

4-1-1974

## New Ethnic Literature: A Review Essay

Ralph H. Vigil

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

---

### Recommended Citation

Vigil, Ralph H.. "New Ethnic Literature: A Review Essay." *New Mexico Historical Review* 49, 2 (2021).  
<https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol49/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Mexico Historical Review by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [amywinter@unm.edu](mailto:amywinter@unm.edu), [lsloane@salud.unm.edu](mailto:lsloane@salud.unm.edu), [sarahrk@unm.edu](mailto:sarahrk@unm.edu).

## NEW ETHNIC LITERATURE: A REVIEW ESSAY

RALPH H. VIGIL

EXTREMES of thought regarding race, nationality, and ethnicity have ranged from the view of St. Augustine regarding mankind to that of nineteenth-century thinkers like Samuel G. Morton. St. Augustine, although born a non-Aryan Berber, became a God-intoxicated Christian who believed that God derived all men from one man for the purpose of giving "unity to the human race by the likeness of nature" and "to bind mankind by the bond of peace, through blood relationship, into one harmonious whole." In short, "What is true for a Christian beyond the shadow of a doubt is that every real man, that is, every mortal animal that is rational, however unusual to us may be the shape of his body, or the color of his skin, or the way he walks, or the sound of his voice, and whatever the strength, portion or quality of his natural endowments is descended from the single first-created man."<sup>1</sup> Enlightenment thought largely dispensed with God in explaining the varieties of mankind, but, as Oscar Handlin observed in *Race and Nationality in American Life*,<sup>2</sup> the essential brotherhood and common attributes of man were recognized by most Americans on the eve of the Revolution, and "Whatever differences distinguished types of men in the present, therefore, were the products of historical development rather than of characteristics inherent to them." Moreover, because John Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* had become the psychological gospel of the eighteenth century and demonstrated that the mind of man owed everything to environment, it was assumed that "repetition of identical impressions from a common environment in time produced the national characteristics

of a people." Building upon Locke and other thinkers, eighteenth-century "Philosophers" looked for what Carl L. Becker<sup>3</sup> has called "man in general" and what David Hume termed "the constant and universal principles of human nature." Which means, of course, that the age of Voltaire and that of St. Augustine were in matters of faith regarding the nature of mankind more or less in agreement.

In the nineteenth century the assumption of the oneness of human nature and the idea that "all humans were ultimately descendants of the same pair of ancestors" sharing common attributes was challenged by individuals like Samuel G. Morton who claimed that "the human race is descended from several or many original pairs." Although this theory about differences among the "races" was not widely accepted, "social scientists" of the nineteenth century, as Carlton J. H. Hayes<sup>4</sup> has observed, planted the seeds of totalitarian nationalism by fitting men into races "according to their behavior." They were aided in their task by anatomists and anthropologists who "devoted themselves with scientific fervor to measuring physiological differences among men in respect of stature, shape of skull, color of hair, eyes, and complexion, and deducing therefrom different races (with correspondingly different qualities)."

Ideas of "race" and "racialism" have been replaced by ideas of "ethnicity" and "racism," but the current trend in ethnic studies is no more and no less than an inheritance from the nineteenth-century obsession with racialism and the nationalizing of minorities. In our day "racial traits" usually go by the name of "cultural traits" or "nationalistic traits," but whatever terms one uses, the conviction that ethnic groups are more different than alike in their manner of thinking and acting remains with us. However, the current interest in ethnics and ethnicity differs from the older history. The earlier writings were largely concerned with European and Asian immigrant groups, and less with American minorities such as Mexican-Americans, and it was either feared that "the melting pot" process would make for "the passing of the great race" or it was hoped that the immigrants would soon become truly "American" and "be like us." Present-day literature about minorities in

America largely ignores the desirability or the question of assimilation and in many instances implies, infers, or boldly states that the common culture of the "regular majority" is "all too common" and that the process of assimilation is the road to godlessness or worse. In sum, ethnic literature of today more often than not emphasizes the "positive" qualities of ethnic identity and stresses that "cultural pluralism" rather than "cultural unity" is the basis for democracy in America. While there is much of value in this point of view, one often wonders whether in some instances advocates of a multiracial, multiethnic society are not really making an argument for "separate but equal" facilities, or the Balkanization of America. Ethnic or cultural "nationalism" may be only a phase in the new ethnic literature, and the books reviewed in this essay seem to indicate that in time the new ethnic literature will become a chapter in an integrated American history, capable of creating nostalgia in another generation in the remembrance of things past. After all, it is just when a particular form of social life is almost dead that it most appeals to us.

DAVID J. WEBER'S *Foreigners In Their Native Land*\* is an anthology of over sixty selections which deals with the pre-twentieth-century Mexican-American experience in the Southwest, beginning with the appointment of Juan de Oñate as *adelantado* of New Mexico. In addition to the selections, which range chronologically from 1595 to 1912 but are in the majority nineteenth-century accounts, Weber's essays and the foreword by Ramón Eduardo Ruiz provide in large part an excellent perspective of Mexican-American history.

Weber, on the one hand, provides what is lacking in most of the literature written about Mexican-Americans in the Southwest: "the obvious and important identity producing links between [this population] and the land they live on."<sup>5</sup> The anthology also

\**Foreigners in their Native Land. Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans.* Edited by David J. Weber. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1973. Pp. xiv, 288. Illus., notes, index. Cloth \$12.00, Paper \$4.95.

demonstrates that Mexicans not only crossed a river in the twentieth century but that the river crossed them in 1848. Also, the argument in the introduction that Mexican-American history is not synonymous with either Mexican history or Indian history and that the Southwest is not "the heart of Aztlán" is a good one.

On the other hand, Weber does not deal with what Arthur M. Corwin calls the biggest *non sequitur* of all, inherited from Carey McWilliams' *North from Mexico*: "namely, that the historical heritage of the massive La Raza or Chicano migration that flowed in from twentieth-century Mexico is somehow the direct lineal descendant of the historical experience of Hispanos, Tejanos, and Californios settled in small, isolated, enclaves on the distant rim of the Spanish empire."<sup>6</sup> Moreover, various statements and selections in the book, if accepted literally, tend to make the Mexican-American experience and ancestry less Iberian (European) than it was. Not only does the Mexican-American ancestry reside "in the diverse aboriginal population of Mexico" and in the mixture of Mexicans with Southwest Indians (p. 5) but it resides in the Spanish overseas migration and settlement, and "to it we owe the origin of our laws and of our existence, and through it came to our soil that part of European civilization which managed to sift through other preoccupations."<sup>7</sup> Statements that persons leading Spanish exploring and colonizing expeditions "were usually persons born in Spain of *pure Spanish blood*" (p. 12, italics mine; see also p. 18) are unfortunate, for they clash with historical reality. Spaniards who came to the New World were members of a European linguistic group but were not ethnically homogeneous. Genetically and culturally the aboriginal tribes of Spain over the centuries absorbed Celts, Phoenicians, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans, Visigoths, Jews, Arabs, Berbers, Gypsies, and medieval slaves, including Slavs and Negroes. In fact, there are probably as many Negro genes in the population of Spain today as there are Gothic genes. The population of the Goths never exceeded more than 100,000 people, and the Negro population of Spain has been estimated as numbering at least 100,000 in the early sixteenth century. Both Goths and Negroes were absorbed into the Spanish

population and did not change somatic composition of the majority of the Spaniards to any great extent. Moslems and Jews did have a great influence in the Peninsula and were part of those Spaniards described in the early sixteenth century as dark-skinned, short, haughty people inclined to war, dissimulation, and the eating of Guinea pepper with their food.<sup>8</sup> In short, Spaniards had experienced ethnic and "racial" *mestizaje* before their arrival in America, but Weber's book does not indicate this.<sup>9</sup>

It would also have been appropriate to have balanced the selection entitled "Mestizaje, The First Census of Los Angeles, 1781" (pp. 33-35) with a census of inhabitants of the Southwest in the period prior to Mexican and American rule. Why not have included the census of the first inhabitants of the Villa of San Fernando (San Antonio) or the *autos* for passing muster to be found in C. W. Hackett and C. C. Shelby, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermin's Attempted Reconquest, 1680-1682*?<sup>10</sup> Also, Weber (following Jack D. Forbes) makes the point that at least one-fifth of the Californios in 1790 were part Negro (p. 18), thus truly *Mexican* (p. 33). It is also observed that some of California's most illustrious "Spanish" pioneers had Negro ancestry, including Pío Pico, the last Mexican governor of California. Does this mean that the 8,000 "rationals" or *gente de razón* mentioned by Leonard Pitt in *The Decline of the Californios*<sup>11</sup> as comprising the inhabitants of the coastline of California in 1826 were also one-fifth Negro? In other words, were the Echeandías, Castros, Vallejos, Alvarados, Carrillos, Bandinis, Argüellos, Lugos, Sepúlvedas, Guerras, del Valles, Coronels,<sup>12</sup> Ybarras, and others also partly of Negro ancestry? More important, does this also mean that one-fifth of the Southwest population in 1790 was part Negro? This reviewer, for one, thinks that one of the books cited by Weber in his anthology, Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán's *La población negra de México, 1519-1810*,<sup>13</sup> needs to be thoroughly analyzed in its statements and sources, but even he balances out the 183 mulattoes he lists for California in 1793 by observing that there were none in New Mexico. It should also be noted that Alexander von Humboldt in the same period was of the

opinion that few Negroes had entered Mexico, and that the mestizos probably made up seven-eighths of the totality of the castes. In addition, Weber might have observed that miscegenation was not confined to the Spanish or Mexican Southwest. "Miscegenation," as Winthrop Jordan has declared in his monumental work *White over Black*,<sup>14</sup> "was extensive in all the English colonies," and in spite of the rigid barriers between whites and blacks, or because of it, "there developed the silent mechanism of 'passing.'" An example that Jordan gives of "passing" is the Gibson family in South Carolina who became fair complexioned and were accepted as whites. Jordan remarks that "Gideon Gibson's success in hurdling the barrier was exceptional," but also observes that "there is no way of telling how many other persons were effectively transformed into white men." Still, the process did occur and continues in America, as it did in Spain and Mexico and elsewhere. As Herbert Eugene Bolton noted in *The Epic of Greater America*,<sup>15</sup> "Europeans who came without their women married native girls. Half-breeds were numerous in Hispanic and French America, and squaw men were the rule on all French, Dutch, and English frontiers. In the Chickasaw nation in 1792 a fourth of the one thousand heads of Indian families were white men, mainly English. Today French, English, and Scotch 'breeds' are numerous in Manitoba, Labrador, and northern California, and dark-cheeked oil queens are popular with white men in Oklahoma." Also, Kit Carson, Charles Bent, and scores of other Anglo-Americans (including Jim Bowie) married and continue to marry into Mexican and Mexican-American families.

One might also differ with Weber on several points, one being the idea that "Most New Mexicans seemed determined to resist their conquerors" in late 1846 (p. 97). Also, Weber presents no evidence that Padre Antonio José Martínez had any part in organizing an abortive attempt to rid New Mexico of its conquerors or that he had any part in the Taos rebellion (p. 98).

Apart from the "race" question, Weber's anthology, used with other volumes, will prove useful in the teaching of Mexican-American and borderlands history. It "represents a bold effort to

develop systematically the documentary sources for Mexican American history" and Weber has an excellent understanding of the Southwest. Further, his choices, as Ramón Ruiz remarks, "reveal a refreshing sympathy for the Spaniards and Mexicans and their conquered descendants."

CHICANO, THE EVOLUTION OF A PEOPLE\* consists of fifty-one selections. The anthology begins with the heritage of the Southwest to be found in chapter VIII of Carey McWilliams' *North from Mexico*<sup>16</sup> and ends with the testimony furnished by Professor Ralph Guzmán to the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs in 1967 (pp. 456-61). The work, as the editors observe, is not definitive but their selections demonstrate historical continuity and perspective, and this is evident in their first and last choices. McWilliams in this chapter of his book, published in 1949 for "The Peoples of America" series, succinctly describes how "the underpinnings of the economy" in the Southwest "are of Spanish origin" and how "Anglo-Americans in the Southwest have been the beneficiaries of three hundred years of experimentation, adaptation, and innovation." In 1967 Guzmán discussed ethics in federally subsidized research and charged that too many scholars had used government grants only to reinforce the negative stereotypes of Mexican-Americans held by the larger society. Not only has the perpetuation of popular stereotypes created misunderstanding, but it "contributes to a disposition for unrealistic and irrelevant group goals. For example, the demand of some leaders, supported by some scholars, that the community *must* maintain a high degree of cultural solidarity and yet still be accorded the benefits of the affluent society is obviously impractical and an interference with a basic personal liberty. The Negroes wisely never accepted the idea of separate but equal. After almost sixty years the Supreme Court rejected the idea that separate facilities could ever be made

\**Chicano: The Evolution of a People*. By Renato Rosaldo, Robert A. Calvert, Gustav L. Seligmann. Minneapolis, Minn.: Winston Press, 1973. Pp. xiv, 461. Illus. No price.

equal. It should not take another sixty years to realize that separate cultural communities cannot be made equal either."

Other noteworthy and readable selections in this anthology are those by Arthur Campa, Octavio Paz, George I. Sánchez, and Fernando Peñalosa. Professors familiar with these writers will readily recognize the value of their essays in classroom discussions seeking to define the Mexican-American, when he appeared on the American scene, and "the extremes at which the Mexican can arrive" as well as his varieties. In addition, this anthology also includes statements by those who have proclaimed the rebirth of Aztlán and Chicano nationalism, and these selections make for an understanding of what another writer once and in a different context called "*La Fuerza de la Sangre*."<sup>17</sup>

The one real fault of the collection is that it lacks an adequate introduction, and the notes introducing each selection do not indicate different or similar points of view expressed by other authors. In addition, the footnotes of the selections chosen have been omitted in some instances. Thus the reader, unless he is familiar with other literature, does not know what to make of statements like that of Richard L. Nostrand (pp. 23-35) who claims that Hispano-Americans have a fatalistic philosophy. "One's fortune is predestined by God, he believes, and rather than try to overcome misfortune and control one's fate, one accepts it. Consistent with the theme of fatalism, Heller noted, is a lack of emphasis on achieving or 'making good' in Anglo-American terms." Let us assume (which is not the same as proving) that the Hispanic-Americans of the Southwest have a fatalistic philosophy and that it is derived from the belief that God has predestined one to his particular rôle in life. Then how do we explain the rôle of predestination in Calvinism and its influence in the development of capitalism in Holland and England?<sup>18</sup> In short, why does the belief in predestination give rise to a fatalistic philosophy and yet affect social and economic life in a different fashion in the Anglo and Hispanic worlds? In the same fashion, the unwary reader would tend to accept Clark S. Knowlton's thesis regarding the *patrón-peón* rôle and structure in the rural social organization of the Spanish-American people

of northern New Mexico and southern Colorado (pp. 232-37), not knowing that a reading of the original article in *Social Forces*<sup>19</sup> reveals that Knowlton used a limited number of secondary sources that do not prove his statement that a major element in the Spanish-American rural social organization was the patrón-peón pattern. It is this reviewer's opinion that if a type of patrón system developed in New Mexico, it probably was not a major element until the nineteenth century and had little in common with the patrón-peón system of northern Mexico.<sup>20</sup>

CHICANOS AND NATIVE AMERICANS\* consists of fifteen selections. Ten of the readings fall under the heading of Political Inputs, or the values, attitudes, and political behavior of Chicanos and Native Americans. Five selections deal with Political Outputs, or the response of the system to Chicanos and Native Americans. The editors state that there is "neither an attempt to discuss historical issues nor to cite again the depressing economic and educational statistics that describe these people" (p. 6). Historical perspective is singularly lacking in the book (and this is one of its weaknesses) but there is an abundance of statistics in one article dealing with the implications of research by the Civil Rights Commission (pp. 161-72). This reading, authored by Susan Navarro Uranga, deals, in part, with the degree of ethnic isolation of Mexican-Americans in the public elementary and secondary schools of the Southwest. The Civil Rights Commission, after analysis of data from the fall 1968 HEW Title IV Survey, found that the 1.4 million Mexican-American public school pupils are "severely isolated by districts and schools within individual districts." In addition, "Mexican-American staff and school board members are found in predominantly Mexican-American schools or districts" and "for the most part [Mexican-Americans] are underrepresented on school and district professional staffs and on boards of education." Further, Mexican-

\**Chicanos and Native Americans: The Territorial Minorities*. Edited by Rudolph de la Garza, Z. Anthony Kruszewski, Tomás A. Arciniega. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973. Pp. xiv, 205. No price.

American pupils do not compare favorably in achievement or educational outcomes with regular majority students. Although the article does not specifically draw conclusions from the degree of ethnic isolation it describes, it seems apparent that part of the reason for the failure of school people to teach Mexican-American children as well as regular majority students has to do with *de facto* segregated schools. Segregated and inferior schools are related, of course, to the fact that the Mexican immigrants were latecomers recruited for particular jobs and "the immigrant had few chances to learn Anglo-American ways by example or imitation."<sup>21</sup> The pattern of employment dictated type and location of residence, and in this fashion segregated areas of residence resulted in segregated schools and "limited opportunities for acculturation."<sup>22</sup> Uranga does observe that low school achievement of Chicano students has to do in part with "the exclusion of the language, culture, and community of the Chicano from the public schools of the Southwest." This observation ignores how Jim Crowism or the segregation of "Mexican" children in the public schools "has served to blind people . . . to the fact that they have used 'language handicap' and 'bilingualism' to justify 'racial' discrimination and their failure to do the kind of teaching job with these children that the American school has done with hundreds of thousands of other children who were similarly situated."<sup>23</sup>

Other articles in the book cover subjects ranging from American Indian values to political coalitions among ethnic groups in the Southwest. The articles are of uneven quality and range from excellent to poor. Also, the editors are mistaken in at least two instances. It is stated, for example, that the Chicano movement "began much as had the Black movement in the 1950's" (p. 2). The Chicano movement, as Joan Moore and Alfredo Cuéllar have pointed out, "developed in southern California no earlier than 1966."<sup>24</sup> The editors also state that "Native Americans and Chicanos are this nation's only territorial minorities" (p. 5). Had historical issues been discussed, they might have noted that Puerto Rico, Guam, the Philippines, and the Hawaiian Islands were in-

cluded in the American course of empire and the inhabitants of these areas were nineteenth-century "territorial minorities."

On the whole, this book is limited in scope and many of the articles (especially those dealing with Indians) tell us very little not already known or assumed. An example is Herbert Hirsch's paper which deals with academic myth-making and racial stereotypes (pp. 10-22). Hirsch cites Carey McWilliams, among others, to prove that from the exploration of the Southwest to the present, "Chicanos have attempted to throw off the Anglo yoke of oppression." First, the "Anglo yoke" did not manifest itself until the 1840's, some years after Oñate's first settlement in 1598. Second, a large number of Mexican-Americans still do not wish to be called "Chicanos."<sup>25</sup> Third, McWilliams himself has noted that Mexican "immigrants were at first pleased with the new opportunities which they found in the border states." It was only when they realized "that the occupations assigned them and the conditions under which they worked were regarded by American urban labor as undesirable and substandard" that they manifested "signs of restiveness."<sup>26</sup> Finally, Hirsch never once cites Cecil Robinson's exhaustive study<sup>27</sup> on the series of stereotyped "images" of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans to be found in American literature.

THE BLACK civil rights movement, in addition to spawning Black nationalism, has also had a great influence, at least rhetorically, on the Chicano and American Indian movements of recent years. More recently, cries of "black power," "red power," and "brown power" have given rise to fears on the part of the "regular majority" and also created ethnic self-consciousness on the part of Poles, Italians, Greeks, Slavs, and other descendants of the turn-of-the-century immigrants. In sum, "tribalism" based on social and economic insecurity has manifested itself among those who feel they have most to lose from welfare programs, "block busters" and the "destruction" of the neighborhood, violence in the cities, and bussing. As Andrew M. Greeley has commented in *Why Can't*

*They Be Like Us?, America's White Ethnic Groups*,<sup>28</sup> "The failure of the liberal elites to understand, much less to have compassion for this reaction, is the greatest single proof of their tendency to snobbishness with regard to white ethnics." Father Greeley does not claim that white ethnics are justified in feeling threatened by the arrival of other social groups in their neighborhoods, but he does note that they do not feel guilty or responsible over the plight of Negroes and other minorities. White ethnics argue with some justification that they did not create the plight of the Negroes in America and also point out that "No one ever worried about the Polish poor or the Irish poor, and no one seems to worry very much now about the residual poverty groups in both these populations."<sup>29</sup>

Father Greeley's objective and compassionate work on diversity in American society has influenced Michael Novak's *Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*.<sup>\*</sup> Both authors are Catholic and each is concerned with white ethnic groups other than the Anglo-Saxon (WASP, British-American) and Nordic groups in the United States. But where Greeley has succeeded in making his point, Novak either fails or confuses more than he clarifies. Novak's book is subjective, personal, readable, interesting, and unscholarly, and he tells us very little about the people he chose to call "unmeltable." In short, Novak seems to know more about an imagined Ethnic Democratic Party than he does about the ethnics he mentions in his book. He also knows very little about minority groups in the United States. All Mexican-Americans have a "Chicano culture," and they and Indians and Blacks have "cultures of the poor." If culture may be defined as transmitted organized human behavior that continues over more than one generation, then one should not confuse economic circumstances and economic determinism with culture.

Novak also observes that when he wrote his book, "the word 'ethnic' was a pejorative word, or else it meant 'colored minorities' (Indians, Blacks, Chicanos)" (p. xix). In this statement he fails to

---

<sup>\*</sup>*The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics*. By Michael Novak. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973. Pp. xxxv, 376. Notes, bibliog., index. \$1.95.

distinguish between fact and opinion. In the nineteenth century, Anglo-Americans viewed Mexican-Americans as "Spanish" or "white" if they were wealthy and fair, and considered them "Mexicans" (Indians or worse) if poor and swarthy. The truth of the matter is that Mexican-Americans call themselves by different names<sup>30</sup> and are genetically and culturally heterogeneous and probably "more diverse in social composition than any immigrant minority group in American history."<sup>31</sup> Because they are a pluralistic people, classifying "Mexicans" or "Chicanos" as a "colored minority" is misleading, and even the Federal government since 1930 has had the good sense not to confuse social prejudice with scientific fact.

Novak's generalizations about Indians, Blacks, and "Chicanos" are matched by his generalizations about "ethnics." The latter are "descendants of the immigrants of southern and eastern Europe: Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Slavs. These include, of course, Armenians, Lebanese (Ralph Nader is our favorite skinny ethnic), Slovenes, Ruthenians, Croats, Serbs, Czechs (Bohemians and Moravians), Slovaks, Lithuanians, Estonians, Russians, Spanish, and Portuguese" (p. 55). These ethnics, sometimes called PIGS by the author (p. 12), will have their day in the sun in this decade and perhaps "can carry our society further, more constructively, more inventively" (p. 22). Ethnics are Catholic, love their families, largely belong to the lower-middle-class income group, and have special characteristics and a unique "symbolic life, rhetoric, and ways of perceiving" (p. 23). For example, they are insecure, loyal Americans, hard workers, resent demonstrations (an inherent WASP tactic) (p. 15), "do not like, or trust, or even understand intellectuals," (p. 71) and "are not, in principle, against 'community control,' or even against ghettos of our own" (p. 72). Ethnics also have an "instinct for family and community" (p. 247), "are often grasping and greedy, of course," and "build their lives around family values and generally settle for modest economic roles" (p. 248). Also, "black militants can push some WASPS and some liberals around, but it [*sic*] will *not* push ethnics around" (p. 199).

Novak's ethnics "resent the liberties, privileges, wealth, and securities of the professional elites based in the universities. They also resent the actual, daily contacts of *their own culture* [italics mine] with black culture. No amount of goodwill, theory, or ideology blinds them to the actual experience of that contact: it is very often characterized by economic penalties for both whites and blacks, by rising violence and conflict, by insolence and insult, by mutual stereotype and prejudice" (p. 35).

At this point it must be observed that at least for this reviewer, American descendants of Armenians and Spaniards, for example, have different historical and cultural backgrounds. It can also be argued that the Lebanese and other ethnics, in individual instances, are not all the same. Ralph Nader is not Willie Farah,<sup>32</sup> and neither one seems to have a great similarity to various nationally known ethnics one might mention who belong to other new immigrant groups. Further, as David Riesman has remarked, "an Italian in Rhode Island may hail from a Sicilian village while an Italian in San Francisco came from Providence or Brooklyn along with everybody else and as early as almost everybody else."<sup>33</sup>

The real enemy in America for Novak is WASP culture, best represented by educated liberals and intellectuals. Intellectuals are resented because they have "unchecked power and influence" and are "establishment" (p. 19). It is claimed that intellectuals are "a dominant ruling elite (among other elites)" (p. 176) whose "intellectual project for America—whether conservative, liberal, or radical—is radically Anglo-Saxon in orientation" (p. 174). This intellectual project is based on solitariness, i.e., "soul-scouring isolation" and "a guarantee of—not a cure for—alienation." Although Novak states that intellectuals have risen to power only since 1932, to him the myth of "modernity" or isolation almost perfectly coincides with what he calls the "myth of the Anglo-Saxon race in America" (p. 175). Ethnics, so Novak tells us, were not only victims of "Nordic racism" but those who aspired to be Americans had to learn (1) loneliness or the solitariness of Protestant consciousness; (2) faith in unlimited success or the rightness of giving free rein to avarice and ambition; (3) mastery or the will of the solitary

self exemplified in the cowboy, the outlaw, and the gangster; (4) the myth of self-help; (5) the equation of America with the Kingdom of God; (6) a new system of internal repression; and (7) a new relationship to sexual fears, or the idea that fornication though socially necessary was *inherently* demeaning (pp. 108-28).

Novak himself is the best critic of his book when he states that his friends "and critics sometimes complain that they do not know where I am, or where I am coming from. My standpoint is not fairly described (whose is ?) as radical, or liberal, or conservative" (p. 61). Thus the search for its roots.

IN CONCLUSION, the following comments and observations are offered. Cultural pluralism does exist in America, but the importance one places on ethnic heritage varies with individuals and groups. There is some basis to the idea that Catholics and Protestants are different in attitudes and that their beliefs determine behavior. However, Catholic and Protestant identity varies among individuals and is influenced by orthodoxy, ethnicity, education, and class. In addition, all religious groups in America produce both saints and sinners. Further, we still do not know very much about ethnic and social-class differences in America, much less national character and how it is shaped and changed. Finally, one does not have to reject one's ethnic heritage to believe that in a truly democratic society, a consensus of opinion must be shared by the majority rooted in a common language and fundamental goals, or for want of a better term, a common culture.

## NOTES

1. St. Augustine, *City of God* (Image Books ed., 1958), pp. 295, 365.
2. Boston, 1957.
3. Carl L. Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven & London, 1964).
4. *A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900* (New York, Evanston, and London, 1963), p. 256.
5. Rodolfo Alvarez, "The Unique Psycho-Historical Experience of the Mexican-American People," *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 52 (1971), pp. 15-29.
6. Arthur M. Corwin, "Mexican-American History: An Assessment," *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 42 (1973), pp. 269-308.
7. Andrés Bello as quoted by Jesús María Henao and Gerardo Arrubla, *History of Colombia*, tr. & ed. by J. Fred Rippey (Chapel Hill, 1938), p. 3.
8. Charles Gibson, ed., *The Black Legend, Anti-Spanish Attitudes in the Old World and the New* (New York, 1971), pp. 32, 64.
9. "Much more needs to be said about the racial and cultural *mestizaje* within Spain before the American expansion. Here, precisely, may lie the *real* root of foreigners' contempt for Spaniards. The great flowering of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Spain should not be viewed in our future research without reference to this medieval past. Similarly, *mestizaje*, always subject to denigration, is the most interesting, significant and enduring contribution of Latin America to a world poisoned by deeply rooted racism." Brian R. Hamnett, reviewing Philip Wayne Powell, *Tree of Hate: Propaganda and Prejudices Affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World* (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. 53, 1973, pp. 671-72).
10. 2 vols., Albuquerque, 1970.
11. *The Decline of the Californios, A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californios, 1846-1890* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1970), p. 2.
12. Jack Forbes states that "Juan Antonio Coronel was classed as a mulatto by Father Serra." Jack Forbes, "Black Pioneers: The Spanish-Speaking Afroamericans of the Southwest," in George E. Frakes and Curtis B. Solberg, eds., *Minorities in California History* (New York, 1971), pp. 20-33. However, as France V. Scholes has observed in the case of the slurs and insults directed against the supporters of Governor Luis de Rosas (1637-1641), care must be exercised in dealing with these characterizations regarding race of individuals in the absence of absolute proof that a particular individual was a *mestizo* or a negro caste, for in the New World epithets directed against individuals of an opposing faction many times

reflected "personal and political passion rather than any deep feeling with regard to the character and race of [individuals]." See France V. Scholes, "Church and State in New Mexico," in Richard N. Ellis, *New Mexico Past and Present* (Albuquerque, 1971), pp. 30-51 (first published in NMHR, vol. 11, 1936, pp. 297-325).

13. Mexico, 1946. The author states that in 1793 there were in Upper California 24 clerics, 6 Europeans, 435 *españoles americanos*, 183 mulattoes, 418 other castes, and 3,234 Indians. New Mexico had 28 clerics, 16 Europeans, 14,537 *españoles americanos*, no mulattoes, 5,736 other castes, and 10,664 Indians. See p. 229.

14. *White Over Black, American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Baltimore, 1969), pp. 136-78.

15. Herbert Eugene Bolton, "The Epic of Greater America," in John Francis Bannon, ed., *Bolton and the Spanish Borderlands* (Norman, 1968), pp. 301-32.

16. *North from Mexico, The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States* (New York, 1968), pp. 133-61.

17. Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *Novelas Ejemplares* (many editions).

18. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York, 1955).

19. Vol. 41 (1962), pp. 12-17.

20. William B. Taylor observes that a *patrón* society "in a relatively pure and static form could be found only on the immense haciendas of northern Mexico before the Revolution of 1910 where a firmly entrenched system of debt peonage prevailed." However, he errs in stating that the *patrón* relationship in southern Colorado "amounted to a personal dependence and mutual obligation between a large landowner and the peasants living on or near his property," for this statement implies that the landowner and the peasants were not related. In the case of my great-uncle, José Urbano Vigil (mentioned in Taylor's article) and his brother Rafaél, there was a feeling of personal dependence because J. U. Vigil was the elder brother. However, one was not a peasant and the other was not a patrician landowner. Moreover, J. U. Vigil is better described as a political *caudillo* rather than as a *patrón*. See William B. Taylor and Elliott West, "Patrón Leadership at the Crossroads: Southern Colorado in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 42 (1973), pp. 335-57. As George Sánchez observed, "field hands, herders, and other laborers, as well as domestic servants, were often close relations of the *patrón*. Nearly all were landowners, with virtually the same economic standards of living as their employer." George I. Sánchez, *Forgotten People, A Study of New Mexicans* (Albuquerque, 1967), p. 6.

21. McWilliams, p. 214.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 216.
23. George I. Sánchez, "History, Culture, and Education," in Julian Samora, ed., *La Raza, Forgotten Americans* (Notre Dame, 1969), pp. 1-26.
24. Joan W. Moore with Alfredo Cuéllar, *Mexican Americans* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970), p. 149.
25. Richard L. Nostrand, "'Mexican American' and 'Chicano': Emerging Terms for a People Coming of Age," *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 42 (1973), pp. 389-406. See also Moore with Cuéllar, p. 8, and Joseph V. Metzgar, "The Ethnic Sensitivity of Spanish New Mexicans: A Survey and Analysis," *NMHR*, vol. 49 (1974), pp. 49-74.
26. McWilliams, p. 190.
27. Cecil Robinson, *With the Ears of Strangers, The Mexican in American Literature* (Tucson, 1963).
28. New York, 1971.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 155-56.
30. See note 25 *supra*.
31. Moore with Cuéllar, p. 1.
32. See "Farah, The Strike that has Everything," *The Texas Observer* (Dec. 29, 1972), pp. 1-7.
33. David Riesman, "Some Questions about the Study of American Character in the Twentieth Century," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 370 (1967), pp. 36-47.