Ever attuned to social, political, cultural, and economic matters, Paredes understood the conservative national atmosphere all too well, having witnessed the hypocrisies of democracy at home and abroad along with the rise of Communism in Asia, as Ramón Saldívar elaborates in *The Borderlands of Culture*. In a letter to Paredes dated February 18, 1953, his former army pal and lifelong friend Horst de la Croix, who was enrolled in a PhD program at UC Berkeley, expressed his frustration with the times, complaining to Paredes that “by the time I finally get my degree, the McCarthies will have fixed up the school system so that nobody but a third generation, true-blue American will be allowed to teach.”

There can be little doubt that Horst’s diagnosis of educational fascism rendered a collision of the past and present for Paredes. Indeed, attending graduate school during an era where suspected anti-Americanism could halt one’s ambitions had its similarities to the longstanding structural racism of the south Texas school system. Paredes knew that in the Lower Rio Grande Valley Mexican Americans, deemed Mexican or “the little Latins” (and thus un-American) in most Anglo eyes, were largely pushed out of the educational system by “a process of not-quite-so-natural selection” (*George Washington Gómez* 117). Lucky for
Horst and Paredes, McCarthy’s anticommunist campaign came and went, but the threat of an anti-Mexican atmosphere still remained, fueling Paredes to complete his dual attack on the “true-blue” academic pillars of the University of Texas and Texas legend. Unlike the previous Mexican American literary producers that comprise this study, Américo Paredes, as a collegiate scholar, challenged spatial constructions in the academic realm. *With His Pistol in His Hand* and *The Shadow* remap the Anglo geographic imaginary advanced by J. Frank Dobie and Walter Prescott Webb, two parts of the Texan “philosophical” trio at University of Texas at Austin.81

Indeed, the years preceding Paredes’s arrival at the University of Texas were as much about exerting hegemonic constructions over Mexican American cultural geographies as they were about establishing Texas and the Southwest in the academic realm. This environment did not cease while Paredes was a student. Webb’s “Great Frontier” graduate seminar was in its tenth consecutive year as a course offering, and although Dobie had been removed from his tenured position in the English department, his course “Life and Literature of the Southwest” was offered regularly by the time Paredes entered the University of Texas in the fall of 1950.82 The Anglo geographic imaginary was a curricular mainstay that proved unavoidable for Paredes. During the summer of 1954, while Paredes was researching for his dissertation and letting *The Shadow* cool from a round of rejections, he enrolled for the second time in “Studies in the Literature of the Southwest.” Although his advisor and dissertation committee member Mody Boatright taught the course, it can be nearly assured Dobie’s design influenced the study material.83 Because of Paredes’s exposure to Dobie’s and Webb’s geographic historicizing, the treatment of geographic space must be considered an influential factor in Paredes’s collegiate writings. Within this Anglocentric geographic
environment at the University of Texas, Paredes produced *With His Pistol in His Hand* and *The Shadow*, textual “fraternal twins” that spatially overturned Dobie’s and Webb’s “true-blue” construction of Texas, the Southwest, and the Frontier.

The majority of Chicano scholarship evaluating Paredes’s *With His Pistol in His Hand*, from Rámon Saldívar’s *Chicano Narrative* (1990) and José Limón’s *Mexican Ballads, Chicano Poems* (1992) to most recently Juan Alonso’s *Badmen, Bandits, and Folk Heroes* (2009), emphasizes Paredes’s narration of Gregorio Cortez and the elements of heroics and social conflict in his legend. Similarly, Chicana scholarship, such as Emma Perez’s *The Decolonial Imaginary* (1999) and Pavletich and Backus’s “With His Pistol in Her Hand” (1994), both of which inject an all-important feminist critique, continue to prioritize Paredes’s exegesis of the man, the legend, and the corrido. Paredes’s work is a mixture of anthropological, ethno-musical, and folkloric affairs that for many scholars can be summed up by Limón’s statement in *Dancing With the Devil* (1994): “*With His Pistol in His Hand* is a study of the life, legend, and corpus of ballads generated by the activities of one individual, Gregorio Cortez” (79).

However, in Rámon Saldivar’s *The Borderlands of Culture*, we get a new perspective on Paredes’s study. Saldivar writes, “His first and most important scholarly work, *With His Pistol in His Hand*, is as much about the borderlands of south Texas … as about the historical personage of Gregorio Cortez and the songs and stories recounting his legendary exploits of 1901” (35). Highlighting the terra firma, “the borderlands of south Texas,” Saldivar emphasizes that Paredes offered in *With His Pistol in His Hand* “a history of the U.S-Mexican border,” and he addresses Paredes’s conception of “Greater Mexico,” Paredes’s term for the transnational socio-cultural space uniting the Mexican republic with the México
de Afuera, which “is composed of all the persons of Mexican origin in the United States” (“Folklore of Groups” 3). Saldívar writes:

Rather than serving simply as celebrations of an achieved identity, Paredes’s writings from *With His Pistol in His Hand* forward continually urge an interrogation of what constitutes Mexican and American social space …

“Every Mexican knows that there are two Mexicos,” notes Paredes in one of his early essays. “One … is found within the boundaries of the Mexican republic. The second Mexico – the México de Afuera (Mexico abroad) as Mexicans call it – is composed of all the persons of Mexican origin in the United States” (“The Folklore of Groups” 3). The composite hybrid of these two Mexicos is what Paredes refers to as Greater Mexico. (37)

But, what Saldívar and Chicano scholarship largely overlook is Paredes’s underdeveloped definition of the term “Greater Mexico,” in 1956, in *With His Pistol in His Hand*. The “early essay” Saldívar cites as an example of Paredes’s development of the term, “The Folklore of Groups,” was written in 1966, ten years into Paredes’s academic career. Moreover, while Paredes argues in “The Folklore of Groups” that there are two Mexicos – a Mexican Republic and a “México de Afuera” composed of all the persons of Mexican origin in the United States – he does not assign this spatial concept a term. In fact, Paredes would not formally unite the term “Greater Mexico” with his transnational conceptualization of two Mexicos until twenty years later, in *A Texas-Mexican Cancionero* (1976). This belated definition gives cause to examine Paredes’s original conceptualization for “Greater Mexico.” Paredes initially uses the term “Greater Mexico” in part two of *With His Pistol in His Hand* to differentiate corridos developed by ballad makers from the “Lower
Rio Grande Border,” “the area lying along the river, from its mouth to the two Laredos” (7) from corridos originating in “Greater Mexico,” which he defines as “the area now comprising the Republic of Mexico, with the exception of the border regions” (129-130). At this juncture and in this text, Paredes was not concerned with using “Greater Mexico” in a transnational sense to unite Mexico de Afuera with the Mexican nation-state. Rather, Paredes uses “Greater Mexico” to distinguish geographically the interior states of the Mexican Republic to create a separate and insular space of corrido production occurring along the Border. *With His Pistol in His Hand* does urge an interrogation of space, but not the space of “Greater Mexico.”

On the contrary, it is Nuevo Santander, the Spanish province colonized in 1749 by José Escandón that straddled both sides of the Rio Grande to the north and south, at whose “heart,” according to Paredes, were “the towns and villages along both riverbanks” (7). An assessment of the “geography” or layout of Paredes’s text reveals that before Paredes engages with the legendary “El Corrido de Gregorio Cortez” in chapter II, he devotes his first chapter to “The Country.” But, by “country” Paredes is not referring to Mexican or American national space. Rather, he finds it more important to historically situate Cortez and corrido production within the pre-Anglo, pre-Mexican National geopolitical space of Nuevo Santander. Therefore, Paredes bestows significance to “the country” before the man and the legend by resurrecting the cartography and cultural geography of Nuevo Santander, a historical space of his familial ancestry that looms like a silent specter in the shadows of both Mexico and the United States, or more specifically Texas and Tamaulipas.

Though Paredes provides geographic and historic information about Nuevo Santander in *Pistol*, a more detailed understanding of the space under consideration is necessary. The
origins of Nuevo Santander can be attributed to the concerns New Spain’s viceregal authorities had about non-Spanish colonial settlements along the northeastern Gulf of Mexico (Osante 230). With their coastal frontier under threat by European rivals, the mid-eighteenth century marked an era of migratory flow toward this region of the Gulf from New Spain (present day central Mexico). The royal government largely moved away from a clerical driven mission-system to a family-based colonization project that would effectively settle the Seno Mexicano, as the northeastern territory between the mouths of the Panuco and Nueces Rivers was known (Osante 230). In 1748, viceregal officials granted José Escandón, a Spanish military man with many years of service to New Spain, authority over the project. Over the course of eighteen months, Escandón settled more than 500 families principally of criollo, mestizo, and mulatto descent, as well as sedentary Indians from the interior of New Spain, within the boundaries of the “new political administrative entity” named, by 1749, “the Colony of Nuevo Santander” (Osante 231).

The geopolitical parameters of Nuevo Santander ran approximately 500 miles from south to north, as it maintained the geographical boundaries of the Panuco and Nueces Rivers, and 100-200 miles inland from the Gulf of Mexico (Osante 231). Nuevo Santander bordered the previously established provinces of Tejas and Coahuila to its north, the province of Nuevo León to its east, and the intendancies of San Luis Potosi and Veracruz on its southern border. (See figure 14). Within a decade, Escandón moved 1,331 civilian families and 144 military families to the province (Osante 245). However, political insurgency within Nuevo Santander in 1821 resulted in a redistribution of regional governmental power and a nominal makeover by post-Independence Mexican national authorities (Andrews y Hernández 78). The 1824 Mexican Constitutional Congress renamed the province of Nuevo
Santander, the state of Tamaulipas, but kept intact its former boundaries. This geopolitical space retained its borders throughout the Texas Revolt of 1835-1836. (See figure 15). Not until after the Mexican-American War, in 1848, did Texas effectively lay claim to the lands extending to the north bank of the Rio Grande. Thus, the modern division between Texas and Tamaulipas had been constructed, which cartographically severed the century-old parameters initially established as Nuevo Santander.

Figure 14. This modern print from the Atlas of Texas most clearly distinguishes the 17th and 18th century boundaries of New Spain’s northern provinces. Nuevo Santander, like Coahuila, extended on both sides of the Rio Grande. (Used by permission of the University of Texas Libraries, University of Texas at Austin).
The current scholarly vacancy surrounding what amounts to Paredes’s defense of Nuevo Santander is in part due to Paredes’s very vocal directive interpretation of *With His Pistol in His Hand*. Paredes reveals to Rámon Saldívar, “… I was writing a brief. I was being an advocate for my people. Enough had been said about them negatively that I wanted to point to the exceptions …” (Saldivar 2006, 400). Indeed, Paredes was being an “advocate for [his people] by responding to a racist rhetoric that he was well aware of put forth by scholars such as Webb who saw the Mexican as a descendant of the Mexican Indian “whose blood, when compared with that of the Plains Indian, was ditch water” (125-126). Yet, despite Paredes’s insistent sole vindication of Cortez and lo Mexicano in general, one scholar clearly recognized Paredes’s attention to land and geography. Renowned folklorist Stith Thompson,
who was placed on Paredes’s dissertation committee in his final semester before graduation, 
detected the bearing geography has in the text. According to Paredes, “[Stith] liked the 
manuscript, probably because he saw something of his historic geographic method there. Not 
something that I like. But he said he was going to recommend the manuscript to the 
University of Texas Press for publication” (qtd. in Saldívar 2006 113). One can imagine the 
mild displeasure in Paredes’s tone when he disclosed his disfavor with Thompson’s 
identification of “his historic geographic method” in Paredes’s dissertation. It appears 
Paredes did not want his work to be associated with Thompson’s scientific methodology that 
“sought to trace the diffusion of folklore by mapping the spread of particular motifs” (Cotera 
246). Understandably, Paredes may have thought Thompson’s geographic method too cold 
and unfeeling in his charge to defend his people along the hot button issues of culture and 
race representation, but he may have consciously imagined the binary between culture and 
geography too deeply.

As the chronological layout of With His Pistol in His Hand shows, Paredes’s 
compulsion to “feel the materiality of [his people’s] presence in the cultural geography” by 
remembering Nuevo Santander is a charge in the text too great to be overlooked. José Limón 
has said With His Pistol in His Hand “is a corpus of work offering an unrepressed critique of 
past and present” (79). But, in Jamesonian terms, the text’s political unconscious (and 
Paredes’s) reveals otherwise. Because Paredes was exposed to and a student of UT’s Anglo 
expansionist course offerings, he may have internalized, particularly in his “Studies in the 
Literature of the Southwest” course, the geographic domination which is coterminous with 
Mexican American racial and cultural domination. That With His Pistol in His Hand 
demonstrates Paredes’s familiarity with Webb’s The Texas Rangers and The Great Plains,
and a slew of Dobie’s works (“Versos of Texas Vaqueros,” *Guide to Life and Literature of the Southwest*, *The Flavor of Texas*, and *The Mustangs*) indicates Paredes was not only knowledgeable of but bombarded with epistemic reminders of the Rio Grande as a geographic marker historically defining the boundary of Texas. With the production of Anglo national and state identity apparent in his readings, I doubt it is not too much to presume Paredes underwent what Sankaran Krishna calls “cartographic anxiety” (194). Krishna, citing postcolonial India, asserts:

> people who live along borderlines are wont to regard [the epistemic and physical violence] of nationality and territoriality as one more minefield to be navigated safely. … The encounters between the state and the people along the borderlines are suggestive of the contested and tortured production of sovereign identity. Ultimately, cartographic anxiety is a facet of a larger postcolonial anxiety…” (194)

State sanctioned spaces such as Fort Brown in Paredes’s hometown of Brownsville, Texas, served as a type of experiential encounter for Paredes that reminded him of the historic conquest, nationalization and division of his family’s homeland. However, attending graduate school three hundred miles north of the border may have proved no different as he encountered an epistemic violence in Dobie’s and Webb’s texts that further eradicated from history the cultural geography and cartography of Nuevo Santander. Regardless of Paredes’s disdain for the historic geographic method of situating folklore, remapping the region away from Anglo constructions of nation and state was an unconscious or, at the very least, unacknowledged priority.
Therefore, “unmasking” *With His Pistol in His Hand* as a “socially symbolic act” in which Paredes counters Anglo academic geography with Nuevo Santandereño cartographic, historic, and cultural geography exposes a third terrain in *Pistol*. Social theorists have used the concept of a third space to analyze the real and imagined social spaces that marginalized peoples have forged in reaction to hegemonic structures. Chicano scholarship, in particular, has adopted the concept to refer to Paredes’s transnational definition of “Greater Mexico” (the one scholars are most privy to).87 I have no qualms associating Paredes’s evolved definition of “Greater Mexico” as a third space. However, as I have asserted, in the case of evaluating the spatial politics of *With His Pistol in His Hand*, it would be wrong to claim “Greater Mexico” as *Pistol’s* third space because of the nationalistic definition referring to the Mexican interior that Paredes assigns the term in this text. Rather it is Nuevo Santander that Paredes forges as a third geopolitical entity in reaction to Dobie’s and Webb’s hegemonic spatial constructions. It is this often forgotten third space, not Texas nor Tamaulipas, not the United States, Mexico, nor “Greater Mexico” that Paredes resurrects and defends in *Pistol*.

In *Pistol’s* opening chapter, “The Country,” Paredes launches into a scathing criticism of what he calls “Anglo-Texas legend” proliferated by “the writer of history textbooks and the author of scholarly works” (16-17). Divulging reductive but nonetheless bitter truths (as far as generalizing Anglo-Texan representation of Mexicans in works published during the first half of the twentieth century is concerned), Paredes states Anglo-Texan legend may be summarized in half a dozen points, which I will cite from *Pistol* in full:

1. The Mexican is cruel by nature.

2. The Mexican is cowardly and treacherous
3. Thievery is second nature in the Mexican
4. The degeneracy of the Mexican is due to his mixed-blood
5. The Mexican has always recognized the Texan as his superior
6. The Texan has no equal anywhere (16)

In retrospect of Paredes’s comment that he was “writing a brief,” these points not only serve to chastise what Chicano/a scholarship has observed as the primary target of Paredes’s rebut, Walter Prescott Webb, but they also serve as an outline for defending Cortez’s moral character and demeanor. However, considering their placement in a chapter that dwells on cartography, we can add a seventh numeration to Paredes’s list. As Paredes understood and subsequently expressed at the level of his text’s political unconscious, Anglo-Texan “attitudes and beliefs about the Mexican” extended from myths about his character to the colonization and historicization of his land (15). While reading Webb’s *The Texas Rangers*, Paredes would have come across passages such as the following that historically cement the Rio Grande as a geographic and cartographic divide separating two nations, two cultures and two peoples:

> By the opening of the [Texas Revolution] the three races that were to struggle for supremacy were all present in Texas. The Indians held undisputed possession of the Plains; the Mexicans held the southwest with their line of occupation resting on the Rio Grande; and the Anglo-Americans, henceforth called Texans, had virtual possession of the timbered portion of the then Mexican province. (57)

In what would have been an infuriating read for any person of Mexican descent with roots in the lands south of the Rio Nueces extending to both banks of the Rio Grande, Webb
anachronistically claims the Rio Grande as an early-1830s geopolitical marker separating Texas from Mexico. Webb’s geo-racial imaginary assigns Mexicans a “line of occupation resting on the Rio Grande,” which cartographically effaces Tamaulipas, the newly christened name for Nuevo Santander and elides the fact that Texas’s southern boundary historically began on the north bank of the Nueces. For Webb, a dual-thinker, and others in his cohort ruled by this type of historical binary logic, there always existed a Texas and a Mexico, Texans and Mexicans, with the Rio Grande as a natural barrier dividing the two. Therefore, we may add seventh numeration to Paredes’s list of Anglo-Texan legend, one that weighs at the level of his unconscious:

7. The Rio Grande is the historic barrier between Texas and Mexico, dividing Texans and Mexicans.

However, of the two Texan “philosophers,” it is Dobie’s remarks in *The Mustangs*, a text that Paredes cites several times in *Pistol*, which may have more directly intensified his cartographic anxiety. Writing in his stylized brand of romantic regionalist folklore, Dobie tells the story of the “wild and free” mustangs that once roamed large swaths of the Southwest. Turning his cartographic eye to the land between the Nueces and the Rio Grande rivers, Dobie writes:

Long before [Jose Escandón and Spanish settlement], mustangs in the Rio Grande-Nueces River territory had by sheer numbers become the wonder of travelers. On maps of Texas drawn early in the last century this vacant space was marked “Vast Herds of Wild Horses” or “Wild Horses.” (100)

While Dobie acknowledges Escandón and Spanish settlement, the remark is culturally and cartographically hollow. Like Webb, Dobie wrongfully associates Texas geopolitics in the
early nineteenth century with the space between the Nueces and Rio Grande, and most ire-
arousing, describes a “vacant” cartography marked “Vast Herds of Wild Horses” that
obliterates Nuevo Santander and its settlements.

When reading *Pistol*, one notices Paredes refrains from rebutting Dobie as directly as
he does Webb, possibly because he did not want to anger Boatright, Dobie’s “good friend.”
Yet, in a continuation of his ridicule against Dobie that first appeared in *George Washington
Gómez*, Paredes’s cartographic resurrection of Nuevo Santander is a second “outlet” for
speaking against the “nice old fraud” (Paredes 2000). To paraphrase J.B. Harley in light of
Paredes’s writing moment, “Maps [were] too important to be left to cartographers alone”
(231).

Paredes defense of Nuevo Santander begins in his text’s first paragraph, where he
describes the province’s cartographic boundaries and historical establishment:

The Lower Rio Grande border is the area lying along the river, from its mouth
to the two Laredos. A map, especially one made some thirty years or forty
years ago, would show a clustering of small towns and villages along both
riverbanks, with lonely gaps to the north and the south. This was the heart of
the old Spanish province of Nuevo Santander, colonized in 1749 by José
Escandón. (7)

Deconstructing the cartographic perceptions of Anglo-Texas legend, Paredes historicizes
Nuevo Santander as the “old Spanish province … colonized in 1749” as he remaps the
“vacant space” Anglo imaginaries saw justifiably ripe for the taking. Supplanting Dobie’s
map that demarcated the region as Texan “Wild Horse” territory, Paredes puts forth his own
map that “show[s] a clustering of small towns and villages along both riverbanks, with lonely
gaps to the north and south.” This descriptive map functions as a third cartographic space that
Paredes writes into (and against) Texan academia. Furthermore, though Paredes’s
cartographic description contains great spaces of isolation, it is not vacant, since the
communities “along both riverbanks” comprise the “heart” of Nuevo Santander. Perhaps the
most decisive statement illustrating Paredes’s commitment to opening a tertiary space comes
a few paragraphs later as he provides a reason for the riverbank communities’ existence.
“Toward the middle of the eighteenth century” Paredes writes, “Spanish officialdom decided
that better communications were needed between Texas and Mexico City” (8). For Paredes,
Nuevo Santander is a go-between, occupying an in-between or third space joining Texas and
the Mexican interior.

With the map of Nuevo Santander intact, Paredes also refutes dominant notions of the
Rio Grande. Society is bound to the Rio Grande in Paredes’s remapping, as he makes it a
point to showcase the permeable nature of the Rio Grande with the small but significant
description illustrating “villages along both riverbanks.” Where the Rio Grande acts as a
historic line of separation in Anglo-Texan legend, Paredes’s map historically places the river
as a “heart,” not a periphery, of geopolitics. Furthermore, wild horses are replaced with the
chronological advancement of the Nuevo Santander/Rio Grande people (two terms Paredes
uses interchangeably) northward as the “colonists push[ed] into the Nueces-Rio Grande area
in search of pasturage for their rapidly increasing herds” (9). By 1835, according to Paredes,
there were “three million head of livestock in the Rio Grande-Nueces area” belonging to
rancheros like Don Blas María Falcón. However, the historic resurrection of Nuevo
Santander would not be complete for Paredes without correcting the historical buffoonery
concerning the division of this third space into the U.S. and Mexican nation-states. In
statement that is both historically revisionist and a calculating mockery, Paredes asserts, “After 1848 the Nueces-Rio Grande area – the northern half of the former province of Nuevo Santander – became part of the United States. A pre-Civil War type carpetbagger moved into the territory to make his fortune, using Texas legend as his excuse for preying on the newly created Americans…” (134). Paredes’s historically correct remark counters Webb’s and Dobie’s anachronistic imaginings of Texan jurisdiction over the former province of Nuevo Santander and adds a jab directed more so at Dobie than Webb. The glories of Anglo cowboys and ranchers who moved into the region mid-nineteenth century (like Dobie’s family) are reduced to carpetbagger ruffians using fraudulent legends an as “excuse” to prey on the properties of the landed.

Furthermore, it must be understood that Paredes’s geopolitical reestablishment of Nuevo Santander comes in two forms – cartographic presence and cartographic absence. Cartographic presence, or the physical descriptions Paredes uses to reinstate Nuevo Santander, such as the crossable Rio Grande with “villages along both river banks,” can be considered one maneuver for countering the Anglo Texan geographic imaginary to create a third cartographic terrain. However, cartographic absence, or what is omitted from Pistol’s geopolitical mappings, serves an equally important function in resurrecting Nuevo Santander from conquest and forgotten borderlands history. For example, in the previous excerpt, Paredes reveals that his ideal map showing “the heart” of the former province of Nuevo Santander is one “especially… made some thirty or forty years ago.” Considering Paredes wrote this statement at some point between 1955 and 1956 means he prefers a map designed in the early twentieth century. But, why would these years of cartographic production appeal to him? That Paredes does not divulge a reason for his cartographic preference in Pistol’s
opening paragraph indicates an unconscious geopolitical warfare at work. Paredes desires an early twentieth century map depicting the south Texas-Mexican borderlands because such a map would omit a number of Anglo-established townships along the north bank of the Rio Grande, including some that emerged during his boyhood (See figure 16). Towns such as Weslaco, McAllen, Pharr, and Sharyland, all founded in the first two decades of the twentieth century, were slow to be included in bi-national maps depicting the region. Therefore, in a seemingly unconscious act of counter-geopolitical erasure (and vengeance), Paredes prefers a modern map that leaves out as much as possible the municipal development resulting from early twentieth century Anglo migration to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. It is an effort to preserve his vision of Nuevo Santander despite twentieth century cartography.

Figure 16. Texas 1900 Railway Map. (Courtesy of the Library of Congress, Geography and Map Division.)
Likewise, when addressing the origins of folk music that led to corrido production, Paredes leaves out Texas and Tamaulipas:

The balladry of the Lower Border is practically unknown as a type in itself, having received to date but passing attention from the Texas folklorist and almost none at all from the Mexican ballad student. It is necessary … to show the place which *El Corrido de Gregorio Cortez* occupies in the Border ballad corpus. … During the first century on the Lower Rio Grande, the Nuevo Santander people must have sung their folksongs in forms other than the corrido. These forms evidently were the *romance*, the *décima*, and the *copla* or *verso*. … The Spanish *romance* was a preserved ballad form … It must have been brought to the Border by the first settlers in 1749. … Other romances, already Mexicanized, evidently came in from Greater Mexico (as we will call the area now comprising the Republic of Mexico, with the exception of the border regions), most probably during the century of border conflict. … Some Border *romances* show similarities to New Mexican variants, suggesting that during the Spanish colonial period there may have been a related ballad tradition in the frontier colonies of California, Nuevo Mexico, and Nuevo Santander. (129-130)

One would think, with regard to Paredes’s career-long interest in Texas-Mexican cultural production, that his removal of Texas from Border cartography is absurd. However, Paredes’s unconscious charge bound to the politics of third space representation associated with Nuevo Santander takes precedent in *Pistol*. For Paredes, “it is necessary to show the place which *El Corrido de Gregorio Cortez* occupies in the Border ballad corpus” (129), and
that “place” is neither Texas nor Mexico, but the historic space of Nuevo Santander. While his omission of Tejas or Texas from the New Spain’s historic frontier is startling, bearing in mind the historical amnesia of Nuevo Santander by dual-minded Anglo-Texan perceptions of the Border, it is yet another volley at hegemony. Paredes rewrites Borderlands history to include Nuevo Santander as a historical geopolitical body from which the “Border ballad corpus” derived. With regard to Stith Thompson, perhaps Paredes on some level realized he was doing more than mimicking Thompson’s historic geographic method. As this passage shows, Paredes was not merely “tracing the diffusion of folklore by mapping the spread of particular motifs.” He was tracing the diffusion of folklore by remapping the Borderlands.

This excerpt also provides insight on Paredes’s omission of Tamaulipas from Pistol’s geopolitical imaginary. While the Anglo geographic imaginary is the principal target of Paredes’s geopolitical unconscious, his censure of Anglo academia is joined in this instance by his disapproval of Mexican folklorists. He criticizes the “Mexican ballad student” alongside the “Texan folklorist” for ignoring “the Balladry of the Lower Border” making Mexican folklorists of his era, such as Vicente T. Mendoza, also culpable of folkloric negligence rooted in geopolitical erasure (129). Paredes recognizes that Professor Vicente T. Mendoza’s folkloric studies elide Mexico’s periphery as they “represent the broadside production from the populous and relatively sophisticated areas of central Mexico” (131). With Nuevo Santander not receiving attention as a historic geopolitical region of ethnomusical production from Mexican folkloric studies, Paredes seeks to revive Nuevo Santander from the Mexican nation-state. In order to open up Nuevo Santander as a third space of folkloric production, Paredes has to situate the history of corrido development in the Lower Border against Mendoza’s “central Mexico” folkloric territory, or what he terms at this
juncture “Greater Mexico.” According to Paredes, the Greater Mexican interior produces “Mexicanized” romances that arrive at the Borderlands a full century after Nuevo Santandereño and other frontera musical influences made their claim.

It is clear Paredes desires to construct a folkloric regional identity separate from “the populous and relatively sophisticated areas of central Mexico,” which is an erudite description of the Mexican interior that must be read with a grain of salt. Paredes’s praise of central Mexico as a “sophisticated” area should be viewed as sarcastic rather than sincere. Paredes, like many people of Mexican descent living along the U.S.-Mexican border, was privy to the geo-cultural hierarchy existing between Mexico de adentro and the frontera, in which the Mexican interior assumes traits of cosmopolitanism, high-culture and thus superiority over its peripheral and former peripheral regions. Much like Paredes’s authorial mockery of Francisco “Four Eyes” Lopez-Lebré in George Washington Gómez, a bourgeois character from Mexico who insists on using an uppity “Castilian” vocabulary that El Colorado and Gualinto call a “ree-fiy-ahned line of bull,” (183) Paredes’s statement is sardonic and shores up his antagonisms directed at “Greater Mexico.” In this vein, he elides the Mexican state Tamaulipas. As aforementioned, the Mexican Constitutional Congress exercised national control over the province of Nuevo Santander in 1824. While Mexican governmental authorities from the newly formed Distrito Federal left the boundaries of Nuevo Santander intact, they stripped the region of its largely autonomous governance. But, perhaps most significantly, the national power structure, exercising its proverbial “long-arm of the law” from the Mexican interior, stripped the region of its colonial name. Eliding Tamaulipas is a measure of geopolitical resistance aimed at the Mexican nation-state’s nominal erasure of Nuevo Santander. Essentially, Paredes refuses to grant historic folkloric
significance to a cartographic construction symbolic of the Mexican interior’s control. In this way, he fulfills his unconscious charge to defend a land forgotten.

With his dual critique of geopolitical negligence by Texan and Mexican folkloric study, Paredes calls attention to the balladry of the Lower Border. The Lower Border as a historic predecessor of the “heart” of Nuevo Santander functions as a third space of folkloric production in between Texas and Mexico. Furthermore, although Paredes does not say it outright, it is heavily implied that his scholarly identity is not Texan, Mexican, nor an amalgamation of the two. Like the Lower Border geopolitical imaginary he opens up in the realm of scholarship, Paredes insinuates a third identity separate from the “Texas folklorist” and the “Mexican ballad student.” As a specialist of Lower Border ballads, Paredes is a Border folklorist, and like the historical origins of the Lower Border ballads, he too has his foundations in Nuevo Santander as the grandson of “Nuevo Santander people.” Within this third space, Paredes carves a third society where men and women with Nuevo Santandereño roots exercise their human right to equality and justice.

For Paredes, then, it was not enough to reclaim Nuevo Santander on the level of cartography alone. His unconscious geopolitical maneuvers also involved reclaiming the historic geo-cultural identity of the people who lived this third terrain. With regard to Dobie’s “Wild Horse Desert,” Paredes replaces horses with gente, thus challenging and changing the spatial composition of the region from “what” dwelled on the land to “whom.” But, in order to build a cultural identity predicated on the “heart” of the region he esteemed, Paredes first had to assign the people of the land a name. As many scholars and students of Paredes’s poetic and fictional endeavors know, names are a significant part of how Paredes relays his interpretation of social and geo-cultural politics. One only need recall the naming
ritual of Gumersindo and Maria’s son in *George Washington Gómez*. After considering and dismissing names with religious and Mexican political significance, at his wife’s insistence that their son be named after “a great man,” Gumersindo suggests “Jorge Wachinton,” a “Gringo name” honoring an Anglo patriarch that María’s elderly mother unable to pronounce truncates and Mexicanizes into “Guálinto.” Guálinto’s nominal significance, as José D. Saldívar notes, is a “hybrid clash of geo-cultural identities [that] will be the very ground for the larger cultural clashes in the novel” (43). The geo-cultural identities represented in Gualinto’s name, which Saldívar refers to, are Mexican and American, or more specifically Mexican and Texan, since Paredes christens his work a “Mexicotexan Novel.” However, unlike the Mexicotexan identity Paredes assigns characters in *George Washington Gómez*, he uses a set of geo-cultural identifiers in *Pistol* such as “the Border people,” “the Rio Grande people, and “the Nuevo Santander people” to construct a third culture distinct from Texas and Mexico.

That the geo-cultural nomenclature in *Pistol* differs from Paredes’s other works, signals a geo-cultural affront unique to the text, which is one that, again, can be better understood by considering the Anglo-Texan academic conditions that stifled the existence of diverse Mexican geo-cultural constructions. To parallel Gertrude Stein’s recognizable modernist quip, “A rose is a rose is a rose,” for Dobie and Webb “a Mexican was a Mexican was a Mexican.” While Webb could differentiate between Indian groups like the “Kickapoos, Creeks, Cherokees, Kiowas and Comanches” in *The Texas Rangers*, Mexicans were one in the same (216). Similarly, for Dobie, any person with a Spanish surname living north of the Rio Grande was a Mexican.90 The problem with Dobie’s and Webb’s geo-cultural nomenclature lies with its solely national identification that overlooks the distinct regional
identities historically maintained by Spanish-speaking peoples in U.S. Southwest. Countering this homogenizing polemic, Paredes’s triple evocation of geo-cultural identities, which are predicated on a historic cartography (the Nuevo Santander people), modern geopolitics (the Border people), and a geographical feature (the Rio Grande people), defend in the name of the past, present, and environmental essence a third society of people that he names into existence. Using what appears to be an unconsciously formed trinity of geo-cultural identities, Paredes distinguishes the Nuevo Santander people and their descendants from other geo-cultural peoples of Mexican descent. The “fuereño” he writes, is an “outsider” from “the Mexican interior” who came northward, while the word “tejano,” he notes, “is used for the Texas-Mexican” (13, 20).

Paredes’s (geo)political unconscious makes one final affront against the two titans of UT and their Southwestern constructions. With a third cartographic space and a set of geo-cultural names to boot, he imagines a cultural geography specific to the Spanish-speaking peoples who resided at the heart of Nuevo Santander and their progeny. Cultural geography, or “the study of cultural norms and their relations to space and place,” has been an aspect in Pistol that a number of scholars have critically addressed (Bychkov). Renato Rosaldo emphasizes that Paredes “uses a nostalgic poetic mode to depict his Garden of Eden” where “manhood” could be “endowed with mythic capacity to combat Anglo-Texan anti-Mexican prejudice” (151). Similarly, Carl Gutiérrez-Jones maintains that Paredes “fundamental[ly]” stresses “the con-sensual purity and egalitarian nature of Nuevo Santander” (105). Rosaldo and Gutiérrez-Jones rightly bring up notions of patriarchy or hyper-masculinity and seemingly unsullied egalitarianism to describe the cultural “norms” Paredes endows the “Rio Grande people” of Nuevo Santander. Statements like “the simple pastoral life… fostered a
natural equality among men” (10) show Paredes neglected historic social upheavals such as those outlined by Catherine Andrews and Jesús Hernández’s “La Lucha por la Supervivencia: El Impacto de la Insurgencia en el Nuevo Santander, 1810-1821.”

Yet, Paredes, ever conscious of a writer’s rhetorical situation, offers a logical explanation for his “nostalgia”:

… Renato Rosaldo … thinks that my book comes up short … he feels that I have idealized the community from which my people came on the border. What bothers me about Renato Rosaldo’s discussion is that in the first place, he forgets that I was not writing an autobiography like [Ernesto] Galarza … I was writing a brief. … I was being an advocate for my people. Enough had been said about them negatively. (qtd. in R. Saldívar 70)

Paredes counters Rosaldo’s remarks, but does not recognize the geographical impulse within Rosaldo’s criticisms just as he does not consciously recognize his advocacy for the land in conjunction with his people. It is left up to the scholar interested in the unconscious workings of *Pistol* and its author to decipher why Paredes would create a “Garden of Eden” before addressing the man “with his pistol in his hand.”

Webb’s and Dobie’s texts, especially the collection of texts cited in *Pistol*, when considered collectively, largely create a cultural geographic imaginary that pits culturally superior Anglo spaces against culturally inferior Spanish/Mexican spaces. Dobie, for instance, in *The Mustangs*, hails that the civilizing advancement west of the Missouri was due to frontiersman and cavalrymen who were “horsed” (271). According to Dobie, “booted rangers and sheriffs expressed the Age of Horse Culture while bringing law to the frontier…” (272). In the way of cultural geography, Dobie’s statements imply that civilization and law
are cultural norms existing within a frontier geography that is a consequence of Anglo horsemanship. Interestingly, Paredes realized Anglo academics were binding progressive cultural ethics to external influences. In the opening pages of *Pistol*, he writes, “Much has been written about the democratizing influence of horse culture” (10). Some scholars have judged Paredes’s statement as a declaration on his part to “focus on the exclusively male domain of horse culture” (Cotera 23). However, this statement should also be read as an astute observation. Paredes was aware that Texan academics were accrediting Anglo horsemanship on the frontier to building a culture of democracy. And, as evinced in *Pistol*, he was equally aware that Texan academics were ascribing horsemanship among Border Mexicans to be the driving force behind a culture of thieves.

In the following excerpt, Paredes lambasts folklorists for their unjust, thieving characterizations of the Border Mexican:

> The picture of the Mexican as an inveterate thief, especially of horses and cattle, is of interest to the psychologist as well as the folklorist. The cattle industry of the Southwest had its origin in the Nueces-Rio Grande area, with the stock and the ranches of the Rio Grande rancheros. The “cattle barons” built up their fortunes at the expense of the Border Mexican by means which were far from ethical. One notes that the white Southerner took his slave women as concubines and then created an image of the male Negro as a sex fiend. In the same way he appears to have taken the Mexican’s property and then made him out a thief. (20)

The characterization of Border Mexican culture as one of “inveterate” thieves exists among numerable examples in Dobie’s and Webb’s texts.91 Each primarily paints the Rio Grande
region of south Texas as a geography historically and culturally defined by Mexican lawlessness and thievery, and Paredes, privy to such “scholarly” bias, sought to point out the ironic falsity in their ethnic-cultural “interests.” He provides a revisionist history of the south Texas border and offers a regionally comparable example of white/Negro relations in the Old South to drive at the incongruous cultural depictions of Border Mexicans cemented in deep in the heart of Anglo Texan folkloric and historic discourse. Paredes is correct when he argues that he advocates for “his people,” yet, this excerpt makes clear that geography is not divorced from his vindication since people and place/space merge into one entity, or rather one cultural geography.

The early pages of *Pistol* reveal Paredes, on a level not too far removed from his conscious psyche, understood the troublingly dichotomous cultural geographies apparent in Texan folkloric study that glorified the Anglo frontier as a space for burgeoning democracy and denigrated the borderlands of south Texas as its geo-cultural antithesis. Therefore, in addition to, but not separate from Paredes’s cartographic anxiety, is a cultural geographic anxiety, which Paredes relieves by defending his “heart” of Nuevo Santander (the modern day south Texas borderlands). He rewrites the cultural norms of the Rio Grande region, replacing a cultural geography akin to an anti-democratic den of thieves with what some scholars have interpreted as a “Garden of Eden.”

As aforementioned, Paredes does take some liberties reimagining the historical culture of south Texas. At one point, he states that the Rio Grande region of Nuevo Santander gave rise to nearly non-existent social hierarchies because “on the Border the landowner lived and worked upon his land” resulting in “almost no gap between the owner and his cowhand” (10). Naturally, Paredes’s blissful cultural geographic musings of a patriarchal paradise have
drawn the criticism over the years; however, nostalgia did not fully get the better of his (geo)political unconscious. Paredes checks his Edenic cultural imaginings when he expounds:

This is not to say that there was democracy on the Border as Americans recognize it or that the average Borderer had been influenced by eighteenth century ideas about the rights of man. Social conduct was regulated and formal, and men lived under a patriarchal system that made them conscious of degree. (11)

Providing an example of a Nuevo Santandereño culture “conscious of degree,” he tells the story of Juan, “the peon who knew his right” (11). According to Paredes, Juan “not only outwitted his landowning employer but gave him a good beating besides, so that the landowner afterward would never hire a peon who “walked like Juan” (11). This simple but significant folk story shows Paredes was aware of a hierarchical patriarchal system replete with social stratification, discord, and the possibility of rightful dissention by those occupying the lower rungs of the social scale. He was not entirely “clouded by a rosy haze of romanticism,” to borrow a phrase from Paredes.92 Therefore, Paredes’s cultural geographic imaginary for Nuevo Santander is less a “Garden of Eden” and more a regional geography where the cultural norm historically involves exercising justice in defense of one’s rights.

As Paredes delineates, one’s rights vary and the justice one seeks depends on the social context of the situation. In the case of Juan “the peon,” he subverted his landowning employer (haciendado) assumingly because his employer denied him his most basic rights as a human and employee. However, Paredes also brings forth the case of Juan Nepomuceno Cortina’s mother. In what can be considered a feminist pulsation in *Pistol*, one that
complicates sole patriarchal authority, Cortina’s mother exercises the right to discipline her adult son after he “deserted his wife,” which was an act that “set him at odds with his mother” (12). Before mother and son reconcile upon his return to the south Texas borderlands from the Mexican interior, Cortina “handed his mother his riding crop, and, as he knelt before her, in the presence of his officers, she whipped him across the shoulders” (12). The rights of familial matriarchs are observed and respected in an incident which Paredes declares “was far from being an isolated case” in the south Texas borderlands (12).

Lastly, Paredes discusses how Cortina exercises his right to justice during the era of “American authority” and the “newly created border” in a final example showcasing the socially transmitted behavior patterns of the region. Far from Dobie’s characterization of Cortina in *A Vaquero of the Brush Country* as “the Red Robber of the Rio Grande” (note the thieving cultural geography apparent in his description) who was “the most elusive Mexican bandit … so ignorant he could hardly sign his name,” Paredes offers a different view (49). Like mother like son, in the sense of defending rights, Cortina “was forced into open conflict with American authority after he shot the Brownsville city marshal, who was mistreating a servant of Cortina’s mother” (134). But, the major difference between mother and son, as Paredes makes them out to be with a return to Mexican masculine discourse, is that Cortina was the “first Border Mexican to fight for his right with his pistol in his hand” (134). Phallocentric weaponry aside, Paredes places Cortina within a historic cultural geography where the defense of one’s rights in the face of hegemonic transgressions is paramount over Edenic patriarchal nostalgia. It is this third cultural geography, neither the Texan frontier nor the Mexico, where men, women, peon, and landowner can, if strong in character, exercise
their right to justice, which Paredes firstly defends before advocating for Gregorio Cortez in a move that positions land before the legend.

*Pistol’s* establishment of a third-space Nuevo Santander cartography and cultural geography in the face of Anglo-Texan academia can be described as an ultra-regional effort, especially when compared to its fraternal twin *The Shadow*. While Paredes was mounting his conscious and unconscious defense of the historical south Texas Borderlands and its people from elision in his dissertation, he was simultaneously writing *The Shadow*, a novella set largely in the modern, globalized Tamaulipas borderlands, that challenges the dominant geopolitical outlook put forth by some of the more acclaimed Anglo Texan academics of his day. However, before addressing *The Shadow’s* spatial retort, it is necessary to bring to light the critical story behind *The Shadow’s* initial failed publications as a means of better understanding its “greater” geopolitical structure.

Considering the scope and output of his career, Paredes wrote with an unprecedented rapidity during his final six months as a graduate student as he feverishly aimed to complete *The Shadow* alongside *Pistol*. Just as he was preparing his “formal” dissertation to go before a committee of folklorists and historians that included Mody C. Boatright and Stith Thompson, Paredes prepared *The Shadow* to go before another committee of UT creative writers who would judge the annual winner of the University’s D.A. Frank Novel Contest. After having *The Shadow* rejected by publishers in 1953, which included Boston’s Houghton Mifflin Company and the Dallas-based *Southwest Review*, for Paredes, the Spring of 1956 brought yet another chance at vindication, albeit this time on the frontlines of his creative pursuits.93 Taking the 15,000-word “long story” that lay dormant for nearly three years, Paredes began “reworking” the original draft of *The Shadow* over the Christmas holidays of
1955 and completed a chapter a day during the first week, stopping only to spend Christmas Day with his boys. By the end of January 1956, Paredes, who averaged “about four thousand words a day” despite teaching and interviewing for jobs out-of-state at the start of the Spring semester, completed the first draft of *The Shadow* in its expanded form. Enduring nearly three “cruel” months of intense “work and worry,” Paredes submitted *The Shadow* on April 19, and one month to the day, on May 19, Paredes learned he was the winner of UT’s Novel Contest.

Unfortunately for Paredes, vindication at the level of external recognition was short lived. *The Shadow’s* newfound acclaim within the University of Texas did not resonate with Northeastern publishing houses, as Paredes’s procured literary agent J.F. McCrindle unsuccessfully pitched the novella to Scribner’s, Dial, Macmillan, Harper’s, Putnam’s and a host of other New York-based publishers. By August of 1957, with his efforts exhausted, McCrindle wrote Paredes, “It is a real sadness to be sending back *The Shadow* after all this time. It is very disappointing not to have sold it.” Critics levied against *The Shadow*, which McCrindle passed along to Paredes, echoed similar dissatisfactions. That the main character was “not very interesting,” the plot too “narrow,” and the novella on the whole “seem[ed]… to lack color and drama” bespoke an overall disinterestedness candidly summed up by a Harpers publishing rep, “… we don’t think it’s something for our list…we’re worried about the market for it.”

Trying to find a publisher for *The Shadow* in an era where “the Western” predominated the national literary market proved McCrindle’s task a lost cause from the start. Paredes’s modern borderlands fiction set in twentieth-century Tamaulipas was the antithesis of the highly structuralized traditional Western literature saturating the market
during an era that many Western aficionados hail “the Golden Age of the Western” (Fagen).

Some of the more prominent marketable Western writers of the 1950s, such as William MacLeod Raine, Jack Schaefer and Louis L’Amour furthered literary archetypes established by Zane Grey and Andy Adams earlier in the century. The archetypical main character that publishers deemed marketable and therefore “interesting” was primarily the Anglo cowboy or pioneersman, unlike Paredes’s “not very interesting” main character Antonio Cuitla, a Mexican “mestizo” in his forties with “much Indian ancestry” (2). In terms of temporality, Western literature of the mid-twentieth century transported its nostalgic readership to the nineteenth century, which was historically and narratively imagined as a time when the Nation was young and where the land west of the Mississippi was readily available (for the taking) by hardy pioneer folk.

Yet, it is the notion of an imagined geography that deserves equal, if not more, consideration when questioning why The Shadow was essentially deemed unmarketable. As the name of the genre defines, traditional “Western” literature stipulates that the geographic setting of its plot either be situated in a western locale or uphold a westward movement within the boundaries of the U.S. nation-state. In other words, the east-to-west national axis of Manifest Destiny must be maintained. Contrastingly, The Shadow’s Mexican borderlands setting in extreme northern Tamaulipas combined with its south-to-north transnational trajectory of events and character movement upset the archetypical space of the marketable literary Western.

Perhaps the best iteration of The Shadow’s spatial “problem” comes from a rejection letter Paredes received in 1953 from the Southwest Review. Assistant Editor Margaret Hartley “read [the] story with much interest,” but citing the length of the story, told Paredes
“we are simply unable, with the **space restrictions under which we labor** [my emphasis], to handle anything of this length.” *The Shadow*, in its original 15,000-word form, may have exceeded the *Southwest Review’s* word count, but an oddity arises. If Hartley found *The Shadow* interesting, why did she not offer Paredes the chance to revise it to a more appropriate length? This inconsistency allows for the possibility to interpret her words figuratively and to therefore read “the space restrictions under which we labor” as a remark connoting the idea that the *Southwest Review* was restricted to literature set in the spatial parameters of the U.S. Southwest. The space under which Paredes labored defied Anglo nationalistic parameters. As Paredes’s defense of the historic space of Nuevo Santander in *Pistol* shows, Paredes’s geopolitical imaginary was one attuned to longitudinal directions that superseded present national borders. Likewise, the following synopsis of *The Shadow* reveals Paredes’s twinned literary production does so as well, but to a far “greater” extent.

Set in the borderlands of Tamaulipas during the late 1930s, *The Shadow* details the demise of Antonio Cuitla, the president of an ejido or communal farm named Los Claveles where he oversees his fellow “comrades” of the Mexican peasantry. As the novella divulges through sporadic flashback, Cuitla’s leadership role evolved over decades, which bears summary as it showcases the reason for his ascension and the root of his downfall. Born in an unnamed Mexican village away from the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, Cuitla runs away to Texas escaping the hurt of his father’s death and the “disgust” he feels towards his mother after witnessing her incontrollable wailing at his father’s wake (56). As a “Mexican peon turned migrant laborer, who looked across the Border for a better life,” Cuitla gets “most of his education in Texas,” where he rids himself of “many ignorant ideas” as he is exposed to “talk of revolution” by “men of his sort” while working in the “cotton fields and coal mines”
Paredes reveals that Cuitla “had killed God long ago,” and in all probability, Texas was the space of His riddance (62). A mere cog in the transnational capitalist circuit bringing cheap labor from Mexico northward in the early twentieth century, Cuitla learns socialist, or perhaps more accurately described, Marxian-inspired communist ideologies, which grant him an air of intelligence, authority, and superiority when he returns to Mexico. Cuitla becomes a squadron leader under Villa’s Division of the North during the Mexican Revolution, he leads a troop of men against the Cristeros, and after revolution and war; he is the jefe of the ejido (agrarian reform community) of Los Claveles. Believed to be an “emancipated man, free in body and mind, no slave to either master or priest,” Cuitla recalls telling the community of Los Claveles in vain that religion is “the opium of the people” (45, 65). Unable to surrender their “songs and tales” and their rituals and religion, Cuitla deems them ignorant, “like children” (6).

Cuitla’s perceived rationality over the people of Los Claveles is heightened by Don José María Jiménez, a member of the local hacendado class whose lands are in jeopardy. Jiménez has retained the most fertile lands that rest along the southern bank of the Rio Grande and strokes Cuitla’s ego in hopes of quelling the Los Claveles community from seizing his lands, so he may keep acreage that has both sentimental ancestral value and burgeoning material value sparked by American capitalist interests. Cuitla ignorantly sides with Jiménez and plans to kill his longtime comrade turned rival Jacinto Del Toro, who, in the name of revolution, calls for the seizure of all private lands in the area. But, unbeknownst to Cuitla, Jiménez hires an assassin out for his and Del Toro’s lives. While Cuitla rides on horseback to kill Del Toro, he encounters “a shapeless mass of black rising out of the middle of the road, where no shadow should be” (10). Angry for succumbing to a fear of the
supernatural, Cuitla nonetheless remains startled and manically fires his gun into moving brush, killing hired assassin, Gerardo Salinas, who set his sights on Cuitla after murdering Del Toro minutes before. As the novella progresses, Cuitla tries to reconcile rationality over the possibility that the black mass was the newly deceased Del Toro trying to warn him, but fails. Cuitla develops fright sickness or “susto,” but because of his disgust for religious folk customs and ritual, he refuses treatment from the communal healer. By the novella’s end, Cuitla, who descends into madness, lays on his deathbed and learns from Jímenez that the ejido system is also reaching its end, as communal lands will be dissolved for capitalist enterprise.

Chicano scholarship has addressed *The Shadow’s* transnational plot and offered interpretations that historicize and politicize the bi-national U.S.-Mexican relations, which attribute to the novella’s meanings. Juan Alonso, Alicia Camacho, and Ramón Saldívar appropriately situate *The Shadow’s* spatial imaginary within the transnational scope of “Greater Mexico,” as Paredes would come to define it in 1976. In 1956, “Greater Mexico” in *Pistol* was no more than a terminological buttress to differentiate Paredes’s heart of Nuevo Santander from the Mexican interior. But, we may say that *The Shadow* was Paredes’s first lengthy canvas and testing ground for working out the root of “Greater Mexico” in its evolved form, as a transnational third space uniting the shared experiences of the Mexican diaspora. Unlike its ultra-regional fraternal twin, *The Shadow* considered a contemporary group of lo Mexicano, the “rural and semi-rural immigrant,” who accommodated to new forms of capitalist modernity, in the 1930s, which moved them across “an imaginary line divid[ing] México de Adentro from México de Afuera” (“The Folklore of Groups” 6).
The role transnational capitalism plays within the space of “Greater Mexico” in *The Shadow* has also been a favorite critical subject of Chicano scholarship. According to Alonso, Cuitla’s pre-revolutionary migration to and from Texas to partake in the cotton season “illustrates capitalism’s organization of its resources” on a transnational scale (107). To illustrate Alonso’s point, Cuitla and the other “men of his sort,” presumably men of Mexican descent from the U.S. and Mexico, who are simultaneously driving and being driven by capitalist modernity, cohabit and traverse a space that defies a predominate east-to-west national and economic orientation. Furthermore, with regard to the post-revolutionary socioeconomic outcome of the Los Claveles community, Camacho best surmises the “Greater Mexican” politics of *The Shadow’s* inconclusive ending. Considering that Del Toro is dead, Cuitla is on his deathbed and their communal lands are being transformed into use for capitalist agribusiness, Camacho states that the “ejidatarios of *The Shadow* are “not so much new national subjects as future emigrants” traversing a fluid space carved from the U.S.-Mexico nation-states (100).

However, as my synopsis reveals, capitalism is not the only ideological and socioeconomic institution traversing *The Shadow’s* “Greater Mexican” space. It cannot be overlooked that amidst the privatization of land that transforms Los Claveles exists Cuitla, a communal leader trying in a failed attempt to inspire his “comrades” to understand that religious folk culture is “the opium of the people.” Why would Paredes endow Cuitla with Marxist ideology by paraphrasing one of Karl Marx’s most recognizable statements? Angie Chabram-Dernersesian reminds us that “it is important to remember that not only people but *ideas* cross Mexican-American borders” and that “it is doubly important to scrutinize those intellectual movements that cross state-sanctioned borders…” (263). Paredes infuses *The
Shadow with two competing “ideas” – Marxism and capitalism – that run the course of “Greater Mexican” space. The seeds of Cuitla’s Marxist mindset are planted in Texas, where he gets “most of his education” from men of his proletariat sort and learns to “kill God.” Cuitla takes these ideas back to Mexico and exercises them in revolution, against the Catholic Church in the Cristero Wars and to no avail within the communal farm of Los Claveles, where ultimately he, a personification of Marxist thought, dies. Likewise, the transnational forces of U.S. capitalism that drew Cuitla and other Mexican laborers northward prior to the revolution invade Tamaulipas by The Shadow’s end. Land and people are transformed as communal ejidos will be turned into large-scale agribusiness and “comrades” will become the transnational proletariat of “Greater Mexico.” For the sake of scrutinizing Paredes’s geopolitical production, what may we make of the Marxist ideology traversing The Shadow’s “Greater Mexican” space alongside capitalist expansion and ideological infiltration? Why would Paredes infuse The Shadow’s “Greater Mexican” spatial construction with two competing ideologies, where one – capitalism – triumphs over the other? If we consider Paredes’s Cold War environment and Anglo spatial construction in the form of Walter Prescott Webb’s magnum opus The Great Frontier, a potential rationale develops.

As I have argued, Paredes was immersed in an academic environment at the University of Texas that epistemologically distorted or eradicated the centuries-old longitudinal cultural geography and cartography belonging to those of Mexican descent. Dobie’s “Southwestern” works and course-development denigrated historical cartographies and cultural geographies of the Mexican body politic on a national level, as his Anglo “Southwestern” spatial production was limited to the imaginings of the United States. Webb,
on the other hand, had expanded his regional and national spatial production during his tenure at the University of Texas to consider Anglo and thereby Eurocentric geographies on a global scale.

In 1952, Webb subjected his frontier thesis in *The Great Plains* to a hemisphere-wide analysis.98 *The Great Frontier*, a work almost fifteen years in the making that bore the same name as Webb’s Great Frontier graduate seminar, presented a history of global movement westward. Like nostalgic “Westerns” of literature and television recollecting vast expanses of land, Webb pontificated about earlier eras of plentifullness. He argued that the expansion of European civilization between the fifteenth and twentieth centuries into the Western hemisphere energized a static society and made possible fundamental institutions of the modern era such “democracy, individualism, and capitalism” (413). This “boom hypothesis,” as Webb called it, flourished so long as the “Great Frontier” (the Americas) remained open and westward lands were available for the taking. But, Webb’s historical optimism was only half the tale, since his historicizing of space was a sign of his times.

Webb states, “that the frontier closed in the period between 1890-1910” (413). Furthermore, he contends that the closure of the global frontier and the end of westward expansion are responsible for the crisis and violence of the twentieth century. The rise of Stalin, Red China and the spread of Marxist ideologies in the form of communism across the global map, coupled with a national atmosphere of McCarthy-driven fear, undoubtedly factored into *The Great Frontier*, since it reflected the Cold War anxiety of its era. For Webb, if the availability of land in the “Great Frontier” correlated to the prolongation of “democracy, individualism and capitalism,” than the end of this east-west expansion signaled their death knell. As William D. Rowley puts it, Webb’s “Great Frontier” thesis maintained
the compulsion to transform “into an allegoric manic-depressive psychosis,” since Webb was “haunted” by the persisting question of his generation: “How can democratic government be sustained without the frontier of wealth?” (xii-xiii). To consider the socioeconomic conditions of Webb’s unease (or disease as I will explain shortly), an equally resounding issue that haunted Webb dealt with the sustenance of capitalism without the “frontier of wealth.” It appears *The Great Frontier* succumbed to a fright sickness or “susto” of its own invention that was incurable. Lauding the “Great Frontier” as one of its kind, Webb devotes an entire chapter to “The Fallacy of New Frontiers” and asserts that “there is no plural for frontiers,” only the “illusion” that frontiers exist elsewhere (283-284). Ironically, it was Webb who held on to illusions binding the “Great Frontier” as the singular spatial construction responsible for producing and maintaining free enterprise. Webb cautioned, “any serious student of the Greater Frontier cannot be bound by political lines” (412). Yet, Webb’s lifelong antagonisms toward Mexico and Mexicans blinded him from seeing that his “Great Frontier” was not only Anglocentric but Eurocentric in its spatial construction. The “Great Frontier” assumes that capitalist ideology was produced and properly maintained by a transatlantic spatial mobility where ethnic subjects from a “first space” (Europe) moved west to a “second space” (the Americas). With the break-down of this Eurocentric spatialization, the movement westward a relic of the desired past, and communist growth a frightening present, Webb assumed (like many northeastern publishing houses) that no other space could match that of the frontier.

Saldívar credits Paredes’s post-World War II experience in Occupied Japan with unfixing his notions of “national, cultural and folk identity” (393). “Thus,” according to Saldívar, “it was that on his return from Japan that Paredes devised “Greater Mexico” (401).
Witnessing the Japanese accommodate to postwar modernization at the hands of U.S. occupation surely assisted Paredes’s transnational spatialization of capitalist geopolitics. However, if Occupied Japan was Paredes’s inspiration for devising the tertiary space of “Greater Mexico,” than Webb’s “Great Frontier” very well could have been another incentive spurning Paredes to enact his “third” spatial orientation. In an interview with Héctor Calderón and José López-Morín, Paredes was not shy about his regard for Webb’s character. Paredes asserts, “Webb was viciously racist and I took him on in With His Pistol in His Hand and other places” (225). Paredes’s remark becomes less obscure considering that The Shadow is Pistol’s fraternal twin and produced from the same Mexican cartographic-eliding academic environment. Whether another manifestation of Paredes’s (geo)political unconscious or a conscious intertextual affront if we apply Paredes’s fervor-filled remark that he “took Webb on in other places,” it is clear The Shadow challenges Webb’s Cold War geopolitical outlook in The Great Frontier with a “Greater Mexico.”

The Shadow reorients the bounds of capitalism longitudinally between the U.S. and Mexico during an era of racist spatialization and Cold War anxiety and asserts the defeat of Marxist ideology’s disdain for religious/superstitious belief, within the spatial bounds of “Greater Mexico.” The Shadow’s ultimate triumph in its “Greater Mexican” third space functions as an allegorical panacea to the Cold War anxieties present in Webb’s The Great Frontier and the societal “susto” experienced by society at large. It is true that Paredes set The Shadow in the 1930s, and his novella can be read as an account for the demise of revolutionary ideals in Mexico in the face of global capitalism. Paredes was ever critical of U.S. imperialism and capitalist forces invading spaces of the defeated, be it south Texas, Mexico, Latin America or Japan. But, his military tenure in Asia not only opened his mind to
a greater transnational spatial perception instigated by capitalism. In the presence of two ideological forces vying for geopolitical control of the pan-Asian Pacific, Paredes learned that folk culture though attenuated can survive in capitalist spaces, while Marxian thought was the bane of folk religion, cultural lore, or “superstition.” After nearly five years of witnessing and reporting on the Communist Party’s spread through China and U.S. capitalist infiltration of Japan, and becoming aware of their hypocrisies, Paredes came to an understanding as to which was the greater of two evils. Paredes concluded that, “in the long run, those that strike … at the heart of superstition are the greatest enemies …” Therefore, in terms of The Shadow’s characters, Cuitla is the greatest enemy traversing Paredes’s capitalist spatialization of “Greater Mexico,” and must ultimately be killed to showcase the power of transnational capitalism and the folk who freely practice their religious folkways via a system of free enterprise. Additionally, it is important to point out that Paredes first conceptualized of The Shadow while in Asia’s post-World War II environment, since he was thinking about the basic plot of what was to become The Shadow in this geopolitical space.

To reference Ramón Saldívar, a “transnational imaginary” link emerges in Paredes’s development of his novella. In what is his earliest recorded iteration of an idea for The Shadow, Paredes writes in his “Far East Notebook” on Sunday February 20, 1949, “There is much to write about – only time, genius and industry fail me. … On Agraristas: story about a man who dies of fright. Maybe chief character and thought of killing Agrarista President – …” Indeed, The Shadow can also be read as a Cold War text that speaks to the troublesome spatializations of its era. Considering the totality of Paredes’s Cold War writing present, with Webb’s conflict-provoking, fear-laden Anglo spatialization, and Paredes’s insight on the socioeconomic and ideological spaces that lo Mexicano are willing to create and uphold, The
*Shadow* uses the pre- and post-Mexican Revolutionary periods to shore up the failure of Marxist views on religion for the *gente* of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands and the rise of a third capitalist space – “Greater Mexico.”

Antonio Cuitla and Jacinto Del Toro are two personifications of communist revolutionary ideology that traverse the otherwise predominant and pre-established capitalist bounds of “Greater Mexico” in *The Shadow*. Considering that the novella opens in the late-1930s U.S.-Mexico borderlands, Paredes’s characterizations of Cuitla and Del Toro fit within the realm of historical accuracy since communist party activity and ideological exchange occurred throughout the U.S. Southwest, South Texas, and Mexico throughout the 1920s and 1930s via the ongoing work of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing, and Allied Workers of America (UCA-PAWA), the Communist Party, and in Mexico the Partido Communista Mexicano (PCM).101 Before Cuitla assumes the presidency of Los Claveles and Del Toro becomes the communal farm’s “chief of the rural police,” both men, who are immigrants from the Mexican interior, receive their new political education in the Texas prior to the Mexican Revolution as a result of the capitalist circuitry informing *The Shadow’s* “Greater Mexican” space. As Paredes’s narrative voice reveals:

> It was in Texas [Cuitla] first heard men talk of revolution, men of his own sort, talk about striking off their chains, and the imprisonment of starvation. Yes, he had got most of his education in Texas. In the cotton fields and the coal mines. And Del Toro, too. He also received his education there, especially at the Huntsville prison farm. Texas had a lot to teach the Mexican peon turned migrant laborer, who looked across the border for a new kind of life. (62)
Cuitla and Del Toro, young men in what can be presumed as the first decade of the twentieth century are, in Paredes’s view, cogs in the early capitalist spatialization between the U.S. and Mexico, as they are drawn north to work in the “cotton fields” and “coal mines” of Texas. Interestingly, Paredes historicizes Cuitla’s and Del Toro’s pre-revolution migrations within emergent “Greater Mexican” space in his later academic essay, “The Folklore of Groups of Mexican Origin.” In this essay, Paredes, discusses “the rural or semirural immigrant folk groups” from the interior of Mexico and historically argues, “It is not until 1890 that the immigration of new Mexican elements to the United States really begins, as part of a reciprocal movement” in which “North American capital invades Mexico,” and “the Mexican bracero invades the United States” (10). It should not be taken as mere coincidence that Paredes situates the transnational capitalist ventures of the U.S. into Mexico in 1890, which is the exact year Webb places the closure of the “Great Frontier.” Nor should it be taken as circumstantial that The Shadow, a prelude to “The Folklore of Groups,” situates the rise of “Greater Mexican” capitalist space after the demise of Webb’s “Great Frontier.” In this way, The Shadow spatially proves other “greater” vertical capitalist orientations exist.

However, Paredes’s reorientation of capitalist space is not without criticism of the socioeconomic ills it causes Mexican immigrants. Capitalism can imprison and shackle men like Cuitla, Del Toro, and their proletariat “sort” within “Greater Mexico,” since they move, not of their own accord, but at the whim of agribusiness and picking seasons. But, the Marxian-inspired communist ideological alternative shunning religion and its folk practice that runs concurrently within the space of “Greater Mexico,” appears as a less righteous ideology that does not belong in The Shadow’s capitalist transnational space.
Paredes divulges Cuitla’s and Del Toro’s past via several retrospective episodes, which are enough to discern the distinct ways Paredes attributes the oddity and dangers of Marxian irreconcilability with Mexican religious folkways. We are taken into Cuitla’s recollecting mind after he inspectsthe belongings of Don José María’s deceased hired assassin Gerardo Salinas. In Salinas’s wallet, Cuitla finds a clipping advertising “the upcoming cotton season in Texas and the need for pickers” (61). This bit of capitalist paraphernalia along with a religious medallion attached to what Cuitla suspects is a rosary bead induces Cuitla into a daydream that transports him across “Greater Mexican” space and time. Cuitla recalls how he, before the revolution, left his boyhood village for Texas, fleeing his father’s death and, what were from his perspective, the shameful acts of wailing performed by his mother at his father’s wake. Paredes highlights Cuitla’s disdain for Mexican folk culture in the forms of religious ritual and folk music when Cuitla recalls that he, unlike Salinas, “had not carried a medallion” nor a “guitar string” on his transnational sojourn decades before. Thus, Cuitla’s disbelief and disrespect for Mexican religious folk culture are characteristics that run contrary to the general folk, like Salinas, who traverse the circuitry of transnational capitalism and take aspects of their culture with them. Even within the southern-most bounds of The Shadow’s “Greater Mexican” construction, in Cuitla’s boyhood village, the narrator announces Cuitla’s characteristics that put him at odds with the folk of “Greater Mexico”: “He had never been good at music, that was one of the things that set him apart from most of the young men of village, who sang and played and danced. … He had been different, proud and cynical so that the others called him an atheist and were afraid of him” (61-62).
Cuitla, a man in conflict with the folk culture that moves with the transnational Mexican proletariat desires to “strike off [the] chains” capitalism has come to bear. But, this is at the cost of embracing a communist education that fixates on a tenant decreeing the riddance of “religious sentimentality.” The education Cuitla receives in Texas where he learns to “kill God” and quote Marx resembles what Leon Trotsky describes in “The Tasks of Communist Education.” Writing for *The Communist Review* in December of 1922, Trotsky states:

> The revolutionist of our epoch, who can only be associated with the working class, possesses his special psychological characteristics, characteristics of intellect and will. …

> The revolutionist knows only external obstacles to his activity, no internal ones. That is: he has to develop within himself the capacity of estimating the arena of his activity in all its correctness… But if he is internally hampered by subjective hindrances to action, if he is lacking in understanding or will power, if he is paralysed by internal discord, by religious, national, or craft prejudices, then he is at best only half a revolutionist. There are too many obstacles in the objective conditions already, and the revolutionist cannot allow himself the luxury of multiplying the objective hindrances and frictions by subjective ones. Therefore the education of the revolutionist must, above all, consist of emancipation from that residue of ignorance and superstition …

> And therefore we adopt a ruthlessly irreconcilable attitude to anyone who utters a single word to the effect that mysticism or religious sentimentality might be combined with Communism. Religiousness is irreconcilable with the
Marxian standpoint. We are of the opinion that atheism, as an inseparable element of the materialist view of life, is a necessary condition for the theoretical education of the revolutionist. He who believes in another world is not capable of concentrating all his passion on the transformation of this one.

Cuitla wants what is best for the working class ejideros of Los Claveles, and he believes to the point of self-aggrandizement in his intellect and will, but his irreconcilable attitude toward religiousness is one that Paredes insists the proletariat of “Greater Mexico” will not embrace.

Cuitla, the more cerebral communist-educated character, illustrates the unnaturalness of anti-religious Marxist notions within the capitalist space of “Greater Mexico,” while Del Toro (of the bull) is a symbolic characterization of the bullish masses dangerous, untamed, and ultimately betrayed by Marxist thought. Del Toro is all body. He is described as “an enormous mass” with a “great belly” (64). As Ramón Saldívar has pointed out, “If revolution is as Trotsky claimed, “a history of the forcible entrance of the masses into the realm of rulership over their own destiny,” then Del Toro is Paredes’s symbol of the malevolence and violence that must accompany the overturning and complete transformation of social relations” (411). The only element missing from Saldívar’s explication of Del Toro’s symbolism is a Marxian/Communist one. A comparison of Del Toro’s actions to Trotsky’s statement invites a communist consideration when determining Del Toro’s symbolism, and therefore invites an adjusted interpretation of Paredes’s sentiments for Del Toro. Del Toro’s massive violent force aimed at overturning “Greater Mexican” capitalist space is less a symbolic “must” for Paredes and more a symbolic “bust” that proves detrimental to “Greater Mexico’s” proletariat folk.
Del Toro, “a wrecker” and “destroyer” receives his “education” in Texas, too, and applies his learning through physical rather than philosophical violence (4). As a corporal manifestation, Del Toro resembles the characteristics of brute force Trotsky outlines in “The Tasks of Communist Education.” “The revolutionist,” Trotsky says, “shatters the historical obstructions, resorting to force for the purpose. If this is not possible, then he makes a detour, undermines and crushes, patiently and determinedly. He is a revolutionist because he does not fear to shatter obstacles and relentlessly employ force …” A symbolic anarchist mass run amuck, Paredes’s narrative voice reveals, “In all the memories, [Cuitla] could call back, he saw Del Toro killing someone” (66). Brutal against both the folk and folk religion, during the Cristero Wars, in Mexico, Del Toro cuts priests down with blows from his machete, “grinning after he finished off the priest” (66). Unthinking and unfeeling, even to his own people, Paredes describes Del Toro as “shooting a path out of his native village through a ring of the soldiers of Christ. … his pistol in his hand, the only man in the village left alive, killing his way to freedom, but leaving his brother dead, and his sister and his sweetheart to be raped before they died” (67). In utmost contrast to Gregorio Cortéz, the (human) subject of Paredes’s dissertation, who partook in south Texas capitalist economy but defended cultural and racial injustice, Del Toro is a different kind of man with “his pistol in his hand.” Del Toro leaves an unacknowledged trail of death among his people, and he can do no good for the folk of “Greater Mexico.”

After the revolution, Cuitla, Del Toro and their “comrades,” who are a group of squadron men and their wives, mothers, and sons that mostly look to Cuitla and Del Toro for leadership, embark on a failed communal ejido in the northern Tamaulipas borderlands. Returning to his motif of unnaturalness, Paredes ensures the communal ejido of Los
Claveles, “one backed by a political philosophy” the old hacendado system of the borderlands “lacked,” is an odd spatial construction with the capitalist bounds of “Greater Mexico” (42). The opening of the novella sets the tone for Los Claveles’s spatial oddity and deserves to be repeated in near totality:

The noon was a glaring quietness. There was no breeze, no movement. People were indoors, waiting for the fury of the sun to pass; outside dogs and chickens panted in the shade-speckled dust. In the chaparral, life was also still.

…

Only at the communal farm of Los Claveles was anyone astir. There, men in sandals and white cotton drawers worked the fields, plowing rapidly drying earth. They worked against time – time lost earlier in the year while their leaders made trips to nearby Morelos to talk to authorities, while they sent petitions to Mexico City, while they marched through the old settlements where lived the original owners of the land they had “affected” and turned into an agrarian colony. Now they had the land, and they were working it, though they preferred to be in the shade like all men with some sense in their heads. But they stayed in the fields because Antonio Cuitla, president of the ejido, kept them there (1).

Only in Los Claveles, a communal space backed by Cuitla’s communist revolutionary leadership, are he and his fellow “comrades” nonsensically working in the heat of the noonday sun. This illogical display bears significance because Los Claveles is the singular Marxist-inspired cell within the otherwise dominant transnational capitalist tide of “Greater Mexico.” Paredes illustrates this continuing capitalist current with Gerardo Salinas, as
aforementioned, who was travelling northward to participate in the Texas cotton season. Moreover, in Salinas’s sojourn, we get a glimpse of bourgeoning American tourism in northern coastal Mexico as “some American tourists with fishing gear gave [Salinas] a ride until they turned off the highway toward the coast” (32). Don José María, former hacendado, and the presumed villain of *The Shadow*, who transforms his lands into a large-scale cotton farm, is another example of a character engaged in normative economic functions within their space. By juxtaposition, these are the sensible “people” who are “indoors” at the novella’s opening. Los Claveles defies nature and logic, since all other forms of life within the capitalist space of “Greater Mexico,” from people to dogs, had enough “sense in their heads” to seek the shade. Even Cuitla’s “comrades” yearned “to be in the shade like all the other men” and work only because Cuitla “kept them there.” Paredes’s narrative voice instills from the start, that if “all men with some sense in their heads” sought the shade, then Cuitla, Del Toro, and Los Claveles are an irrational presence in “Greater Mexico” and must be removed.

Don José María has been described as a “diabolical” and “vicious” antagonist. When reading the novella in anti-capitalist lens, José María is surely the villain, as it is he who seeks to have Cuitla and Del Toro killed to protect his large-scale cotton enterprise from the ejidatarios. However, recognizing Paredes’s critical but nevertheless spatial interests for illustrating the rise of transnational capitalism in “Greater Mexico,” José María is less an antagonistic villain and more a bourgeois instrument for demonstrating that Cuitla and Del Toro and their symbolic Marxist representations have no place within *The Shadow’s* capitalist space. José María disposes of Del Toro, via his hired assassin Salinas. Symbolically-speaking José María and Salinas, a bourgeois and proletariat tag-team, rid the
bullish masses that would otherwise challenge transnational capitalist economy in the borderlands.

Yet, killing Cuitla proves to be more difficult. Cuitla, while on his way to kill Del Toro, is put on edge by a “shapeless mass of black rising out of the middle of the road, where no shadow should be” (10). Like a good communist-educated revolutionary, Cuitla tries to subdue his “superstitious” fright, he dismounts his horse and searches the chapparal for something material only to be startled by a moving bush. Terror-filled, Cuitla fires his rifle and upon inspection sees he has killed a man who unbeknownst to him was Salinas. Cuitla’s “comrades” are glad their presidente has evaded death, and they alert Cuitla that Del Toro was killed only moments before by the slain assassin who would have murdered him if not for his alertness. Cuitla escapes death, thwarting José María’s plans. However, after receiving news of Del Toro’s murder, Cuitla cannot shake the fear that Del Toro was the black shadowy “mass” attempting to warn him. Because Paredes primarily associates the word “mass” with Del Toro’s physical form and the shapeless thing Cuitla’s sees, it can be assumed the apparition-like essence rising from the road is Del Toro. Therefore, though there has been some debate regarding interpretations of the “shadow” in title and character, it appears the “shadow” can also be metaphorically read as a Marxist specter haunting the recesses of Cuitla’s traitorous mind. That Paredes witnessed the hypocrisies and dangers Communism inflicted onto its body politic, this novelistic manifestation is exemplary of the masses returning to haunt its betraying ideological leaders.

Nevertheless, Cuitla, who has “killed God long ago,” and unlike his men, has an “education” that instructs “religion is the opium of the people,” struggles to reconcile his fright. In the eyes of Trotsky, we might say Cuitla “is at best only half a revolutionist” since
he fails to “emancipate” himself “from that residue of ignorance and superstition.” However, in the eyes of Cuitla’s fellow ejideros, he, too, is only half a man (or Mexican), since he fails to embrace religious folk customs. An “hijo disobediente” (disobedient son) who condemns religious/superstitious folkways, Cuitla refuses the insistence of his “comrades” and wife to seek out the communal curandera to rid his “susto.” Ultimately it is of no consequence whether José María’s assassin kills Cuitla or not, because Cuitla’s communist regard for religion/superstition is the death of him.

From Paredes’s perspective, Cuitla exhibits the most harmful strain of Marxist ideology – the devaluation and destruction of religious folk culture. It is unnatural for the folk of Los Claveles, or the folk of any community within “Greater Mexico,” to be led by persons who go against folkways, religious or otherwise. Although Cuilta’s “comrades” do not comprehend Cuitla’s Marxist preaching, the community understands the detriment of his wayward actions. While on his deathbed, Cuitla hears his “comrades” singing outside his jacal “El corrido del hijo disobediente.” This corrido, which tells the story of a disobedient son who defies patriarchal order, is one that his “comrades” had “brought up north from the hotlands where they had been born” (99). Cuitla’s “comrades” recognize his cultural disobedience and, though comrades in the revolution fighting for class equality, will not embrace an ideology that prescribes the extermination of their religious folk customs.

This is also true of the bourgeois class of lo Mexicano. Indeed, there are striking differences between José María and the ejidatarios. Unlike the mobile proletariat that the ejidatarios will become after their communal farm is dissolved, José María, in cooperation with U.S. and global forms of agribusiness, will immensely profit from their labor on his lands. Despite his love for the ancestral estero on his property, José María will drain it to free
up more land for cotton-growing and tells the dying Cuitla in the final pages of the novella, “this will be progress” (113). Paredes, attuned to the hypocrisies and crimes of “Greater Mexican” capitalism and classist division wrote this line with as much acerbic cynicism as knowledge of the fact that the new frontier is the transnational frontera of “Greater Mexico.” However, what is a progressive similarity José María and the Los Claveles community (minus Cuitla) share is their ability to practice their folkways in the face of capitalist modernization. Just as Paredes endows the greater Los Claveles community with a love and practice of folk culture, Paredes also assigns these traits to José María. José María kept in his parlor “a fat notebook with manuscript copies of the verses written by his poetic great-grandfather. … They were well-turned, witty verses, all in décimas, the ten-line stanza that had been popular in the Spanish court” (25). He “knew them all by heart” and “often tried his hand” at verse-making (25). José María may have drained his familial estero, but as a lover and archivist of décimas, his treasured culture, like the corridos and religious folk beliefs the Los Claveles community “brought north from the hotlands,” will live on in capitalist “Greater Mexico.”

Paredes symbolically kills Cuitla, an agent of communist ideology antagonistic toward religion and an enemy of folk culture and “Greater Mexican” capitalism. Ramón Saldívar says Cuitla was unable to understand that he “failed the campesinos only because they did not go deep enough to break capitalist domination of production and exploitation” (Saldívar 425). However we must consider that Cuitla failed to understand that adapting to the inevitable tides of capitalist “Greater Mexico” was a cultural necessity. Cuitla’s failure is highlighted when we consider the outcome of Feliciano, Gualinto Gómez’s uncle in George Washington Gómez. Felicano, too, upholds a Marxist mindset against religiousness as he
traverses the south Texas-Mexico borderlands, spouting to his brother-in-law Gumersindo, “Religion is the opium of the people” (20). However, as the novel progresses, Feliciano quiets this particular mentality and partakes in the capitalist system through various legal and illegal forms of borderlands trade. By the novel’s end, Feliciano, arguably the protagonist, privately owns a small farm in addition to his property in Jonesville, and most importantly in juxtaposition to Cuitla, lives.

Paredes understood, contrary to Webb’s comprehension of capitalist space as a horizontal construction, the vertical space of “Greater Mexico” had been and would continue to be a spatial force upholding the tenants of capitalism. He also knew that the people who Webb dismissed, the mixed-blooded Mexican, were part of a longitudinal capitalist circuit that they creatively used to fulfill their cultural needs. Therefore, Paredes’s most profound statement of “Greater Mexico’s” socioeconomic strength comes from the Los Claveles community. Even within their seemingly communist cell, Cuitla’s “comrades” adapt to and participate in their capitalist surroundings for the sake of performing their religious folk rituals. Much has been made about the significance of the final scenes of *The Shadow* as Mexican dignitaries arrive at Los Claveles to inspect the ejido. The “broom of light” that interrupts the community’s *barrida* or cleansing ritual to drive out Cuitla’s “susto” has been interpreted as capitalist modernity penetrating and thus disrupting the traditional and preferable folkways of Los Claveles. However, *The Shadow* delivers a more influential scene attesting to what will be “Greater Mexico’s” prolongation. In the middle of *The Shadow*, in what can be considered the heart of the novella, Paredes, via a symbolic tableau, communicates the death communist revolution and the rise of capitalism by a willing proletariat. After Del Toro’s death, the community holds a wake for their fallen “comrade”: 
They had laid straw mats on the dirt floor, and on these rested the enormous mass that had been Del Toro, with his hands over his great belly, as if he were asleep. ... Candles had been lighted, yellow wax candles adorned with shiny tinfoil bands, ... expensive wax candles bought at the stores of Morelos and carefully treasured by the women of Los Claveles for occasions such as this. ... Around the corpse knelt black-clad women, their bare feet folded behind them, rosaries in their hands, muttering prayers in a ceaseless bodiless hum.

(64)

Next to Del Toro’s dead body are “expensive wax candles” bought in Morelos by the community’s women. Whereas a symbol of communist revolution dies, a symbol of capitalism adaptively used in folk ritual endures. Well before Mexican dignitaries physically penetrate the community, Los Claveles members demonstrate their agency for adapting to and preferring the capitalist modernity of “Greater Mexico.” Paredes gives us a glimpse of proletariat consumerism emerging with the inevitable draw of capitalism as the Los Claveles women buy candles “carefully treasured” for religious folk custom. It is also in this overlooked scene that the second text comprising Paredes’s fraternal effort to challenge Anglo academic spatializations of his era makes a spatial prognostication, one that has held true into the twenty-first century: The community of Los Claveles may lose their land, but they will retain their culture, since their entry into “Greater Mexico’s” proletarian class allows them to keep their religious folkways alive, as they traverse and further the transnational third space of longitudinal capitalism in the borderlands and beyond.
Conclusion

As this sojourn across the transnational literary landscape of early Mexican American writers draws to a close, let us return to where we began – the open roads of the Southwest. Like the writers of this study, I have woven my own trialectics of discourse, memory, and space to showcase the power of spatial production as both a cultural and colonial act. So, why not take one more trip down memory lane (or Interstate, should I say) that punctuates the significance of early Mexican American literature that remaps the Southwest?

***

I took one final gaze of El Paso in the pre-dawn quiet, before settling into hundreds-of-miles of sleep. The Franklin Mountains were dark silhouettes. Although I could not see the Rio Grande, I knew where its meandering course divided two countries, since street lights in Juarez, in the early 1990s, were white, while those in El Paso had modernized to orange. I traced this contrast of white and orange, this contrast of geography and geopolitics, until I drifted into unconsciousness, as my father drove us out of the city on I-10 West. A few hours later, I awoke to daylight and family chatter. My mother and father asked my brother and I if we wanted to stop at “THE THING?” My parents said they started seeing billboards marketing this curiosity-piquing roadside attraction outside of Deming, New Mexico. Now that we crossed the Arizona state-line, I, too, saw the large yellow signs with the bold blue lettering. The font was cryptic enough to recall 1950s monster movie titles. My excitement grew with each passing billboard, as we wondered what this “Mystery of the Desert” at Exit 322 could be?

Within an hour, we arrived at a giant souvenir emporium in Dragoon, Arizona, about eighty miles east of Tucson, seemingly in the middle of nowhere, if one wishes to perceive it
that way, where the average tourist craving the Southwest experience can buy everything from Southwestern rugs, to Mexican imports, to Native American jewelry and other mass-market items. We paid a small fee and pushed passed the crowds of other tourists caught up in the thousands of things demarcating the commercialization of cultures within the region, in order to see THE THING. The sales clerk told us to follow the bigfoot-sized yellow footprints out the emporium’s backdoor and through the grounds until they led us to the main attraction.

We walked through two metal warehouses filled with curios and installations. Interestingly, and perhaps an allegory for the immutable and monolithic ways of the region itself, when I visited this space/place again some twenty years later, I saw little to no change. Amidst Singer sewing machines and other relics of the pioneer and early American past is a 1937 Rolls Royce believed to have been used by Hitler, although the sign accompanying the vehicle says, “it can’t be proved.” No doubt, this particular installation does more to nationalize and globalize rather than regionalize the walkway to the main attraction, as it marks the residue of the World War II era in which THE THING was originally conceived. However, beside the Aryan Rolls Royce is an 1849 model covered wagon that lets the viewer know they are indeed in an Anglo Southwest. There is no uncertainty in the sign accompanying this vehicle as it states with a tone of indisputable historical fact:

Wagons like this provided shelter and transportation to our forefathers who travelled 3,000 miles through uncharted wilderness to settle the west.

Whether onlookers navigating their way through the path of objects leading to THE THING realize, throughout the entire commercialized space of the emporium and that of the “cultural” trek out back, they are being instructed in Turnerian fashion who “settled” the region and who was simply settled, as active and passive, voiced and voiceless subjects emerge amongst
objects on the way to THE THING. Which is why, two decades after my first visit, I can finally offer a more significant meaning for what I saw at the end of that trail of yellow footprints. In the third warehouse, entombed in a white, cinderblock “sarcophagus” and encase in glass is THE THING – an old, odd mix of plaster of Paris and cloth formed into the shape of a semi-decayed, mummified mother, laying stiff with her arm akimbo holding a mummified child. Perhaps it was once a Hollywood prop?

Most tourists probably wonder at not so much what they saw – obviously it is a fake mummy – but why this is THE THING they saw in the middle of the Arizona desert in the back of a Southwestern emporium. The fact of the matter is THE THING is not too much different from the thousands of things inside the souvenir space or the stereotypical projections of the geo-spatial landscape itself. It is objectified; it is passive; and especially judging from its yellow footprints, it stands (or rather lays) as a metaphor that befits those who have been historically silenced and made foreign within the region: THE THING is the Orientalized Other of the Southwest. As Erlinda Gonzalez-Berry states in her introduction to Paso Por Aquí: Critical Essays on New Mexico Literary Tradition, “it is not coincidental that many Anglo texts written by Anglo explorers echo European texts that gave shape and essence to the discourse on Orientalism” (3). Although Gonzalez-Berry addresses the rhetoric of Anglo explorers writing about New Mexico in particular, her statement applies to Anglo writers affiliated with publishing houses back East. After all, as my effort has shown, many canonical authors constructed the Southwest as a geo-cultural space of conquered peoples who were, to cite Said, “irrational, depraved (fallen), child-like [and] ‘different” (40).

Of course, as Remapping the U.S. “Southwest” both asserts and proves, Mexican American writers and their perceptions of the region remap Orientalized and monolithic
constructions of culture and region. They challenge the Southwestern literary landscape of their Anglo contemporaries and constructions of cultural/commercial space that dot the physical landscape at present. These early Mexican American voices and their respective literary narratives offer a collective chorus of transnationalism that urges us to continue to rethink the region and the positions these writers occupy within literary canons. For as much as this effort demonstrates a remapping the Southwest, it also engages in a remapping of these writers within the scholarly fields of Southwestern and Chicano/a literature. A transnational analytical framework demonstrates early Mexican American narratives and lives cannot be limited to purely national or local scopes of understanding. Part of the significance of *Remapping the U.S. “Southwest”* is its attempt to speak with both Southwestern and Chicano/a literary studies in an effort to gain recognition for the unique, unexpected, complex, and contradictory ways Mexican Americans historically write their identities, culture, and region. It especially draws attention to the way they do so while facing adversity or a specific adversary that seeks to misrepresent or disrupt their socio-spatial sensitivities/agenda.

This sojourn has taken us inside the transnational cultural/capital Californian desires of Ruiz de Burton and one of Mexican America’s first novels *The Squatter and the Don*. New Mexico was transformed from a “land of poco tiempo” to a global Spanish Borderlands in Fray Angélico Chávez’s short fiction. The Arizona-Sonora border comes undone with Federico Ronstadt’s memories of the historic Pimeria Alta and a transnational Tucson of the late nineteenth century. And, South Texas was shown to be the historical cartographic space of Nuevo Santander and part of a contemporary Greater Mexico in Américo Paredes’s *With His Pistol in His Hand* and *The Shadow*. This begs the following question. Should we
continue to canonize Joan Didion’s 1968 *Slouching Toward Bethlehem*, Cormac McCarthy’s border trilogy, or later twentieth and twenty-first century writings by Chicanas and Chicanos as works that “rewrite” the Southwest, “announce” the New West, and usher in a new sense of transnationalism without paying homage to the literary forebears who busted borders and complicated conceptions of the region? The early Mexican American writers under discussion undo the seams of literary traditions the moment those traditions were solidifying dominant perceptions of the region. These writers impart a legacy that defies regional and national structures of geopolitical and cultural space.

However, *Remapping the U.S. “Southwest”* not only recovers a cultural literary past. The historical presence of Mexican peoplehood in what we now know today as the Southwest and the transnational connections and cartographic imaginaries charted are for understanding twenty-first century discussions about migration, immigration, and contemporary pressures surrounding border security. The anti-immigration campaigns and anxieties heightened by the 2000 Census, which Mary Pat Brady cites in *Extinct Lands, Temporal Geographies*, abound over a decade later and are fueled, yet again, by the numbers of Mexicans and other Latinos migrating north. As Ana Gonzalez-Barrera and Mark Hugo Lopez of the Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project report, “a record 33.7 million Hispanics of Mexican origin resided in the United States in 2012 …” (“A Demographic Portrait”). This estimate, Gonzalez-Barrera and Lopez continue, includes 11.4 million immigrants born in Mexico and 22.3 million born in the U.S., which makes Mexicans the largest Hispanic-origin population in the U.S., accounting for 64% of the U.S. Hispanic population and 11% of the overall U.S. population in 2012. Approximately one out of every ten people residing in U.S. borders is of Mexican descent with the vast majority of those of Mexican heritage living in
the Southwest. Of the immigrant population specifically, Gonzalez-Barrera and Lopez state 51% are in the U.S. without documentation.

Even with the construction of the Border Wall and a doubled number of Border Patrol agents by the Obama administration, the numbers keep coming, and, as with every approaching Presidential race, immigration reform and border security emerge as hot-button issues. Politicians on both sides of the political divide levy criticisms against the continuously described “broken immigration system” as they mostly call for the deployment of more men, munitions, and money to secure the Southwest’s 1,954 mile border with Mexico. With the rise of undocumented immigrants from Central America following their Mexican counterparts into the Global North, the fight to halt the spatial and racial demographic shift of the Southwest and other regions of the nation-state, for many, has taken on a new urgency.

Amidst the calls for more fortification by political heavyweights like Texas Governor Rick Perry, and House Speaker John Boehner, local voices speaking transnationally get lost in the fray. Juan Sheenan, a Catholic Relief Services representative in Honduras asserts that critics must “address root causes” of migration, for “without any willingness” to do so “is a strategy that just won’t work” (LA Times.com). Those root causes, we might add, which are attributed to the social and economic violence faced in immigrants’ countries of origin, result in the traversal of historic routes that cross contemporary nationalized spaces. Hemispheric roots and routes, as J.D. Saldivar notes in Trans-Americanity, are the backbone of operations in the Américas (48-49). With the acknowledgment and discussion of these roots and routes, it becomes clear that contemporary pressures on the U.S.-Mexico border are not new phenomena.
As Remapping the U.S. “Southwest” elucidates, people of Mexican descent have long imagined themselves as occupying a porous region where people and commerce pass in favor of longitudinal movement within the hemisphere and other geopolitical spaces of the transnational beyond. Considering the significance of the spatial politics and poetics of the early Mexican American writers discussed, these writers and their works help us recognize that we must contrive immigration policies with regard to the existence of historic and cultural spatialities and their unwavering presence in contemporary times, rather than futilely attempt to end centuries-old migratory roots and routes leading in and out of this transnational space, this THING, we call the Southwest.
Notes

1 In fairness to Guthrie (1912-1967), American folksinger and songwriter whose critical views of classism in the United States often shaped the lyrical content of his songs, "This Land Is Your Land," originally included the following protest verse: "As I went walking, I saw a sign there,/And on the sign there, It said ‘Private Property.’/But on the other side, it didn’t say nothing!/ That side was made for you and me.” See Klein (1999). This 1940 version, however, was appropriated to fit the nationalistic fervor of World War II, and by 1945, “This Land Is Your Land” was stripped of its capitalist-spatial criticism which complicated its movements of Manifest Destiny.

2 See Dobie, Guide to Life and Literature of the Southwest (1943), pp. 11-12.

3 In “No More Monoliths, Please: Continuities in the Multi-Souths” (1981), his final essay before his death, Holman called for a greater recognition of the South as a “profoundly pluralistic world,” and credited feminist studies, black studies, and critical theory for helping provide fresh perspectives to judge old paradigms about “the South.”

4 An excellent example that displays this shift in regional thought is A Companion to The Literature and Culture of the American West edited by Nicolas S. Witschi.

5 For a discussion of colonial violence as the result of symbolism, interpretation, legislation, and other forms of speech acts exerting dominant viewpoints within contested geographic spaces see José Rabasa, Writing Violence on the Northern Frontier (2000); and for a discussion of colonial violence in the form of renaming/nominaly erasing native landscapes, geographies and mappings see Michael J. Shapiro, Violent Cartographies: Mapping Cultures of War (1997).


7 The Tohono O’odham, in particular, face difficulty maintaining their way of life on cultural lands that span the U.S.-Mexico border. See Pyclik and Leibig’s “Living in No-Man’s Land.”


9 See Old Southwest/New Southwest: Essays on Region and Its Literature, Southwestern Women: New Voices, and Writing the Southwest.

10 José Martí lived in New York as a Cuban exile from July 1881 to 1891 and then intermittently throughout the final four years of his life. With his talent for observation and journalism, in the 1880s, Martí contributed articles to Caracas, Venezuela’s La Opinión and Buenos Aires, Argentina’s La Nación and became known for his insightful descriptions and criticisms regarding life and culture in the United States. In his article “The Great ‘Buffalo Bill,” Martí documents a performance by renowned western showman William Frederick
Cody (Buffalo Bill) and his Wild West Show. There is an air of sarcasm in Martí’s tone as he clearly registers the staged cultural performance before him. “It’s just a circus show,” he writes, “for the benefit of Easterners, but this is so deeply rooted in their souls that the show seems real” (126). Yet, Martí claims this “circus show” and “Buffalo Bill’s men represent the scenes which are still being enacted out West.” (126).

11 See Conflicts of Interest, pages 227-230 for a detailed account of Ruiz de Burton’s financial situation as a newly widowed woman.

12 When I say “hacienda identity” and “pastoral economic order,” I am referring to Vincent Pérez’s and José F. Aranda’s arguments concerning Ruiz de Burton’s identity politics in “Remembering the Hacienda: Land and Community in Californio Narratives” and “Returning California to the People: Vigilantism in Squatter and the Don,” respectively.

13 See José David Saldivar’s Border Matters or Sonia Saldivar-Hull’s Feminism on the Border for definitions of “la frontera.”

14 Donn B. Tatum and David M. Pletcher provide excellent biographical studies on General William Rosecrans and his post-bellum career as a railroad promoter in the United States and Mexico.

15 See Conflicts of Interest, pages 25-28, for Ruiz de Burton’s biography of Don José Manuel Ruiz, written for the Bancroft Project.

16 When I reiterate Ruiz de Burton’s sympathies for Mexico, the California Frontera, and San Diego, I refer to her individual and separate statements found in her August 17, 1869 and July 8, 1877 correspondence with Mariano G. Vallejo, and in her novel The Squatter and the Don, page 275.

17 For a historical account of William Walker’s and Ruiz de Esparza’s political maneuvers and their effects on the California frontera, see Conflicts of Interest pages 111-114 and 121-128.

18 Vincent Pérez’s essay “Remembering the Hacienda: Land and Community in Californio Narratives,” contains a more complete account of Vallejo’s statements, cited from Vallejo’s “Recuerdos históricos y personales tocante a la alta California,” that are as follows: According to Vallejo, the “morale of the people, whose patriarchal customs have broken down little by little” is due to “contact with so many immoral persons who came to this my country from every nook and corner of the world” (46). With regard to the “immoral persons” who invaded Vallejo’s “country,” Perez informs us that Vallejo believed Mormons “professed a religion which is in open conflict with good taste and with moral and political soundness,” … “Australia sent us a swarm of bandits who … dedicated themselves exclusively to robbery and assault;” “Peru sent us a greater number of rascals, begotten in idleness and schooled in vice;” and Mexico (from which I quote) “inundated us with a wave of gamblers who had no occupation save that of the card table” (48).
19 See Robert R. Alvarez’s *Familia* for an account of the historic northward migration of Baja Californio families who settled along the border and in San Diego, as well as for discussions on the formation of transnational familial networks.

20 With these dates, it is important to note that the Don, like Ruiz de Burton, is of the generation that lived through the Mexican-American War, the installation of the U.S.-Mexico borderlands, and separation of the Californias.

21 I paraphrase Chicana scholar Norma Alarcón’s titular work “Chicana’s Feminist Literature: A Revision Through Malintzin /or Malintzin Putting Flesh Back on the Object,” because I feel it is a fitting comparison to Ruiz de Burton’s socio-spatial project. Like Chicanas revising Malintzin from a flat, stereotypical figure dictated by patriarchal hegemony, Ruiz de Burton, in *The Squatter and the Don*, gives the California frontera historical and cultural definition lacking in popularized Anglo stereotypes of the region.

22 Sánchez and Pita, in *Conflicts of Interest*, bring to light that, in 1853, Ruiz de Burton induced her mother and aunts to “sign over and transfer their rights to [the Ensenada claims] under the pretext that they were merely conveying to her a power of attorney.” Ruiz de Burton’s mother, nearly four decades later, would file suit against her daughter, which Sanchez and Pita include. (See pages 621-624).

23 Richard White’s *Railroaded* offers an unprecedented account of Tom Scott’s railroad interests. For his railroad affairs in Mexico, see page 53.

24 The affairs of the Texas Pacific did improve with financial reorganization by 1875, but Scott failed to get Congressional approval for his railroad due to the Big Four’s legislative control. Over the next four years, Scott and Huntington engaged in a bribing war, each attempting to fix Congress for their interests, with ultimately Huntington winning out. See *Railroaded* pages 118-133.

25 The name Mariano has three distinct meanings, most deriving from Latin. The first, and most popular, originates from Marius, which has its root in Mars, the name of the Roman god of war and the word for “warfare.” Secondly, in the Christian era, Mariano came to be associated with the name Maria, and thus the virgin mother of Jesus, therefore taking on a religious derivation. The third, which I base my explication, recognizes Mariano is a variant of the Roman name Marinus, which originates from the same word, “marinus,” meaning “of or belonging to the sea.” Considering Ruiz de Burton was educated, very well read, and that one of her husband’s merits was Latin (see *Conflicts of Interest* 19), the seafaring symbolism was probably an attractive feature for Ruiz de Burton, when choosing a name for her titular character, Don Mariano. Regardless, this tertiary meaning makes the most symbolic sense when evaluating the novel for its spatial poetics and transnational geopolitical agenda.

26 We learn from a letter Sánchez and Pita include in *Conflicts of Interest* by E. W. Morse, San Diego businessman, lawyer, and Ruiz de Burton’s one time agent, that Huntington did not want to create water competition on the Pacific coast. Recalling Ruiz de
Burton’s meeting with Huntington when he and Crocker visited San Diego in 1875, Morse writes: “Mrs. Burton, widow of General H. S. Burton, was once dining with [Huntington] and she said to him she did wish he would build a railroad into San Diego … ‘Well,’ he said, ‘it is not to our interests to build in there at present.’ He talked very pleasantly about it and gave as one of their reasons for not building that if they should touch the coast of San Diego, they would come in competition with water transportation.” (385)

27 By the novel’s end, this mode of transportation for moving people has been made obsolete by the Big Four’s Southern Pacific, which Ruiz de Burton unfavorably documents on page 333.


29 Justifiably, the narrator is female if we analyze the critical gendered description the narrator gives when Col. Tom Scott visits San Diego: “The ladies wished to give him a ball, but the businessmen said Tom Scott did not come to dance, he came to work. There was a banquet given to him, but no ladies were present, only men, and plenty of railroad speeches. The ladies could only meet him at private receptions in the evening, when he was tired out with driving. Yet, this was the best that could be done, as his time was limited.” (115)

30 See Leland Fetzer’s San Diego County Place Names, A To Z for a historical account of Point Loma, Ballast Point, and La Playa.

31 Chávez’s biographer Ellen McCracken as well as Chávez enthusiast and personal acquaintance Phyllis S. Morgan consider Chávez a Renaissance man, while Rodolfo Acuña, in Occupied America: A History of Chicanos 2nd edition, states Chávez “ignores history” by putting forth the Spanish “fantasy heritage” (48).

32 This and other general biographical information included in this chapter comes from McCracken’s biography The Life and Writing of Fray Angélico Chávez: A New Mexico Renaissance Man.

33 In My Penitente Land, published in 1974, Chávez draws historical and cultural differences among Mexicans and Mexican Americans versus the Nuevo Mexico Castizo, which he defines as Spanish New Mexicans “most conscious of their own Spanish individuality, and yet – like my mother long ago – frustrated by their not being able to explain it” (267). For Chávez’s poem, see The Official Santa Fe Fiesta Program 1928 p. 30.

34 See “‘Foreign New Mexico,” August 3, 1928, p.4, col. 1 for initial publication.

35 Audrey Goodman’s Translating Southwestern Landscapes: The Making of an Anglo Literary Region explains the ironic effect Anglo writers, photographers, and painters, who infiltrated the region between 1880-1930, had on the pre-existing cultural environment. Goodman contends that while Anglo artisans desired to preserve the Southwest and particularly New Mexico as a microcosm of anachronistic primitivism, their dependence on and contribution to economic development threatened to destroy native cultures.
In her dissertation *Triptych Cultural Critique: Fray Angleico Chavez and Southwestern Critical Regionalism, 1939-2004*, Vizcaíno-Alemán defines modern regionalism as “a mode of expression that responded to Northeastern hegemony by isolating the Southwest and appropriating native lifestyle and folk practices” (53).

These themes are more than obvious in the following selections from *The Turquoise Trail*: Mary Austin’s “The Eagle’s Song,” Witter Bynner’s “New Mexican Desert” and “An Adobe House,” Willa Cather’s “Spanish Johnny,” Alice Corbin’s “In the Desert,” “Juan Quintana,” and “Cundiyo,” and John Gould Fletcher’s “Cliff-Dwelling.”

The “others” I am thinking of are Aurelio M. Espinosa and Nina Otero-Warren who espoused in their respective folkloric and regional historical works, *The Folklore of Spain in the American Southwest* (1985) and *Old Spain in Our Southwest* (1936) purist Spanish representations of New Mexico.

Aside from short fiction, Chávez was prolific in multiple genres, which maintained a focus on socio-cultural or religious aspects of life in Hispano New Mexico. An account of his poetry yields well over one hundred poems written from the 1920s to the 1960s that were published in secular and religious venues and included five poetry books: *Clothed With the Sun* (1939); *Eleven Lady Lyrics and Other Poems* (1945); *Selected Poems with an Apologia* (1969); *The Single Rose* (1948); and *The Virgin of Port Lligat* (1953). Furthermore, to showcase the staying power of his short fiction, several collections have been published throughout the decades from *New Mexico Triptych* (1939) and the reprints of *From an Altar Screen; El Retablo: Tales from New Mexico* (1957) to Genaro Padilla’s edited collection of Chávez’s fiction *The Short Stories of Fray Angelico Chavez* (1987) and its editions. Chávez also wrote a longer work of historical fiction, *The Lady from Toledo*, in 1960. Regarding things historical, Chávez’s love for history propelled his oeuvre beyond creative genres. Chávez was every bit a historian and historical archivist who wrote a tantalizing body of work related to New Mexico history, which included genres such as biographies, genealogies, criticisms, translations, essays, articles and reviews. Some of Chávez’s more prominent books on the subject of regional history include: *La Conquistadora: The Autobiography of an Ancient Statue* (1954); *Origins of New Mexico Families in the Spanish Colonial Period* (1954); *The Missions of New Mexico, 1776: A Description by Fray Francisco Atanasio Domínguez with Other Contemporary Documents* (1956); *Archives of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe* (1957); *Coronado’s Friars* (1968); *My Penitente Land: Reflections of Spanish New Mexico* (1974); *The Dominguez-Escalante Journal: Their Expedition through Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico in 1776* (1976); *But Time and Chance: The Story of Padre Martinez of Taos, 1793-1867* (1981); *Tres Macho – He Said: Padre Gallegos of Albuquerque* (1985); *Chávez: A Distinctive Clan of New Mexico* (1989); and the post-humus *Wake for a Fat Vicar: Father Juan Felipe Ortiz, Archbishop Lamy, and the New Mexican Catholic Church in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century* (2004). For a complete bibliographic listing of Chávez’s works that includes his four decades of publications in numerous magazines and journals as well as works about Chávez and his oeuvre, see Phyllis S. Morgan’s excellent and exhaustive work *Fray Angélico Chávez: A Bibliography of Published Works (1925-2010) & A Chronology of His Life (1910-1996).*
These statements are taken from a document titled “REREDOS: The Saints of the Americas,” Fray Angélico Chávez Collection, 1929-1996, Fray Angélico Chávez History Library, Santa Fe, New Mexico. The document is not dated, but gathering from Chávez’s age, presumably Chávez drafted the document in 1985 when he was on the centennial celebration of St. Francis Cathedral planning committee. McCracken documents Chávez’s role in the creative process of the alter screen/reredos on pages 392-393 of The Life and Writing of Fray Angélico Chávez. A “reredos,” simply described, is a decorative facing of stone, wood, or metalwork depicting Catholic/Christian iconography usually covering a wall at the back of an altar.

McCracken tells of an incident in Chávez’s biography that occurred in 1927 while Chávez was in seminary school that is nothing short of racial prejudice from his peers, which was sadly condoned by the faculty. McCracken writes: Fellow seminarians also emphasized Manuel’s ethnicity … in a 1927 Christmas wish list addressed to “My Dear, Dear Santa Claus.” Under Chávez’s name, a fellow peer wrote “He’s been getting so brown lately that Kaiser calls him the Black Bottom upside down. Bring him some complexion soap or cream.”

See “On Borderlands.”

See Bannon’s edited collection of Bolton’s Borderlands scholarship Bolton and the Spanish Borderlands.

The term “Greater Southwest,” used in contemporary American archeological studies, refers to the geographic region that runs “from Durango Colorado to Durango Mexico, and from Las Vegas Nevada to Las Vegas New Mexico” (http://www.swanet.org/). Archeologists recognize that because the Chihuahuan and Sonoran deserts traverse the U.S.-Mexico border, it is reasonable to extend Mexico a Southwestern identity. However, from the perspective of postcolonial studies, the imagined and nominal development of a “Greater Southwest” inscribes a kind of Anglo American hegemony over part of Mexico’s national geography historically coveted by Presidents Polk (1845-1849) to Pierce (1853-1857), as well as a number of American filibusterers. The Greater Southwestern geography may turn southward to a “greater” degree than parameters of the U.S. Southwest, but like Turner’s Frontier Thesis, it also privileges Anglo directional perspective and colonization.

Let us recall that Américo Paredes, in “The Folklore of Groups,” stated that there are two Mexicos – a Mexican Republic and a “México de Afuera” composed of all the persons of Mexican origin in the United States – which he would later term “Greater Mexico” in A Texas-Mexican Cancionero (1976).

See Bolton’s “The Epic of Greater America” in Wider Horizons of American History.

Plutarco Calles served as President of Mexico from 1924-1928. His association with the Laborist Party of Mexico and the Confederación Regional Obrera Mexicana (CROM) led to sweeping socialist reforms in education, agriculture, and health care. Since
Calles’ implementation of such reforms demanded strong political support, he exercised an anti-clerical legislation based on Mexico’s 1917 constitutional provisions to silence intrusion of the Catholic Church in Mexican secular affairs. Callas placed a per capita of one priest for every 30,000 constituents, closed dozens of convents, and deported foreign priests, which resulted in Church militancy against the Mexican Government that came to be known as the Cristero Wars. Wanting to squelch Catholic ideology and rebellion swiftly, Calles executed Catholic insurgents, including priests.

However, it seems odd, if not erroneous that Chávez would link Emiliano Zapata to Mexican anti-Catholicism of the late-twenties. Not only had Zapata been assassinated in 1919 for his revolutionary efforts to strike down monopolies and reform socio-economic conditions for the poor and indigenous peasantry, but during his life, Zapata did not reject the Catholic religion. In Zapata’s reformist Plan of Ayala, its drafters note “the support of God for the revolution,” and Zapata himself maintained friendships with parish priests sympathetic to his cause. Chávez either was influenced by anti-Zapata propaganda in his youth, or Chávez faulted Zapata for attacking clerical wealth. As Samuel Brunk notes, “it was the historical role of the Church hierarchy that Zapata rejected, not the Catholic religion itself” (69). For more on Calles and Zapata, see MacLachland and Beezley’s El Gran Pueblo: A History of Greater Mexico and Brunk’s Emiliano Zapata: Revolution & Betrayal in Mexico.

Interestingly, and as excepted, Chávez’s transnationalism in “The Blasphemer” works counter to other relations between the U.S. and Mexico of the times. According to Helen Delpar in The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican, “in the late 1920s, Mexican culture, always an attraction, became the chief magnet for Americans” (195). “Cultural pilgrims” flocked to Mexico and cultural exchange was financed by private institutions allowing a north-south transnational flow of artists, scientists, and scholars between the two nations, such as Clemente Orozco, who painted frescoes in Dartmouth College. Chávez’s negative transnationalism falls into a camp of religious conservatives who opposed Calles reforms, while the American liberal left promoted transnationalism and “applauded the reform programs of Obregón and Calles and defended them against the assaults of critics in the United States” (194).

Hesed, an Old Testament Hebrew word, essentially invokes the reciprocal relationship between God and man. It involves actions of love and kindness from man toward his fellow man and God as well as God’s loving-kindness expressed in His covenant relationship with Israel. Here Chávez seems to conflate hesed with Northern New Mexico’s Hispano culture and history. His use of the word hesed as a possession of “the land” appears to imply that Hispanos are the land’s chosen people and signals the reciprocity between Hispano peoplehood and the terrain before wrongful disruption. See Biblical Heritage Center “Hesed: Mercy or Loyalty?”

McCracken concludes that the Spanish guitar “symbolizes the anxiety of Hispanos in New Mexico about the pervasiveness of death in their age” while “the adobe symbolizes life – for they are used to construct homes that give people shelter” (22). Therefore, she positions the two objects in opposition, with the guitar as the “embodiment of Thantos” and
the adobes representing “Eros and life.” See McCracken’s “Introduction” to *Guitars and Adobes and the Uncollected Stories of Fray Angélico Chávez*.

51 See Josiah Gregg’s *Commerce of the Prairies* page 160 and Susan Shelby Magoffin’s *Down the Santa Fe Trail and Into Mexico* pages 119-120 for descriptions of Doña Tules as a “stately dame” with “shrewd sense” used to lead “inexperienced youth to the hall of final ruin.”

52 John Gould Fletcher to Fray Angélico Chávez, letter dated with the year 1939, Fray Angélico Chávez Collection, 1929-1996, Fray Angélico Chávez History Library, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

53 While “The Colonel and the Santo” was first published among Chávez’s collection of short stories entitled *From an Altar Screen* in 1957, my research indicates Chávez penned the story in 1949 or 1950 after researching New Mexico geographic place names and publishing “Saints’ Names in New Mexico Geography” in the November 1949 issue of *El Palacio*. The first place name Chávez addresses in this article is “Acacia, San” to which he writes:

> This is clearly an American corruption of San Acacio. The *acacia* tree is probably the cause of this confusion. There are several male Saints of the first centuries of Christendom bearing the name Acacius or Achatius. The santeros of nineteenth century New Mexico represented San Acacio as crucified and dressed in the Spanish military uniform of the period, sometimes with an “honor-guard” of several little soldiers on either side. … (323)

New Mexican historical geography naturally also plants the seeds for the narrative.

54 Chávez does not mind historical inaccuracy in favor of illustrating Hispano cultural evolution, evident from the changing icon of San Acacio. But, only four years later, he takes an opposing view. In 1954, Chávez was adamantly critical of altering the features and dress of La Conquistadora (the statue of the Madonna brought by Fray Alonzo Benavidez to Santa Fe in 1624). Chávez pushed for original-inspired, historically accurate vestments of La Conquistadora’s attire rather than “the flat-chested, rear-bustle Victorian look.” See McCracken’s *The Life and Writing*, page 212.

55 Vizcaíno-Alemán also asserts the global significance of “The Colonel and the Santo” in her dissertation.

56 See Chávez’s article “Some Original New Mexico Documents in California Libraries.” Additionally, Bolton would seek Chávez’s help regarding the lives of Father Escalante and Father Dominguez, two priests who sojourned across the Spanish Borderlands in 1776, from Santa Fe to Utah. In a letter dated August 25, 1950, Bolton writes Chávez and asks him “if you can furnish me with the data I lack I shall be most grateful, and shall gladly give you full credit when I publish the Escalante Diary.” Herbert Eugene Bolton to Fray
Had José Limón widened the geopolitical parameters of his fascinating study *Dancing with the Devil: Society and Cultural Poetic in Mexican American South Texas*, that uses the devil as a “signifier to capture [his] subjects contradictions under capitalism,” Chávez’s “The Ardent Commandant” would fit the theme (17). See Limón’s work for an extensive and focused regional study on how he extends the “dancing with the devil” folk legend to discuss cultural embattlement, preservation, and proliferation in South Texas.

As word of the French Revolution spread to the Américas, peoples in Spanish territories questioned their allegiance to the metropole and stoked national independence movements until sovereignty from the Spanish empire was achieved. See Chambers and Chasteen’s *Latin American Independence: An Anthology of Sources*.

Chávez’s literary segregationist move runs counter to the sentiments of the majority of the Mexican American population in the 1950s. According to Rodolfo Acuña “The G.I. Forum and other Mexican American organizations fought segregation, filing cases against several school districts in Texas. Victimized by separate and unequal schools, Mexican Americans in Texas applauded the *Brown* case” although “the *Brown* decision of 1954 had little effect on schooling for Mexican Americans at the time of the decision” (319). See *Occupied America* 4th edition.

The Ronstadt Family Collection contains dozens of newspaper clippings documenting Luisa Ronstadt’s (stage name Espinel) tours. Her fame and performance abilities landed her a role alongside lead actress Marlene Dietrich in “The Devil Is a Woman” (1935). Clearly, an inspiration for niece Linda Ronstadt, Luisa’s performance politics deserve to be analyzed in depth.

For a historical study on the rise and fall of Ignacio Pesqueira and Sonoran politics, see Rodolfo Acuña’s *Sonoran Strongman: Ignacio Pesqueira and His Times* (1974).

I follow Nicolás Kanellos’s definition of “native” in *Hispanic Immigrant Literature: El Sueño del Retorno* when I state “native literary subjects.” Kanellos argues, “...attempts to treat all “hitherto marginalized literatures, specifically the Asian-, Caribbean-, and Mexican-American ones,” under the rubric of “new immigrant,” erroneously consider[s] the works of authors of Asian-, Caribbean-, or Mexican-American ethnicity as immigrant literature while discounting their hyphenated American status; even when the authors studied are the products of generations of U.S. citizenship or residence and even of an indigenous or territorial residence prior to the establishment of U.S. dominion over their families’ lands, their works are [wrongfully] regarded as immigrant literature” (10). Kanellos uses a lowercase “n” to differentiate “native-born” Latino writers, whom he defines as “having been born or raised in the United States,” from Native American writers.
Although the photo is not dated, the “Union Pacific-Southern Pacific” map allows an approximate date range for the image. The Union Pacific purchased 38% of Southern Pacific stock in 1901 giving it control of the railroad until 1913, when the U.S. Supreme Court order the Union Pacific to sell SP stock and relinquish control. See *Union Pacific Chronological History*. Web.


See Officer’s *The Pimería Alta: Missions and More*.

See John R. Signor’s and John A. Kirchner’s *The Southern Pacific of Mexico and the West Coast Route*.

See Miguel Tinker Salas’ *In the Shadow of the Eagles* (1997) for a multi-sided discussion on the effects of Sonoran railroads.

This section of Ronstadt’s memoirs does not appear in the edited editions of *Borderman*. When *Borderman* was being prepared for publication in the early 1990s, Edward Ronstadt decided to exclude a section on wagon making that had been published nearly twenty years earlier in a magazine called *The Smoke Signal* (Spring 1975). The piece, entitled “Wagon Making in Southern Arizona” by James E. Sherman and Edward Ronstadt, used large portions of Ronstadt’s original memoirs to illuminate Tucson’s wagon making business in the fin de siècle. But, in what can now be described an act of double exclusion, Sherman and Edward Ronstadt initially removed this paragraph and several others documenting Ronstadt as a transborder wagon-seller. The narrative-eliminating cause is bound in the geopolitics of the article’s title. The original, unedited version of Federico Ronstadt’s memoirs can be found in electronic form online courtesy of the University of Arizona library.

See Ramón Ruiz’s *The People of Sonora and Yankee Capitalists* (1988).


Ronstadt’s transnational business revelations undo academically established geographic, economic-generational paradigms by Arizonan scholars. Thomas Sheridan’s theory that “businessmen like Fernando Laos, Carlos Jácome, and Federico Ronstadt … were essentially city dwellers … unlike their Mexican predecessors … frontier elite [who] utilized Tucson as a base of operations but cast their nets across southern Arizona into New Mexico, Chihuahua, and Sonora” (*Los Tucsonenses* 52) needs correction.
A letter written by Ronstadt to the Arizona Agriculturist Board on behalf of his first-born son Fred, dated April 16, 1925, explains a troubled situation involving a smuggling altercation. According to Ronstadt, Fred, who was of college-age and working at the store, innocently sold Sonoran clients a small pocket pistol and some boxes of cartridges “not knowing that there had been a federal order a few days before against selling firearms to any alien that might take them into a foreign country.” “An over-zealous Federal agent,” Ronstadt writes, made a charge against the buyers and Fred “as a conspiracy to smuggle firearms into Mexico.” Ronstadt relays the indictment was eventually dropped and his “boy’s” character should not be questioned. At no point does Ronstadt condone smuggling, but rather stresses smuggling is a violation of the law, which his son had no intent to do.

See Daniel Margolies’ *Spaces of Law in American Foreign Relations: Extradition and Extraterritoriality in the Borderlands and Beyond, 1877-1898.*

One of the earliest popular literary representations of a Mexican-free Arizona are narratives by Owen Wister, who in the 1890s, used a rhetoric of riddance to cleanse the Arizonan terrain of peoples of Mexican descent. Wister’s collection of short stories *Red Men and White* (1896) includes the tale of “Specimen Jones.” The story centralizes Jones and a young tenderfoot from the east coast who has ambitions of chasing Apaches while it places Mexicans on the social periphery as a concertina of indolent drunks who “did not understand either the letter or the spirit of American words, but they drank their drink” (45). Later in the story, when Apache induced warfare breaks out, Jones and the tenderfoot come across a burning freight wagon and “five dismembered human stumps” (58) in the road. The narrator, in a foreboding tone remarks, “this was what happened to the Miguels and Serapios and the concertina” (58), as Wister reduces a tri-cultural Arizona to a bi-racial conflict that lives up to the name of his collection, *Red Men and White.*


See *St. Augustine's Cathedral Dedication: Diocese of Tucson centennial, 1868-1968* for its historical narrative.

Linda Ronstadt, Federico Ronstadt’s granddaughter, is recognized as one of modern music’s most versatile performers. Described as a “chameleon who can blend into any background yet remain boldly distinctive,” (Loudon) Linda’s genre-crossing style, combines the sounds of country music with the syncopation of ranchero rhythms to create a melodic cultural fusion new to the late-twentieth century music scene. Collaborations with Dolly Parton, Aaron Nevil, Frank Zappa, and Flaco Jimenez to most recently sharing the stage with Mariachi Los Camperos testify to Linda’s hybrid musical exposure and her fluid navigation of the transnational music she absorbed as a child within the intimate spaces of her and her grandfather’s Tucson homes. Linda’s chameleon-like musical style was a seedling sprouted from Club Filarmonico Tucsonense led by her grandfather.
Paredes provides a detailed chronology of his college years at the University of Texas at Austin in his personal journal titled *Far East Notebook #3*. I draw from it here and for other personal biographical information that I incorporate in my chapter, unless indicated otherwise. This journal and its counterparts, which document the years 1947-1956, can be found in the Américo Paredes Papers, box 8, folder 14.

Like Paredes, de la Croix attained a doctoral degree in his respective field of art history at the University of California at Berkeley. Horst’s critical speculation on McCarthy-era social politics and its effect on his and Paredes’s futures in higher education is described more fully in de la Croix’s correspondence to Paredes, February 18, 1953, Américo Paredes Papers, box 4, folder 3.

When I say “Texan philosophical trio,” I am referring to “Philosopher’s Rock,” a statue that sits at the entrance to Barton Springs pool in Austin, Texas that commemorates the meeting spot for J. Frank Dobie, Walter Prescott Webb and Roy Bedichek. The bronze statue was cast in 1994 and placed in the area to monumentalize their friendship and literary discussions.

Dobie, a liberal for his day in academic circles, protested when the conservative University of Texas Board of Regents fired University President Homer Rainey, in 1944. Dobie supported educational integration, and ultimately, angered then Texas Governor Coke R. Stevenson. The Regents, in 1947, denied him the status of professor emeritus and removed his name from the budget. See Mody Boatright’s “A Mustang in the Groves of the Academe” and Winston Bode’s *A Portrait of Pancho*.

Mody Boatright “was a very good friend of Dobie” heightening the possibility Boatright kept some or most of Dobie’s course materials in tact after taking over his course. See Paredes’s interview with Ramón Saldívar in *The Borderlands of Culture* 113. What may be more concrete, however, is Paredes’s intellectual knowledge of several books by Dobie and Webb, which he cites repeatedly in *With His Pistol in His Hand*. I do not think it would be too far-fetched to assume Paredes was exposed to several texts by Dobie and Webb in this course.

José David Saldívar circumvents the issue in *Border Matters* (1997). Héctor Calderón traces Paredes’s ideological development of Greater Mexico in one detailed but succinct paragraph in *Narratives of Greater Mexico* (2004) and arrives at Paredes’s definition provided in Paredes’s 1976 publication *A Texas Mexican Cancionero*: “Greater Mexico refers to all the areas inhabited by people of Mexican culture – not only within the present limits of the Republic of Mexico but in the United States as well – in a cultural rather than political sense” (Paredes 1976, xiv). But, he does not consider the cultural geographic implications of Paredes’s underdeveloped definition of Greater Mexico in *With His Pistol in His Hand*. Rather, he goes on to credit “Paredes’s classic study of a border world” (26) and associate it with Paredes’s mature construction of Greater Mexico.
The Folklore of Groups” was published in English in 1979, but Paredes initially wrote and published this work Spanish in 1966 under the title “El folklore de los grupos de origen mexicano en Estados Unidos.” See Richard Bauman’s bibliography of Paredes’s work that appears in Folklore and Culture on the Texas-Mexican Border 279-287.

This statement comes from Webb’s The Great Plains and is cited by Paredes in With His Pistol in His Hand when he discusses race and racism in the “Anglo-Texan legend” See pages 17-23.

I am referring to David G. Gutiérrez’s study “Migration, Emergent Ethnicity, and the ‘Third Space’: The Shifting Politics of Nationalism in Greater Mexico.” Also see Fernandez and Gonzalez 149-80. For discussions of “third space” in a Chicana feminist context see E. Pérez, and Licona 1-20. For more general discussions of “third space” as a social production of colonized or diasporic peoples see Bhabha 207-21, Lefebvre, and Soja.

Paredes reveals in an interview with Héctor Calderón and José López-Morín that “if you read George Washington Gómez you get a very negative view of Dobie” (225). Paredes ridicules Dobie under the thinly veiled character K. Hank Harvey.

Some may be compelled to argue that Paredes’s mapping of the Border corrido from Spain to Nuevo Santander is geographically Eurocentric, but Paredes was no Hispanophile. More appropriately described as a Fronterophile, Paredes situates some romance ballads of the Border within a “related ballad tradition” linking what he calls “the frontier colonies of California, Nuevo Mexico and Nuevo Santander” (130).

On rare occasion, such as in A Vaquero of the Brush Country, Dobie, attaches the geopolitical signifier “Texan” or “Texanized” to Mexican when referring to “good Mexicans” residing in Texas. While this breaks from the homogenizing term “Mexican” and recognizes bi-national identities, Dobie’s contextual application only admits those of Mexican descent whose actions are socially acceptable to Anglos. See 60-61.

For Dobie see Vaquero of the Brush Country, The Mustangs, and Tales of Old Time Texas. For Webb see The Great Plains and The Texas Rangers. With regard to Paredes, one cannot ignore Dobie’s version of Gregorio Cortez in The Mustangs. Perhaps an undisclosed reason for Paredes’s defense of Cortez, Dobie’s rendition of the lore paints Cortez as being a wearied thief. In Dobie’s tale, Cortez is exhausted to the point of collapse while being “trailed” by the legendary Bigfoot Wallace. Only through the vigilance and strength of Cortez’s “yeguita trigueña” (little brown mare) does he avoid captivity, as Cortez is found shortly after he releases his horse (288).

Paredes uses this phrase when reflecting on an article he read about the Chinese by Pearl S. Buck entitled “China: Still the Good Earth” in The Saturday Review of Literature. As one whose life’s work bespoke cultural complexity and evolution as much as cultural recovery and conflict, Paredes critically writes: “[Buck’s] article, on the Chinese people, is sensitively and beautifully written. But, despite her deep knowledge of the Chinese, her
memories are clouded by a rosy haze of romanticism. As in *The Good Earth*, it is not the whole picture; it is only the sentimental part; the smells, the misery, the fierce struggle for survival is also part of the character of the Chinese people. Whether they are ever patient and unchanging is a debatable point; the history of Communism in China these past few years seems to point the other way …” See *Far East Notebook #2* in the Américo Paredes Papers, box 8, folder 13.

93 See the Américo Paredes Papers, box 18, folder 11.

94 See the Américo Paredes Papers, box 18, folder 11.

95 Paredes’s difficulty with Anglo-run publishing houses puts him in league with other South Texas Mexican American writers that preceded him, namely Jovita González and Jose de la Luz Sáenz. As María Cotera states “In the summer of 1939 Jovita González expressed her frustration with the decidedly unenthusiastic and sometimes downright negative responses to “All This is Mine” from publishing houses” (203). Similarly, Emilio Zamora writes of Sáenz “[He], however, was equally proficient in English and tried to publish a translation but was unable to convince English-language publishers to give the book a chance.” See Cotera’s *Native Speakers* and Emilio Zamora’s recently published edited translation of *The World War I Diary of José de la Luz Sáenz*.

96 The Cristeros were a collective of priests, lay leaders, and Catholic supporters who revolted against the anti-Catholic Mexican government lead by President Plutarco Elías Calles. From 1926-1929, Catholic insurgents took up arms in a period of Mexican history known as the Cristero Rebellion or the Cristero wars. See Meyer; MacLachlan and Beezley 275-294; and Bailey.

97 More specifically speaking, I am referencing Marx’s statement “Religion is the opium of the people,” that is translated from the German original “Die Religion … ist das Opium des Volkes” and published in Marx’s *Critique of Hegel’s ‘Philosophy of Right’* 131.

98 Theorizing Anglo-America’s movement westward, in 1931, Webb published his frontier or Great Plains thesis. He argued that the Great Plains environment (the area between the 98th meridian and the western slope of the Rocky Mountains) with its lack of timberlands and abundant rainfall, halted frontier advancement until Anglo-American settlers adapted technologically, agriculturally, architecturally, socially, and culturally to the conditions of their natural surroundings. Webb maintained that he was not influenced by Fredric Jackson Turner’s writings, which he asserted were “exclusively American” and national in scope by the time he published his hemispheric frontier analysis (7). Also see the forward to *The Great Frontier* by Rowley.

99 Paredes records with much interest the spread of U.S. democracy and capitalism versus the spread of Russian and Chinese communism throughout the Pan-Asian Pacific and in North Africa in his *Far East Journals*. See the Américo Paredes Papers, box 8, folders 12-14. Also see his wartime writings in Stars and Stripes and The American Red Cross. For an
excellent discussion of Paredes’s wartime writings and experiences dealing with his cultural perspectives on Occupied Japan see R. Saldívar 344-394.

100 See Far East Notebook #3 in the Américo Paredes Papers, box 8, folder 14.

101 While I attribute the Far East’s influence on Paredes’s perception of communism, he was also exposed in his home region of the South Texas borderlands to communism and the Marxist ideology that informs it. Paredes, as a proofreader and reporter for the Brownsville Herald during the 1930s would have been privy to communist actions. For more information on communism in the U.S. and Mexico see Rodolfo Acuña’s Occupied America and Barry Carr’s Marxism and Communism in Twentieth Century Mexico.

102 See R. Saldivar, The Borderlands of Culture 425.

103 According to Manager Jerry Bone, The Thing has been a tourist attraction since 1950. See RoadsideAmerica.com for a field review and other factoids on The Thing.

104 Krista Comer in “New West, Urban and Suburban Spaces, Postwest” states that “the signature text announcing the arrival of 1968 and the New West is Joan Didion’s first collection of essays” which narrate “western spaces on the brink of transition from older settled orders to new ones” (249). Comer says Didion mourns the fracturing of frontier values and cites Didion’s telling statement “center was not holding” to showcase her literary work as a pivot point for the arrival of a new literary West. Likewise, Daniel Worden in “Literary Cultures of the American Southwest” primarily credits Cormac McCarthy and Larry McMurtry with “rewriting” the literary Southwest, as both are examples of writers who have “returned to the [genre] and made it relevant within the context of globalization” (94). Indeed Comer and Worden are correct. Didion, McCarthy, and McMurtry de-center the region. But, it is important to note that they are the first Anglo-American writers to challenge Anglo-American literary tradition of the Southwest/West. See A Companion to the Literature and Culture of the American West.

105 Referring to U.S. immigration policy and procedure as a “broken system” is such an omnipresent catchphrase that even The White House readily uses it. See www.whitehouse.gov/issues/immigration.

106 As I put the final preparations on this manuscript, record numbers of immigrant children predominantly from Central America and Mexico enter and are detained in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of South Texas. Rick Jervis of USA Today reports that the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which is responsible for the youth, has seen a jump from 7,000 to 8,000 immigrant children annually earlier in the decade to more than 42,000 this fiscal year. Although Diplomatic talks with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto and Central American officials are underway, Boehner called for the deployment the National Guard to the border, while Perry authorized an increase in border security by the state’s Department of Public Safety.
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