

4-1-2014

Against the Odds: Chinese-Mexican Marriages in Southern Arizona, 1880–1930

Sal Acosta

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

Recommended Citation

Acosta, Sal. "Against the Odds: Chinese-Mexican Marriages in Southern Arizona, 1880–1930." *New Mexico Historical Review* 89, 2 (2014). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol89/iss2/3>

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, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sarahrk@unm.edu.

Against the Odds

CHINESE-MEXICAN MARRIAGES IN SOUTHERN ARIZONA, 1880–1930

Sal Acosta

Manuel Ahloy and Isabel Escalante traveled two hundred miles from Tucson, Arizona, to Silver City, New Mexico, in August 1891. They undoubtedly rode on the recently completed railroad line that connected towns along a southern route from California to Texas. Although the eight-hour train ride represented some inconvenience and expense—the tickets alone cost the working-class couple nearly one hundred dollars roundtrip—venturing by horse carriage, as travelers had done just a decade earlier, seemed almost prohibitive. The ten-day journey by carriage would have incurred significant lodging costs and proven particularly strenuous in the midst of southern Arizona’s summer temperatures that typically surpass one hundred degrees Fahrenheit.¹ In the couple’s view, however, the trip merited both cost and effort, for they were visiting Silver City to enter into marriage.² Ahloy was actually born Fô Loy in Hong Kong and could not legally marry Escalante in Arizona.³

This study seeks to locate Chinese-Mexican marriages within the history of racial attitudes in southern Arizona from 1880 to 1930.⁴ It argues that these intermarriages occurred primarily because Chinese men entered the racially ambiguous space Mexicans occupied in the Southwest, an area characterized by both racist attitudes and racial fluidity. Frequently, time and location—more than legal restrictions, definitions, and categories—determined which interethnic marriages could legally take place. Some Chinese-Mexican couples

Sal Acosta is assistant professor of American history at Fordham University. He is preparing a book manuscript on interethnic marriage among Mexicans in southern Arizona.

actually obtained legal marriages in Arizona, whereas others traveled out of the territory or state to circumvent the miscegenation law.⁵ This study briefly addresses the manifestations of racism—such as laws, rhetoric, and violence—but underscores the relative forbearance in which these couples managed to form families. Their interethnic unions demonstrate that individuals successfully adapted to the legal, social, and cultural realities of the Southwest as they sought the benefits of family life and the protection and recognition of legal marriages. This article focuses on three subtopics: (1) the high probability that Chinese men would experience permanent bachelorhood in Arizona; (2) the ability of Chinese-Mexican couples to marry inside and outside Arizona; and (3) the family experiences of these couples and their descendants.

The existence of Chinese-Mexican marriages supports historian Peggy Pascoe's assessment that miscegenation laws were strict yet porous. It also reinforces legal historian Laura E. Gómez's argument that the construction of Mexicans as a racial group positioned them between whites and nonwhites. The proliferation of miscegenation laws that targeted Chinese, Pascoe explains, stemmed from state and territorial efforts to codify white supremacy and to establish firm distinctions between whites and nonwhites. Accordingly, in the 1860s, western legislatures began to prohibit those marriages. Yet, they never banned unions among nonwhites, for instance, between blacks and Chinese, for their marriages did not threaten white purity.⁶ The racial ambiguity of Mexicans thus proved important because the official classification of Mexicans as white in the nineteenth century, Gómez maintains, coincided with their social construction as nonwhite.⁷ In their position as an intermediate group, Gómez and other historians have argued, Mexican elites sought to establish their whiteness by separating themselves from blacks, Chinese, and Indians.⁸ But poor Mexicans frequently faced the same social obstacles and ostracism as nonwhites and were not in a position to pursue social whiteness. Their actions—and their bodies, historian Pablo Mitchell posits—in fact became foci of inspection and disapproval.⁹ Their racial ambiguity meant that some interethnic couples could escape the grip of miscegenation laws by convincing local officials that neither partner was white or by traveling to evade the law. Mexicans, several studies have demonstrated, were often able to marry nonwhites.¹⁰ Their relationships with Chinese followed a similar path.

Until recently historians had undertaken a narrow approach to race and class to examine the role of intermarriage among Mexicans in the Southwest in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, creating two gaps in the historiography: (1) scholars had primarily focused on intermarriages between prominent white men and the daughters of the old Mexican elites; and (2) even when studying the lower classes, marriages with whites tended to dominate

the scholarship. In particular, the elite-centered narrative still permeates the syntheses and overviews and originates from a tendency in the most influential historiography to highlight the lives of dominant classes or figures, people who leave the most historical records. Scholars, such as Rodolfo Acuña, Tomás Almaguer, and Albert Camarillo, correctly identify the alliances formed through intermarriage by social and political leaders from both groups.¹¹ They posit that wealthy Mexican families tried to maintain their power and whites sought access to trade, land, inheritance, and political influence.¹²

Whatever the psychological and economic prerogatives behind these prominent unions, their predominance in the historiography distorts their frequency among the Mexican population of the Southwest. Demographic logic suggests that the potential intermarriages among the more than one hundred thousand lower-class Mexicans who lived in the area in the nineteenth century could easily surpass the number of marriages among the few dozen elite Mexican families. Indeed, recent studies prove that intermarriages among the lower classes represented the norm.¹³ Along with emphases on the lower classes, these works also focus on different types of intermarriage. For instance, Karen Isaksen Leonard and Rudy P. Guevarra analyze marriages between working-class Mexican women and working-class Punjabi and Filipino immigrants, respectively, and Ana C. Downing de De Juana studies the relationship between Mexican men and women and working-class blacks and Indians.¹⁴ This case study on the Tucson area corroborates the primacy of this latter type of intermarriage. It reveals that these relationships took place almost exclusively among working-class partners, primarily between Mexicans and whites, but also between Mexicans and either blacks or Chinese.

Men like Fô Loy could hardly expect to marry when they immigrated to the United States after the mid-nineteenth century. In the early 1880s, he arrived in Tucson, where he met his future wife, Isabel, a recent immigrant from the neighboring Mexican state of Sonora.¹⁵ Born only one generation after the United States obtained half of Mexico's territory in the U.S.–Mexico War (1846–1848), the future spouses partook in the migratory wave that settled in the burgeoning American Southwest. As part of the Americanization process in the acquired lands, the new state and territorial governments swiftly imposed legal codes that reflected, among other things, American racial prejudices. In Arizona, this transformation included an immediate ban on marriages of whites to blacks, Chinese, and Native Americans. The couple thus decided to make the long and expensive visit to Silver City to circumvent the miscegenation law.

Discrimination against Chinese residents pervaded the West. Most notoriously, Chinese residents in San Francisco lived under constant harassment

and vilification by the dominant white population.¹⁶ Verbal attacks ranged from claims that they refused to Americanize to allegations of dealing drugs, spreading disease, and practicing polygamy. But physical violence typically erupted only in small mining towns, such as those in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming.¹⁷ For its part, Arizona exhibited both the vitriol of California and the violence of the mining towns.¹⁸ Chinese men faced local covenants that restricted mining sites to whites only, and in some towns, they faced de facto anti-Chinese leagues and were forbidden residence in certain neighborhoods.¹⁹ Actual physical attacks took place in the mining areas of Clifton, Flagstaff, Prescott, and Tombstone, among others. They fared better than in other states, but at least fifteen Chinese men died in such episodes.²⁰

Chinese immigrants also endured this violent treatment in northern Mexico, where they arrived in significant numbers primarily after the United States restricted their immigration in 1882.²¹ They experienced physical attacks, including the massacre of over three hundred Chinese residents in Torreón, Coahuila, in 1911. In Sonora, the state that has historically sent the highest percentage of Mexican immigrants to Arizona, local populations accused Chinese men of taking their jobs and their women, 166 of whom had married Chinese men. In 1923 the Sonora legislature unanimously approved a law to forbid marriages between Chinese men and Mexican women, and in 1931, the state enacted a law to deport Chinese immigrants.²²

The Prospect of Permanent Bachelorhood

In addition to the antagonism Chinese residents encountered—and, in effect, as a manifestation of it—Arizona's miscegenation law (1865–1962) greatly limited their ability to form families. The newly formed Arizona Territory wasted no time in encoding racial barriers. In 1864 the First Territorial Legislature approved a ban on interracial marriages by borrowing from the statutes of California.²³ The identical laws made the following stipulation: "Marriages of white persons with negroes or mulattoes are declared to be illegal and void." Violations resulted in a misdemeanor, and fines ranged from one hundred to ten thousand dollars and prison sentences from three months to ten years.²⁴ The law recognized marriages that had occurred legally in other states—including interracial marriages—regardless of their legality in Arizona. Although in 1901 the legislature made it illegal to leave the territory purposely to circumvent the law, Arizona couples could, in theory, secretly visit another state or country, marry, return to Arizona, and enjoy the legal protections of valid marriages.²⁵

In 1865 the Second Territorial Legislature promptly added Indians and Chinese to the list of people who could not marry whites. These additions

separated Arizona from the less restrictive statutes of its neighbors. At the time, California and New Mexico only prohibited marriages between blacks and whites, and the latter's legislature repealed its law the next year (1866).²⁶ Although racial segregation and the presence of minority groups historically correlated with the enactment of bans on interracial marriage, the Arizona law anticipated, rather than responded to, such circumstances.²⁷ The prohibition on Chinese-white marriages demonstrated more racism and fear than common sense. At the time of its passage, Arizona had zero Chinese residents, and only twenty had appeared by 1870. In fact Arizona's Chinese population never exceeded 1,700 between 1870 and 1930, when it decreased to 1,110.²⁸

Nonetheless, Arizona politicians and newspapers frequently spoke against Chinese residents before and after the United States curbed Chinese immigration in 1882. Mining interests, in particular, exerted great influence in Arizona politics throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; in the 1860s, miners outnumbered other professions in the legislature by a ratio of two to one. In all likelihood, regional antagonism toward Chinese workers prompted miners to vote for the ban on white-Chinese marriages.²⁹ But the legislature went even further. In 1887 Arizona became one of the first American governments to adopt strict definitions of whiteness in its miscegenation law. The amendment extended the prohibition to include marriages between "persons of Caucasian blood or their descendants with Africans, Mongolians and their descendants."³⁰ This clause sought a more rigid curtailment of intermarriage by forbidding people with any trace of black, Chinese, or Indian ancestry from marrying people with any percentage of white ancestry—anticipating, if more vaguely, the one-drop laws that would appear in the early twentieth century.³¹ Thus, even if one went with a racial definition of Mexican—rather than with their legal whiteness—mestizos would not be able to marry either white or Chinese partners. As partially white, they could not marry nonwhites, and, of course, as partially Indian, they could not marry whites. Ridiculously, a strict enforcement of the law would mean that multiracial people could marry no one, not even another multiracial partner—an unintended effect of legislation that only sought to restrict marriages to whites. In sum, as early as 1865, Arizona legislators had adopted a restrictive miscegenation law that exceeded those in California and New Mexico, and by 1887, it had surpassed most legislatures in the country by encoding a strict definition of whiteness.

In addition to Arizona's miscegenation law and anti-Chinese attitudes, two factors combined to produce a high probability that Chinese men would never be able to form families in the West. First, the great majority had migrated either as married men traveling alone or, more frequently, as single men.

Second, relatively few Chinese women arrived in the United States before the 1940s. All data suggest that Chinese men faced considerably limited prospects of a married life in Arizona because of highly disproportionate sex ratios that plagued their community. Nationally, Chinese men outnumbered Chinese women by a ratio of 21 to 1 in 1880 and by a still high 4 to 1 in 1930. Locally, only two Chinese endogamous couples appear in the Tucson census of 1880. More revealing, from 1860 to 1910, only one unmarried Chinese woman sixteen years of age or older resided in town, whereas the number of single Chinese men ranged from 54 to 116. The number of Chinese couples does begin to increase in 1910, reaching a high of nineteen in 1920, but single Chinese men always outnumbered their female counterparts by a ratio of at least 10 to 1 (see table 1).

Table 1. Chinese adult residents and couples involving Chinese, Tucson, 1860–1930

Census year	Couples			Chinese residents sixteen years old and over		
	Chinese endogamous	Chinese man-Mexican woman	Other	Married men, wife not present	Single men	Single women
1860	0	0	0	0	0	0
1870	0	0	0	0	0	0
1880	2	0	1	20	98	1
1900	6	4	0	105	54	0
1910	9	3	1	42	116	0
1920	19	4	1	80	64	6*
1930	18	1	2	33	71	7

Sources: All information comes from a database created by the author based on the census schedules for Tucson for the years 1860–1930. See Population schedules, city of Tucson, Arizona County, New Mexico Territory, Federal Census, 1860, r. 712, microfilm (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Record Service), Eighth Census of the United States, microcopy M653, National Archives Microfilm Publications, Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C. [hereafter Federal Census, year, roll #, Microcopy #, RG29, NARA]; Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1864, r. 46, MM593, RG29, NARA; Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1870, r. 46, MM593, RG29, NARA; Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1880, r. 36, MT9, RG29, NARA; Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1900, r. 47, MT623, NARA; Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1910, r. 41, M T624, NARA; Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1920, r. 50–51, MT625, NARA; and Population schedules, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1930, r. 61–62, MT626, NARA.

Note: The Arizona schedules for the 1890 census no longer exist.

*In 1920 three of the single women were sisters listed as Chinese but were born in Mexico, so their mother might have been Mexican because they do not share the surname of the listed parents and some siblings. Population schedules, district 103, p. 12B, lines 71–79, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1920, MT625, RG29, NARA. The other three single women were widows (ages 30, 32, and 32).

Consequently, a great majority of Chinese men who migrated to Tucson between 1870 and 1930 faced the high probability of living in permanent bachelorhood. Whether single or as absentee husbands (married but living apart), Chinese men who settled in Tucson consistently migrated to the United States when they were approximately twenty years old (see table 2).

Table 2. Chinese men sixteen years old and over, Tucson, 1880–1930

Year	Married and living apart						Single					
	All			Forty years of age and over			All			Forty years of age and over		
	Total	Average age in years	Average age at migration	Total	Average age in years	Average years since migration	Total	Average age in years	Average age at migration	Total	Average age in years	Average years since migration
1880	20	33.3	No data	4	50.5	No data	98	27.6	No data	9	44.3	No data
1900	105	40.8	19.7	54	47.9	28.4	54	41.3	18.5	34	46.9	25.4
1910	42	47.6	21.3	38	48.9	27.1	113	46.7	20.7	90	50.9	29.5
1920	80	49.3	22.4	63	54.0	33.2	61	40.2	18.2	33	54.7	35.8
1930	33	40.1	19.7	17	50.6	28.5	69	39.2	15.4	32	57.5	43.3

Source: All information comes from a database created by the author based on the census schedules for Tucson for the years 1880–1930. The information for 1880 is unavailable because the forms did not include a box for year of migration.

Note: Some of these totals are lower than those in Table 1 because a few entries did not mention the age of the individual.

Over this period, however, measurable differences arise between married and single men when one analyzes data for those over forty years of age—i.e., long-time residents. Between 1880 and 1930, the average age of married men (ranging from forty-eight to fifty-four years) and their residence in the country (between twenty-seven and thirty-three years) remained remarkably consistent. In other words, the cohort of permanently absentee husbands periodically renewed itself: some of them reunited with their wives by bringing them to the United States or, more likely, by returning permanently to China, since typically only affluent merchants could meet the expenses and qualifications required to obtain American visas.³² Apparently, the strategy by local leaders in China—coercing immigrants into marriages to instill a sense of allegiance to the sending Chinese village—worked at least partially, for many immigrants did return to China to rejoin their wives and communities.³³

The typical single man over forty years of age, on the other hand, became progressively older, and his length of residence increased every decade. In 1900 the average bachelor was forty-seven years old and had lived in the country for twenty-five years. Over the next three decades, both numbers increased steadily. By 1930, Chinese bachelors were on average fifty-eight years old and had resided in the United States for an extraordinary forty-three

years. Evidently, large numbers of Chinese men never managed to marry in the United States or to make marriage trips to China. Sadly, these Chinese men had arrived as young laborers, spent more than two thirds of their lives in the West, and faced the tangible prospect of dying as old bachelors, a sentence further complicated by racist attitudes in the region.

Beating the Odds in the Mexican Borderlands

Thus, anti-Chinese attitudes in the American Southwest and in northern Mexico, a strictly-worded miscegenation law that preceded the arrival of Chinese immigrants in Arizona, and extremely skewed sex ratios in their communities all combined to create almost insurmountable odds against the formation of families.³⁴ Therefore, the number of relationships Chinese men formed with Mexican women, although relatively small in comparison to the total Chinese population, proved even more significant. The fate of those men who never married—and locally there was only one Chinese man-Anglo woman marriage between 1880 and 1930—attests to the importance of Chinese-Mexican relationships.³⁵ The persecution of Chinese residents in San Francisco, western mining towns, and northern Mexico would suggest that Tucson, with the presence of whites and a large percentage of Mexican immigrants from Sonora, might portend difficulties for its Chinese residents. Such, however, was not the case. Several circumstances combined to create a more accommodating space for Chinese men in Tucson, especially in Mexican enclaves.

Examples of ethnic antagonism clearly illustrate how Arizona resembled other parts of the West, but significant factors demonstrate conditions that fostered forbearance. Two dichotomies help to explain the fluidity of race and the variability of race relations in the seemingly intolerant territory. First, in effect, there were two Arizonas, one where whites predominated and controlled political and economic power and another one where they did not. Second, there were two kinds of whiteness in Arizona, social and legal (Anglos possessed both and Mexicans only the latter). Consequently, Chinese—and Mexicans, for that matter—encountered more antagonism in Anglo dominated central and northern Arizona and in mining towns across the state than in Tucson, and Chinese men witnessed opprobrium only when they pursued relationships with white women.³⁶

Most likely due to their relatively low numbers, Tucson's Chinese residents did not encounter the type of harassment their countrymen faced in places like San Francisco and in Arizona mining towns. Tucson officials often linked prostitution and opium use to the Chinese, but no violent anti-Chinese

campaigns occurred in the city. No distinctive Chinatown developed, and the city never had to deal with the creation of Chinese brothels—a source of great antagonism from the white population in San Francisco. In Tucson, Chinese immigrants lived in predominantly Mexican enclaves.³⁷ The very few Chinese residents who lived in white neighborhoods worked as either cooks or servants. Their presence, therefore, did not threaten or undermine the class and racial status of whites in those areas. Editorial attacks did occur occasionally in town, but papers from central and northern Arizona and from mining towns expressed far more hostility and did so more frequently than their Tucson counterparts. True, in the early 1880s, the *Tucson Arizona Weekly Star* published a letter accusing Chinese storekeepers of taking advantage of local Mexicans. But Louis C. Hughes—owner of the *Star* and the only local Hughes brother who did not marry a Mexican woman—had to travel to the mining town of Tombstone to express his solidarity with an anti-Chinese gathering. He asserted that Chinese stores in Tucson were underselling local merchants, in part, because Chinese stomachs were supposedly easily satisfied.³⁸

These verbal attacks and the efforts to segregate Chinese residents did not receive enough support in Tucson to take effect by law or custom. In 1893 the Tucson city council rejected a proposal to restrict Chinese settlement to certain areas, granting them the freedom to escape the types of enclaves that existed in other Arizona towns.³⁹ Furthermore, the Chinese labor force never became large enough to represent a threat to Mexican workers.⁴⁰ More importantly, evidence suggests that, in general, Mexicans welcomed Chinese men into their communities and even into their extended families. Several of the Chinese-Mexican marriages involved Chinese men whose businesses catered to the Mexican community and who learned the Spanish language.

In addition to its sizeable Mexican population, Tucson differed in another important way from areas that antagonized Chinese immigrants. Intermarriage of various forms characterized the multiethnic space Chinese immigrants entered when they began arriving in southern Arizona in the 1870s. These interethnic unions became commonplace in Tucson immediately after its acquisition by the United States in 1853. The town's first American census (1860) revealed that, in addition to the preponderant endogamous Mexican families, the few white men who resided in town were twice as likely to live with Mexican women than with white women (see table 3 for all data in this paragraph). These white-Mexican intermarriages continued to increase in total numbers for the next seventy years, although logically the rates relative to white endogamous marriages declined because the white population grew more rapidly. In particular for white men, these unions accounted for 92 percent of all their relationships in 1864, 79 percent in 1870, and a still significant

Table 3. Population and couples for Mexicans and whites, Tucson, 1860–1880

Census year	Population	Endogamous couples		Exogamous couples	
		White	Mexican	Mexican-white	Mexican-nonwhite
1860	940	6	104	16	1
1864	1568	2	150	22	1
1870	3224	14	397	54	2
1880	7007	149	461	97	1

Source: All information comes from a database created by the author based on the census schedules for Tucson for the years 1860–1880. The table does not include soldiers stationed in Tucson during these years.

39 percent in 1880, when 97 of the 246 white men involved in relationships had a Mexican partner. For Mexican women, the rate of these interethnic relationships consistently ranged between 12 percent and 17 percent during this period.

Although one can ascertain the number of white-Mexican legal marriages with relative ease, Chinese-Mexican unions prove significantly more difficult to find. Only Jew Lee and Francisca Valdez, who married in 1910, and Dong Yet and Rosario Ramirez, who wed in 1924, obtained licenses and married legally in the Tucson area. Similarly, though more common, legal marriages involving the children of Chinese-Mexican couples occurred only five times in the Tucson area by 1930. Nonetheless, further inquiry reveals the persistence of these couples in forming families. For example, a divorce record suggests that some Chinese-Mexican couples were indeed marrying elsewhere even if living in southern Arizona. Such was the case of Lee Kow and Mercedes Chávez, whose divorce in 1920 represents the only legal separation of a Chinese-Mexican couple in Tucson. They stated their marriage had taken place in 1916, but no record of it exists in Arizona.⁴¹ Residents moved in and out of the region, and census canvasses could only record them if their time of residency coincided with the decennial enumeration. Some couples might have lived in Tucson for several years, married in Mexico or New Mexico, returned to Tucson, and moved away, all between census counts. Others might have married outside Arizona before settling in Tucson, making their unions legal but leaving no traces of a marriage license in Arizona or in southern New Mexico. Thus, the dissolution of the Kow-Chávez union indicates that their marriage definitely took place, but one can only offer conjectures about where and, more importantly, about how many other couples resembled their situation.

Tucson residents undoubtedly knew that marriages took place outside Arizona. For example, in 1895, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that in recent

years two Chinese men had requested marriage licenses in Tucson to marry Mexican women, and when rejected, they hired a lawyer who argued that the women, having “Moorish and Indian ancestry, were exempt from the law.”⁴² The judge rejected the argument, and the couples went to Silver City, married there, and returned to Tucson, where they “lived happily ever afterwards.”⁴³ Such was also the recourse of You Cang, from China, and Esperanza Fraijo, from Sonora. The couple wed at St. Augustine Catholic Church in 1896. The priest indicated that the couple had already obtained a civil marriage in Lordsburg, New Mexico—the nearest New Mexico town connected to Tucson by rail. Although a justice of the peace had already married them in New Mexico, the Tucson ceremony was not entirely superfluous. Fraijo had in fact given birth to the couple’s first child two months before their trip to Lordsburg, and the church wedding probably helped to legitimize their union among family and friends.⁴⁴

Accounts in New Mexico legal records of successful wedding trips from Arizona reveal the frequency of the practice and illustrate the existence of networks among interethnic couples. One can safely assume that this recourse formed part of the conversation among interethnic couples that could not legally marry in Arizona—as dozens more made visits to New Mexico in the ensuing years. A couple could offer both moral support and valuable information to family members. For example, in 1920, Manuel Samaniego and Mary Lee—daughter of a Chinese-Mexican couple—traveled from Tucson to Lordsburg. Their wedding proceeded smoothly, and they evidently informed Mary’s sister of their experience, for one year later, Isaura Lee and Harry Williams Nelson also found their way to Lordsburg. A certain apprehension might have prompted Isaura and Harry to opt for New Mexico. She had previously married a Chinese man legally in Arizona. Perhaps she feared that while local officials allowed her to marry a Chinese man, a marriage to a white man represented a different issue. She might have been unaware that both marriages were in fact prohibited under Arizona statutes, but the marriage to Harry must have seemed like more of a violation.⁴⁵

Couples could also exchange information with friends. For example, the aforementioned Ahloys made their wedding journey in 1891 in the company of Jim Lee and Concepción Moreno, another Chinese-Mexican couple from Tucson in pursuit of a legal marriage. The four friends had most likely discussed and planned their trip together, for they married on the same day and served as witnesses to the others’ ceremony.⁴⁶ Similarly, Charles Lee and Concepción Chávez married in Lordsburg in early 1898. Four months later, and certainly after sharing information about the opportunity to obtain a legal marriage across the territorial line, they accompanied and served as

witnesses to Hi Woo and Ernestina Moreno when they, too, made a marriage trip to Lordsburg. In all likelihood, lying to the local authorities formed part of the advice, for both couples falsely claimed local residency.⁴⁷ Although a few couples might have feared legal ramifications and claimed they actually resided in New Mexico, for the most part, these brides and grooms openly stated that they lived in Arizona.⁴⁸

The evidence indicates that Arizona couples deliberately visited New Mexico as a strategy to escape the purview of the miscegenation law. In total, at least thirty-two interethnic couples from various racial groups made such wedding trips between 1891 and 1929. Only seven couples made the journey before 1910, but the numbers increased in the 1910s and 1920s, as the Chinese and black populations, though still small, grew. Most of them came from Tucson or from places located closer to it than to the New Mexico border, but some traveled from as far as Phoenix. Although endogamous couples from Arizona towns bordering New Mexico frequently crossed into Silver City and Lordsburg to marry, the interethnic couples in question made trips that ranged from 110 to 270 miles, clearly inconvenient distances and expenses to cover if they could otherwise marry locally. Although Mexico was geographically closer, it appears that New Mexico became a more common destination. Perhaps they ascribed more validity to an American than to a Mexican marriage certificate, even though Arizona law recognized interstate and international marriages equally. Resistance to Chinese-Mexican marriages in northern Mexican towns might have also dissuaded some couples. The ethnic backgrounds of these couples leave little doubt regarding their intent to get around Arizona statutes: thirty of the thirty-two couples involved Asian men or black men, and they primarily married Mexican women.⁴⁹ They all knew—or, at least, feared—that they could not marry legally in Arizona.

In the Tucson area alone there were at least forty-one unions, including all couples with and without marriage licenses, which involved either Chinese and Mexican partners or the descendants of Chinese-Mexican couples (see table 4). Twenty-two of these unions occurred between Chinese men and Mexican women, and nine others between Mexican men and women of Chinese-Mexican descent. Almost 60 percent of all couples obtained legal marriages either in Tucson (7) or in New Mexico (17). Although these numbers seem relatively small, one must keep in mind that at no point from 1880 to 1930 were there more than twenty endogamous Chinese couples in Tucson.

Looking specifically at marriages involving Chinese men and Mexican women, one can establish that both partners generally benefited from their ability to form a household. Chinese men, of course, found the family life they had not experienced since leaving China, which, for most, was decades

Table 4. Unions involving Chinese, Mexicans, and Chinese-Mexicans, Tucson area, 1880–1930

Ethnicity of partners		Total couples	Record of legal marriage	
Man	Woman		Arizona	New Mexico
Chinese	Mexican	22*	2	15
Mexican	Chinese	2	0	0
Chinese	Chinese-Mexican	1	1	0
Mexican	Chinese-Mexican	9	2	1
Chinese-Mexican	Mexican	5	1	0
White	Chinese-Mexican	2	1	1
<i>Total</i>		41	7	17

Sources: For information on the two Mexican men who married Chinese women, see Grace Delgado, “In the Age of Exclusion: Race, Region and Chinese Identity in the Making of the Arizona-Sonora Borderlands, 1863–1943” (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2000), 271–72. I have found no corroborating evidence that the women were in fact Chinese. Information for legal marriages in Arizona comes from the Baptismal Registry and the Marriage Registry at the Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson Archives and Library, Arizona; Floyd R. Negley and Marcia S. Lindley, *Arizona Territorial Marriages, Pima County, 1871–1912* (Tucson: Arizona State Genealogical Society, 1994); and Floyd R. Negley and Marcia S. Lindley, *Arizona Marriages, Pima County, Marriage Books 5–10, February 1912 through December 1926* (Tucson: Arizona State Genealogical Society, 1997). Information for legal marriages in New Mexico comes from Grant County Clerk’s Office, Silver City, New Mexico and Hidalgo County Clerk’s Office, Lordsburg, New Mexico. Information for the other couples comes from the census schedules for Tucson for the years 1880–1930.

*This total differs from the aggregate of Table 1, which only includes census information, while Table 4 adds data from other sources.

in the past. They thus attained some stability and comfort. They furthermore married young brides, most of them in their late teens and early twenties. Indeed, these marriages stand out for the noticeable age differences between spouses. In the twenty marriages between Chinese men and Mexican women for which enough data exist the average groom was 41.4 years old, while the average bride was only 22.7, a difference of almost nineteen years.

Presumably, the appeal of these mature Chinese men lay in their economic status, but financial reasons do not sufficiently explain the marriage decisions of these Mexican brides. Of the fourteen men for whom one can identify occupations, three owned their businesses, five worked as store managers, and six were unskilled and semi-skilled workers. These numbers, however, do not signify that the business owners and the managers were affluent—although they do imply potential upward mobility for the typical Mexican woman. Notably, only four men were both homeowners and either managers or businessmen. In fact, in six of the seven marriages with the biggest age differences, Chinese men were workers who rented their dwellings. One can only speculate about what prompted these women to marry them, but keeping in mind that they did have other options, it becomes clear that

they certainly saw their Chinese partners as good prospects and their appeal did not rest solely on economic concerns.

Family Life

The preponderance of the Mexican population and the unavailability of women from other ethnic groups until the late nineteenth century, combined with the openness with which residents intermarried, made Tucson family life a markedly Mexican experience. Men from other ethnic groups usually adapted to the Hispanic traditions of the Mexican women they joined in marriage or cohabitation. For instance, whatever the beliefs of the husband before marriage, interethnic households predominantly conformed to the Catholicism of the Mexican side of the family. Some of the white husbands came from Catholic backgrounds—most evident were the cases of men born in France, Ireland, and Italy—but virtually all weddings took place at St. Augustine's regardless of the faith of the husband. Therefore, non-Catholic men underwent a form of initiation into the religious world of their wives when they entered into a union with a Mexican woman.⁵⁰

Correspondence from the Vicar Apostolic of Arizona suggests that Catholic priests constantly worried about the presence of Protestant missionaries and public schools in southern Arizona.⁵¹ Mexican families even established a private school so that their daughters did not have to attend classes with Protestant children, and similarly, intermarried Mexican women sought measures to ensure the preeminence of Catholicism in their families.⁵² First, some Mexican women required their prospective spouses to sign an affirmation that acknowledged the primacy of the Catholic faith in solemnizing their matrimony and in guiding family life. Likely at the suggestion of the priest, the wives ensured that the document stipulated that no other wedding ceremony—e.g., in a Protestant Church—would take place and that the husband would not interfere in the teaching of Catholicism to the children. White men, it seems, willingly complied with the precondition. For instance, Jewish men who resided in nineteenth-century Tucson, historian Katherine A. Benton explains, lacked a strong sense of religious ties and were traditionally predisposed to grant their Mexican wives complete control over the religious upbringing of their children.⁵³ Therefore, almost universally, the children of interethnic couples were baptized and raised under Catholic traditions. As late as the 1940s, virtually all descendants of interethnic unions, regardless of the combination of faiths among their ancestors, remained practicing Catholics.

Although Protestant and Jewish men only had to recognize the primacy of the Catholic Church, the Church viewed non-Christian Asian men as

infidels, and they typically had to convert to Catholicism before receiving the wedding sacrament. For example, Fô Loy underwent conversion just before marriage.⁵⁴ He was baptized at St. Augustine's in 1890, receiving the Christian name of Manuel that he would carry until his death. Soon after, the neophyte Manuel married Isabel Escalante. The couple would return to the church on many occasions to baptize and confirm at least eight children. Like other Chinese-Mexican couples, almost all the godparents of their children were Mexican. Not surprisingly, the children of these couples adhered to Hispanic culture and married in Catholic ceremonies. Although these families certainly maintained geographic, social, and kinship attachments to Mexican communities, Chinese friends and relatives undoubtedly viewed Chinese-Mexican children as part of their community as well.⁵⁵

Men who intermarried also adapted to the Hispanic linguistic tradition of their Mexican wives. Those who originated from European cultures often adopted Hispanicized versions of their names, while Chinese men frequently received Hispanic names—typically names of saints—when they converted to Catholicism or as they interacted in the Mexican communities where most of them resided. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the children of interethnic couples from all backgrounds almost always received Hispanic names. For example, the children of Manuel and Isabel Ahloy received names like Antonio, Francisco, and Jose Manuel. This custom greatly facilitates the identification of people of mixed ancestry due to the abundance of residents with Hispanic first names and non-Hispanic surnames, such as Carlos Lee, Petra Ahloy, and Maria Lem. The tradition of giving Hispanic names declined but remained remarkably common into the twentieth century. In 1930 most children of interethnic families still received Hispanic names (like Margarita, Jose, and Juan) or bicultural names (such as Laura, Clara, and David). Naming patterns reveal no differences according to class, but immigrant and first-generation parents more commonly gave Hispanic or bicultural names to their children than did second- or later-generation parents.

The multiethnic characteristic of naming patterns and the racial fluidity of Mexicans extended to the classification of the descendants of Chinese-Mexican couples, producing manifest inconsistencies. For example, the death certificate of Maria Ahloy—daughter of Manuel Ahloy (Chinese) and Isabel Escalante-Ahloy (Mexican)—classified her as Mexican.⁵⁶ Conversely, the child of a similar couple—Dong Yet and Rosario Ramirez-Yet—appeared as Chinese.⁵⁷ In another case, the Board of Health registered one child of Heng Lee and Ernestina Ayala-Lee as white, while one of their other children received the vague designation of “light.”⁵⁸ Although equally devoid of legal ramifications, the 1930 census suffered from similar inconsistencies. That year, ten people of

Chinese-Mexican ancestry lived in Tucson, belonging to six different families. Since all descended from Chinese-man/Mexican-woman couples, census instructions dictated that enumerators list them as Chinese.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, they classified five individuals as Mexican and the other five as Chinese.⁶⁰ For people of Chinese-Mexican ancestry, the distinction between a classification as Mexican or Asian signified the difference between being white and nonwhite.

Since hospital staffs, medical personnel, and census enumerators could not consistently assess the racial classification of a person, particularly of someone with mixed ancestry, in all likelihood city clerks, justices of the peace, and religious figures also wavered when deciding whether a couple was indeed interracial, and in effect, whether it met the racial requirements to marry in Arizona. Based on the amendment in 1887 of Arizona's miscegenation law, the descendants of Chinese-Mexican couples could essentially marry no one—they could technically not even marry a person who descended from an identical lineage. Yet, confusing race definitions, misinformation by officials, and racial ambiguity signified that most descendants married legally.

Although the children of Chinese-Mexican couples certainly understood their mixed ancestries, their Mexican culture apparently shaped their experiences more acutely. For instance, ethnic associations played a factor in their marriage decisions. Children of Mexican-white couples married extensively among their three major cohorts (Mexicans, whites, and people of Mexican-white ancestry). The descendants of Chinese-Mexican couples, however, almost universally formed families with Mexicans, a likely indication of their Mexican cultural upbringing, and in particular, of the importance of religious and linguistic affinity. The lack of Chinese women meant that men of Chinese-Mexican ancestry in effect had a limited pool of potential partners. Yet, although there were plenty of single Chinese men in Tucson, women of Chinese-Mexican ancestry rarely married them. Census, church, and county records indicate that all five men and nine of the twelve women of Chinese-Mexican heritage married Mexicans. Five of these couples legally married in Arizona in spite of its miscegenation law, and two others wed in New Mexico. But given the ease with which these marriages apparently took place, it is highly probable that all other similar couples married in Arizona. These couples were highly mobile, and their marriages might have taken place away from Pima County. Others might have resided in Mexico and married there. Although these descendants held strong attachments to Mexican culture, they still remained connected to their Chinese heritage. In 1933, for instance, Elsa Corrales, who was only one-fourth Chinese (and three-fourths Mexican), married Tong (Albert) Lee, who was Chinese. Elsa

was the daughter of a Mexican man and a Chinese-Mexican woman, and evidently, the family belonged to circles that included both ethnic groups.⁶¹

Between 1880 and 1930, only one of the marriages of these descendants involved a white spouse, but the existence of that marriage demonstrates the fluidity of racial classifications in the Borderlands. In 1914 Alexander MacMinn, from Scotland, married Rita Lee, the daughter of a Chinese man and a Mexican woman.⁶² They obtained a marriage license from the county clerk and wed at St. Augustine's. Their union, though technically illegal in Arizona, occurred uneventfully, most likely because Rita, growing up in a Mexican neighborhood and speaking Spanish, could probably pass as Mexican in the eyes of county officials. Yet, if passing as Mexican facilitated the McMinn-Lee marriage in Tucson, one would assume that all marriages involving partners of Chinese-Mexican ancestry proceeded smoothly, but at least two couples still decided to travel to New Mexico. As indicated above, Harry Williams Nelson, a white man from Missouri, married Isaura Lee Yee, a Chinese-Mexican woman, and Mary Lee, also of Chinese-Mexican ancestry, wed Manuel Samaniego, a Mexican man.⁶³ Although the children of Chinese-Mexican couples seem to have not encountered major problems in securing legal marriages in Arizona, these couples must have deemed the trip necessary.

Conclusion

The history of Chinese-Mexican couples proves the existence of accommodating spaces in the West. Southern Arizona was not unique, as historian Liping Zhu underscores in his studies on the Chinese experience in Idaho and South Dakota at the turn of the twentieth century. As in Arizona, Chinese residents in those areas encountered legal discrimination as well as verbal and physical attacks—resulting, for instance, in twenty-five deaths in Idaho. But this mistreatment did not occur ubiquitously or uniformly. In the Boise Basin and in the Black Hills, Zhu explains, Chinese residents escaped the worst of attacks, participated in their local communities and in the legal system, and some even managed to prosper. Family life eluded them, however, because miscegenation laws and greatly imbalanced sex ratios inevitably precluded their marriages.⁶⁴ One can then appreciate the importance of Mexicans in Arizona for the Chinese men who managed to form families. The power of county clerks, Pascoe points out, increased dramatically in the early twentieth century. In an era of anti-immigrant, eugenicist movements, they functioned as “the gatekeepers of white supremacy.” These emissaries interpreted race restrictions and established racial classifications according

to their own, selective criteria.⁶⁵ Chinese-Mexican marriages often received legal sanction and frequently social acceptance because they did not threaten white purity. Clearly, the architects and the enforcers of miscegenation laws did not have the legally-white Mexicans in mind when they sought to keep whites and nonwhites apart.

For these interethnic couples, a successful trip to the county clerk, whether in Tucson or in New Mexico, marked the culmination of overcoming obstacles and making calculations to find family life in the West. Chinese men, in particular, faced overwhelming odds. They had to negotiate racist attitudes, miscegenation laws, skewed sex ratios, and cultural apprehensions. In Tucson, however, they benefited from fluid ethnic spaces and from the racial ambiguity of Mexicans. But their unions with Mexican women did not stem from mere good fortune. They had to convince their potential brides that a suitable future awaited them. After all, Mexican women could and did marry extensively with whites and, of course, with Mexicans. They, in other words, had the marital options Chinese men lacked. In forming families with each other, both groups stood to gain: Chinese men beat the odds and were able to marry, and Mexican women achieved social mobility that, while still keeping them in the lower classes, improved their lives. Local marriages only numbered in the few dozens, and three couples separated several years later—although only one of them legally divorced—but the Tucson area offers a glimpse at the larger picture. Several barriers made these interethnic marriages highly improbable. But, as recent historiography continues to demonstrate, hundreds of couples did manage to beat the odds and form families in the United States-Mexico Borderlands.

Notes

1. As is the case for most states and territories, the original manuscripts for the census of 1890 do not exist for Arizona. But in 1900, approximately twenty years after his immigration to the United States, Manuel Ahloy still worked as a common laborer. The schedule listed no occupation for Isabel Escalante, who was most likely a homemaker, since the couple had five young children at the time. Population schedules, district 48, p. 10B, lines 73–74, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1900, r. 47, microfilm, (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Record Service), Twelfth Census of the United States, microcopy T623, National Archives Microfilm Publications, Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C. [hereafter Federal Census, year, roll #, Microcopy #, RG 29, NARA].

Calculations based on contemporary sources indicate that ten years earlier the train fare was approximately twenty-two dollars per person each way. David F. Myrick, "Railroads of Arizona," in *The Westerners Brand Book XII*, ed. George Koenig (Los

- Angeles: Los Angeles Corral, Stephens Printing Company, 1966), 23; and Patrick Hamilton, comp., *The Resources of Arizona, Its Mineral, Farming, Grazing and Timber Lands; Its History, Climate, Productions, Civil and Military Government, Pre-History Ruins, Early Missionaries, Indian Tribes, Pioneer Days, Etc., Etc.*, 3d ed. (San Francisco, Calif.: A. L. Bancroft & Company, 1884), 123.
2. Marriage license for Manuel Ahloy and Isabel Escalante, 29 August 1891, Marriage Record 1872–1899, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico.
 3. Ahloy most likely began using the name Manuel after his baptism in 1890. Manuel's godparents were Alfredo and Luisa Durazo, an indication that he maintained ties to the local Mexican community prior to his baptism and marriage. Baptismal entry for Manuel Ah Fo, 2 March 1890, p. 123, St. Augustine Baptismal Register, 1888–1891, Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson Archives and Library, Arizona.
 4. This period revolves around census years because these sources offer accurate information on the local Chinese population. It begins in 1880, when Chinese immigrants first appear in Tucson schedules, and ends in 1930, when the first generation of Chinese immigrants to Tucson was passing away.
 5. I refer to statutes that prohibited interracial marriages as miscegenation, rather than as anti-miscegenation, laws for the sake of brevity and in order to conform to the practice of most scholars in the field. Obviously, all these laws were indeed *anti*-miscegenation.
 6. Nevada (1861), Idaho (1864), and Wyoming (1869) banned marriages of whites to blacks and Chinese in single laws, and in 1866, Oregon and Arizona added Chinese to laws that already forbade blacks from marrying whites since 1862 and 1865, respectively. Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 10, 77–89, 91–93, 100, 120–22. Arizona legislators banned white-black marriages during their first territorial session in 1864. In 1865 they added Indians and “Mongolians” to the list of races that could not marry whites. The laws went into effect in 1865 and 1866, respectively. *The Howell Code, Adopted by the First Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Arizona* (Prescott: Office of the Arizona Miner, 1865), 230–31; and *Journals of the Second Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Arizona* (Prescott: Office of the Arizona Miner, 1866), 158.
 7. Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*, 109–14; and Laura E. Gómez, *Manifest Destinies: The Making of the Mexican American Race* (New York: New York University Press, 2007), 1–4, 43–45. Historian Martha Menchaca points out that since Mexicans could be of different races, including mestizo, mulatto, and Indian, the legislatures of the ceded territory immediately curtailed the rights of a significant portion of the Mexican population who were suddenly ineligible to vote, hold important offices, practice law, and participate in cases involving whites. Martha Menchaca, *Recovering History, Constructing Race: The Indian, Black, and White Roots of Mexican Americans* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 215–28.
 8. Gómez, *Manifest Destinies*, 9–11, 114–15, 142. See also, Pablo Mitchell, *Coyote Nation: Sexuality, Race, and Conquest in Modernizing New Mexico, 1880–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); and John M. Nieto-Phillips, *The Language of Blood: The Making of Spanish American Identity in New Mexico, 1880s–1930s* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2004).
 9. Mitchell, *Coyote Nation*, 102, 108, 120–21, 174–75.

10. Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*, 89–90, 152–54; Neil Foley, *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 208; Rudy P. Guevarra, *Becoming Mexipino: Multiethnic Identities and Communities in San Diego* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2012), 130–39; and Karen Isaksen Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices: California's Punjabi Mexican Americans* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 1992), 63–68.
11. Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: The Chicano Struggle toward Liberation* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972), 33, 83; Tomás Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 58; Albert Camarillo, *Chicanos in a Changing Society: From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848–1930* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 69; Manuel González, *Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000), 90, 93; Carey McWilliams, *North from Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States* (New York: Praeger, 1990), 90; and Thomas E. Sheridan, *Los Tucsonenses: The Mexican Community in Tucson, 1854–1941* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1986), 145–46. The latest monograph on Mexican intermarriages also focuses exclusively on the lives of elites. See María Raquel Casas, *Married to a Daughter of the Land: Spanish-Mexican Women and Interethnic Marriage in California, 1820–1880* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2007).
12. Acuña, *Occupied America*, 31, 33, 53, 117; Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines*, 58–59; McWilliams, *North from Mexico*, 90; Camarillo, *Chicanos in a Changing Society*, 70; González, *Mexicanos*, 90, 101; and Pablo Mitchell, “You Just Don’t Know Mr. Baca’: Intermarriage, Mixed Heritage, and Identity in New Mexico,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 79 (fall 2004): 437–58. See also David Montejano’s discussion of the role of intermarriages in facilitating a peaceful transition from Mexican to white dominance in southern Texas. David Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836–1986* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987). A brief essay by sociologist James Officer produced an oft-quoted assertion that in Tucson the descendants of intermarried couples have linked the white and Mexican communities since the United States annexed it and “have helped to maintain good relations between the two groups . . . down to the present day [1960].” Although Officer provides no data or sources and actually discusses examples of discrimination and alienation, his remarks on intermarriage appear unquestioned in several of the aforementioned works. James Officer, “Historical Factors in Interethnic Relations in the Community of Tucson,” *Arizona* 1 (spring 1960): 13–15. Only two of the works cited for this paragraph provide quantitative data on intermarriage practices, although they neglect to incorporate class in their data analyses, focusing primarily on prominent families. Richard Griswold del Castillo, *La Familia: Chicano Families in the Urban Southwest, 1848 to the Present* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 67–69; and Sheridan, *Los Tucsonenses*, 145–48.
13. Examples of famous men who intermarried in New Mexico include Charles Bent, the first white governor of New Mexico; Christopher “Kit” Carson, frontier guide, soldier, and Indian agent; Henry Connelly, governor of New Mexico during the Civil War; and two New Mexico delegates to the U.S. Congress, Miguel A. Otero and J. Francisco Chávez. In Texas, James Bowie, who fought at the Alamo, married the

- daughter of a Texas governor (during the Mexican period), and several politicians and county officers also married Mexican women. Deena J. González, *Refusing the Favor: The Spanish-Mexican Women of Santa Fe, 1820–1880* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 113–14; Darlis Miller, “Cross-Cultural Marriages in the Southwest: The New Mexico Experience, 1846–1900,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 57 (October 1982): 335, 337, 340; Rebecca M. Craver, *The Impact of Intimacy: Mexican-White Intermarriage in New Mexico, 1821–1846* (El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1982), 11; Jane Dysart, “Mexican Women in San Antonio, 1830–1860: The Assimilation Process,” *Western Historical Quarterly* 7 (winter 1976): 370; Ana C. Downing de De Juana, “Intermarriage in Hidalgo County, 1860 to 1900” (master’s thesis, University of Texas, Pan American, 1998); Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices*; and Katherine Benton, “Border Jews, Border Marriages, Border Lives: Mexican-Jewish Intermarriage in the Arizona Territory, 1850–1900” (master’s thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1997). See Pablo Mitchell’s work on Albuquerque for examples of elite intermarriages, whose data suggest that the working class accounted for most unions. Mitchell, *Coyote Nation*, 97, 102–110; and Mitchell, “You Just Don’t Know Mr. Baca,” 437–58.
14. These authors provide data that diverge from the white-man/Mexican-woman model. Looking at Hidalgo County in Texas, Downing demonstrates that Mexicans frequently married outside their group between 1860 and 1900 and that Mexican *men* accounted for one third of these unions, marrying white and black women. Focusing on California, Leonard explains that between 1910 and 1940, virtually all marriages for Punjabi men involved Mexican women. Finally, Guevarra provides many examples of Filipino-Mexican marriages. Downing, “Intermarriage in Hidalgo County,” 94–96; Leonard, *Making Ethnic Choices*, 67, 186, 212; and Guevarra, *Becoming Mexipino*, 126–61.
 15. His name variably appears as Manuel Ahloy, Manuel Ah Loy, Manuel Aloy, Fô Manuel Ah, and Fô Ah Loy. The Chinese *Ah* is an informal addition that friends and relatives use as a form of endearment, but it frequently was used in official records. Census records provide various birth years, all between 1858 and 1865. Population schedules, district 48, p. 10B, line 73, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1900, r. 47, MT623, RG29, NARA; Population schedules, district 107, p. 5A, line 10, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1910, r. 41, MT624, RG29, NARA; and Population schedules, district 56, p. 11B, line 55, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1930, r. 62, MT626, RG29, NARA. Census records provide various birth years for Isabel, all between 1869 and 1875. Her death certificate, locating her birthplace in Ures, Sonora, indicates she was born in 1879, which is unlikely, because she would have been only eleven years of age when she married—yet no parental consent form was filed. Population schedules, district 48, p. 10B, line 47, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1900, r. 47, MT623, RG29, NARA; Population schedules, district 48, p. 5A, line 10, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1910, r. 41, MT624, RG29, NARA; Population schedule, district 48, p. 18A, line 24, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1920, r. 50, MT625, RG29, NARA; and Certificate of Death for Isabel Escalante Aloy [*sic*], 28 August 1932, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>.

16. Not surprisingly, California legislation soon prohibited Chinese-white marriages in 1880 and 1905. Nayan Shah, *Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 1–2, 25–26, 80–89, 94, 97–99, 107–9. Illogically, the 1880 law prohibited only the licensing of marriages, but the 1905 legislature finally amended the state's miscegenation law. Yong Chen, *Chinese San Francisco, 1850–1943: A Trans-Pacific Community* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2000), 75–83; George Anthony Peffer, *If They Don't Bring Their Women Here: Chinese Female Immigration Before Exclusion* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 1–13; Judy Yung, *Unbound Feet: A Social History of Chinese Women in San Francisco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 26–34; and Edward C. Lydon, "The Anti-Chinese Movement in Santa Cruz County, California, 1859–1900," in *The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States, 1776–1960*, Proceedings of the National Conference at the University of San Francisco, July 10–12, 1975 (San Francisco: Chinese Historical Society of America, 1976), 219–42.
17. Stephens, "A Quantitative History of Chinatown," 72–73, 77–78; John R. Wunder, "Anti-Chinese Violence in the American West, 1850–1910," in *Law for the Elephant, Law for the Beaver: Essays in the Legal History of the North American West*, ed. John McLaren, Hamar Foster, and Chet Orloff (Regina, Saskatchewan: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1992), 212–18; Sucheng Chan, "Introduction: The Significance of Locke in Chinese American History," in *Bitter Melon: Inside America's Last Rural Chinese Town*, ed. Jeff Gillenkirk and James Motlow (Berkeley, Calif.: Heydey Books, 1997), 24–25; Shih-Shan Henry Tsai, *The Chinese Experience in America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 68; and Edward J. M. Rhoads, "The Chinese in Texas," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 81 (July 1977): 15–16, 24–25.
18. For negative depictions of Chinese in Arizona newspapers, see "The Argonaut on the Chinese Question," *Tucson Arizona Weekly Miner*, 7 March 1879; "Our Asiatic Friends," *Tucson Arizona Weekly Miner*, 11 April 1879; "The Chinese Question," *Tucson Arizona Weekly Star*, 22 January 1880; "Hon. Thomas Fitch," *Tucson Arizona Weekly Star*, 20 April 1882; "The Chinese Question," *Tombstone (AZ) Epitaph Prospector*, 5 February 1886; "The Chinese Question," *Tombstone (AZ) Epitaph Prospector*, 9 February 1886; "The Chinese Question," *Tombstone (AZ) Epitaph Prospector*, 20 February 1886; "Unrestricted Immigration," *Phoenix (AZ) Republican Herald*, 12 July 1900; "The Chinese Curse," *Tucson Arizona Weekly Star*, 7 August 1879; and "America for White Men," *Tombstone (AZ) Daily Epitaph*, 28 February 1886.
19. For examples of anti-Chinese sentiments that were more pervasive in small mining towns and in Phoenix than in Tucson, see Melissa Keane, A. E. Rogge, and Bradford Luckingham, eds., *The Chinese in Arizona, 1870–1950: A Context for Historic Preservation Planning* (Phoenix: Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, 1992), 8–22; and Rhonda Tintle, "A History of Chinese Immigration into Arizona Territory: A Frontier Culture in the American West" (master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 2006), 39, 43, 49–52, 58–60, 64, 73–76.
20. John R. Wunder, "Law and the Chinese on the Southwest Frontier, 1850s–1902," *Western Legal History* 2 (summer/fall 1989): 140–42; and Wunder, "Anti-Chinese Violence," 214, 220–22, 231.
21. Rhoads, "The Chinese in Texas," 1–36; and Julian Lim, "Chinos and Paisanos: Chinese Mexican Relations in the Borderlands," *Pacific Historical Review* 79 (February 2010): 50–85.

22. In 1916, for example, it became illegal for Mexicans to lease land to Chinese residents. In Cananea and Nogales, Chinese entrepreneurs could no longer trade in meats and vegetables or offer laundry services. In Agua Prieta, Chinese residents had to submit to public baths and to receive permission before visiting each other. Sonora adopted a repressive law in 1919 when it required that the workforce of foreign companies be at least 80 percent Mexican. The law directly targeted Chinese storeowners, who typically only hired Chinese employees. Evelyn Hu-DeHart, "Immigrants to a Developing Society: The Chinese in Northern Mexico, 1875–1932," *Journal of Arizona History* 21 (autumn 1980): 288–95; and Grace Delgado, "In the Age of Exclusion: Race, Region and Chinese Identity in the Making of the Arizona-Sonora Borderlands, 1863–1943" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2000), 255, 292. From 1930 to 1940, the Chinese population of Sonora declined from 3,571 to only 92. A few of those who had intermarried moved their families to other Mexican states, some managed to gain entry into the United States, and others relocated to China. For those families that migrated to the United States, Arizona and California became their primary destinations. Julia María Schiavone Camacho, "Traversing Boundaries: Chinese, Mexicans, and Chinese Mexicans in the Formation of Gender, Race, and Nation in the Twentieth-Century U.S.-Mexican Borderlands" (PhD diss., University of Texas at El Paso, 2006), 19, 23, 63–69, 168–75, 273; Julia María Schiavone Camacho, "Crossing Boundaries, Claiming a Homeland: The Mexican Chinese Transpacific Journey to Becoming Mexican, 1930s–1960s," *Pacific Historical Review* 78 (November 2009): 545–77; and Gerardo Rénique, "Race, Region, and Nation: Sonora's Anti-Chinese Racism and Mexico's Postrevolutionary Nationalism, 1920s–1930s," in *Race and Nation in Modern Latin America*, ed. Nancy P. Appelbaum, Anne S. Macpherson, and Karin Alejandra Roseblatt (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 227–30.
23. Byron Curti Martyn, "Racism in the United States: A History of the Anti-Miscegenation Legislation and Litigation" (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 1979), 127, 221; John S. Goff, "William T. Howell and the Howell Code of Arizona," *American Journal of Legal History* 11 (July 1967): 221–28. Arizona's first legislative action authorized Gov. John N. Goodwin to hire Judge William T. Howell to write a legal code. The first Arizona statutes thus became known as *The Howell Code*. Howell based it on the statutes of New York and California, and the legislature promptly approved the code. New York, however, never forbade interracial marriages. Thus, Howell in fact copied California's miscegenation law verbatim. I compared the wording of the California and Arizona laws. The California law appears in Martyn, "Racism in the United States," 453. For the Arizona law, see *The Howell Code*, xi–xii, 230–31; Jay J. Wagoner, *Arizona Territory, 1863–1912: A Political History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1970), 47; and Roger D. Hardaway, "Unlawful Love: A History of Arizona's Miscegenation Law," *The Journal of Arizona History* 27, no. 4 (1986): 178.
24. As Hardaway points out, the punishment contradicted the designation as a misdemeanor, since the upper range of these prison terms corresponded only to felonies. Hardaway, "Unlawful Love," 178.
25. *The Revised Statutes of the Arizona Territory: Containing Also the Laws Passed by the Twenty-first Legislative Assembly, the Constitution of the United States, the Organic Law of Arizona and the Amendments of Congress Relating Thereto, 1901* (Columbia, Mo.: Press of E. W. Stephens, 1901), 809.

26. *Journals of the Second Legislative Assembly*, 38–40, 104–105, 108–109, 122–23, 225. Nevada banned marriages between whites and “Orientals” in 1861. Martyn, “Racism in the United States,” 564. For information on the New Mexico law, see Peter Wallenstein, *Tell the Court I Love My Wife: Race, Marriage, and Law—An American History* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002), 253; and Andrew D. Weinberger, “A Reappraisal of the Constitutionality of Miscegenation Statutes,” *The Journal of Negro Education* 26 (autumn 1957): 443 n. 1.
27. Deenesh Sohoni, “Unsuitable Suitors: Anti-Miscegenation Laws, Naturalization Laws, and the Construction of Asian Identity,” *Law and Society Review* 41 (September 2007): 588; and Hrishi Karthikeyan and Gabriel J. Chin, “Preserving Racial Identity: Population Patterns and the Application of Anti-Miscegenation Statutes to Asian Americans, 1910–1950,” *Asian Law Journal* 9 (May 2002): 1–2.
28. These figures paled in comparison to California’s Chinese population, which numbered almost fifty thousand in 1870 and over seventy-five thousand in 1880, the year the state first prohibited Chinese-white marriages. Martyn, “Racism in the United States,” 453.
29. Thomas E. Sheridan, *Arizona: A History* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995), 59–61, 77–78.
30. Previous scholars have incorrectly located the “ancestry” or “descendants” clause in the twentieth century. In fact the ancestry clause first appeared in 1887. See *Revised Statutes of Arizona* (Prescott, Ariz.: Prescott Courier Print, 1887), 371. The clause, however, did not appear in the statutes of 1877. See John P. Hoyt, comp., *The Compiled Laws of the Territory of Arizona* (Detroit, Mich.: Richmond, Backus, and Co., 1877), 317. The legislature made no pertinent changes to the miscegenation law between these two publications. As printed, the 1887 statutes erroneously omitted Indians in the list of groups ineligible from marrying whites. The law, however, had not changed and Indians still could not marry whites. The next version of the statutes (1901) corrected the error, and Indians and their descendants reappeared. See *The Revised Statutes of Arizona*, 809.
31. In 1892 Mississippi law added a specification that whites could not marry partners who had one-eighth or more Mongolian ancestry. Karthikeyan and Chin, “Preserving Racial Identity,” 1–7.
32. Lyman, “Marriage and Family,” 324; and Opper and Lew, “A History of the Chinese in Fresno,” 47–55.
33. Stanford L. Lyman, “Marriage and Family among Chinese Immigrants to America, 1850–1960,” *Phylon* 29 (winter 1968): 323–24.
34. High percentages of the scant Chinese female population had migrated as prostitutes, typically under the coercion of Chinese societies that often served as the only provider of sexual intercourse for Chinese men, and even these services remained out of reach in most rural areas. But prostitutes rarely married, since the typical Chinese laborer could not afford the purchase or redemption fee. The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 further ensured that only prosperous merchants could afford the luxury of securing visas for Chinese wives. John W. Stephens, “A Quantitative History of Chinatown, San Francisco, 1870 and 1880,” in *The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States*, 72–73, 77–78; Rhoads, “The Chinese in Texas,” 3, 8, 14–15; Arnoldo de León, *Racial Frontiers: Africans, Chinese, and Mexicans in Western America, 1848–1890*, *Histories of the American Frontier*, ed. Ray Allen Billington (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 75–77, 82; Lyman, “Marriage and Family,”

- 322–28; S. Michael Opper and Lillie L. Lew, “A History of the Chinese in Fresno, California,” in *The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States*, 47–55; Sohoni, “Unsuitable Suitors,” 588–89, 597–98; Lydon, “The Anti-Chinese Movement in Santa Cruz County, California, 1859–1900,” in *The Life, Influence and the Role of the Chinese in the United States*, 219–42; Jian Li, “A History of the Chinese in Charleston,” *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 99 (January 1998): 49; Liping Zhu, *A Chinaman’s Chance: The Chinese on the Rocky Mountain Mining Frontier* (Niwot: University Press of Colorado, 1997), 59, 87, 119–20, 188; and Liping Zhu, “Ethnic Oasis: Chinese Immigrants in the Frontier Black Hills,” *South Dakota History* 33 (winter 2003): 295–96.
35. The census of 1910 indicates that Dore Yan, born in China, married Juliett Yan, born in France, in 1903. They might have married before settling in Tucson, most likely in another state, since no marriage license appears in Pima County. Population schedules, district 106, p. 15A, lines 21–22, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1910, r. 41, MT624, RG29, NARA.
 36. In the central Arizona mining town of Jerome, a Chinese restaurant owner became the target of the racial animosity of a newspaper editor in 1909. The latter reprinted an article from the *New York Evening Post* that disdained relationships between Chinese men and white women. The *Post* derided what it characterized as the lack of morality of white women who did missionary work among the Chinese, a service the newspaper editor qualified as the result of “misguided zeal or stupid ignorance.” It added: “The yellow races have plenty of opportunity to develop in Asia; they should stay there and work there.” The Jerome editor further reported that authorities in Phoenix had recently interrogated a Chinese man-white woman couple. Although the investigation revealed they had legally married in New Mexico, he retorted that their marriage was illegal in Arizona—which was true only if the couple deliberately traveled outside of Arizona to circumvent the law. The editor insisted that no white woman was “sufficiently degraded to accept the hand of a Mongolian.” The story and the quoted passages appear in Kathryn Reisdorfer, “Charley Hong, Racism, and the Power of the Press in Jerome, Arizona Territory, 1909,” *Journal of Arizona History* 43 (summer 2002): 138–42.
 37. Delgado, “In the Age of Exclusion,” 255, 292. My mapping of the census schedules corroborates Delgado’s conclusion and supports my statements in this paragraph.
 38. “The Chinese Question,” *Tucson Arizona Weekly Star*, 22 January 1880. See also “Hon. Thomas Fitch,” *Tucson Arizona Weekly Star*, 20 April 1882.
 39. Keane, Rogge, and Luckingham, *The Chinese in Arizona*, 8–22.
 40. For examples of the willingness and ability of Chinese business owners to learn local languages in Arizona, see Lawrence Michael Fong, “Sojourners and Settlers: The Chinese Experience in Arizona,” *The Journal of Arizona History* 21 (autumn 1980): 236; and Heather S. Hatch, “The Chinese in the Southwest,” *The Journal of Arizona History* 21 (autumn 1980): 264.
 41. Mercedes [Chávez] Kow v. Lee Kow, SCC 7280, Pima County Superior Court (Tucson, Ariz., 1920).
 42. As discussed above, the Arizona legislature added an ancestry clause to the territorial law in 1887. Therefore, even if the court had accepted the claim that these Mexican women had “Moorish and Indian” ancestry, it could only have allowed the marriages

- if it determined that the women had no white ancestry whatsoever.
43. "A Cosmopolitan Wedding," *Los Angeles Times*, 29 April 1895, p. 5.
 44. Census records indicate that their first child was born in May 1896. Note that the other child listed was not Fraijo's, for the schedule states that she had only given birth to one child by 1900. Population schedules, unincorporated area, district 60, p. 2A, lines 6–9, Santa Cruz County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1900, r. 47, MT623, NARA; and Marriage license for You Cang and Esperanza Frijo [Fraijo], 18 July 1896, Marriage Record 1872–1899, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico. The record is housed in Grant County, but their marriage took place in Lordsburg, before the southern half of Grant County became Hidalgo County in 1919. Marriage entry for You Cong [Cang] and Esperanza Fraijo, 20 July 1896, p. 202, St. Augustine Marriage Register, 1883–1899, Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson Archives and Library, Arizona.
 45. Marriage license for Manuel Samaniego and Mary Lee, 13 March 1920, p. 8, Book 1, Marriage Record, Hidalgo County Clerk's Office, Lordsburg, New Mexico; and Marriage license for Harry Williams Nelson and Yaura [Isaura] Lee Yee, 20 March 1921, p. 114, Book 1, Marriage Record, Hidalgo County Clerk's Office, Lordsburg, New Mexico.
 46. The couples married on 29 August 1891. Marriage license for Manuel Ahloy and Isabel Escalante; and Marriage license for Jim Lee and Concepción Moreno, 29 August 1891, Marriage Record 1872–1899, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico.
 47. No record exists of Lee and Chávez in either New Mexico or Arizona, but Woo and Moreno resided in Benson, Arizona, where they had children before and after their wedding year. Their friendship suggests that Lee and Chávez most likely lived nearby. Marriage license for Charles Lee and Concepcion Chabes [Chávez], 13 March 1898, Marriage Record 1872–1899, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico; Marriage license for Hi Woo and E. [Ernestina] Morano [Moreno], 14 July 1898, Marriage Record 1872–1899, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico; Certificate of Birth for Jose Ong Woo, 15 November 1891, Benson, Cochise County, Arizona Territory, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>; and Certificate of Birth for unnamed female child of Hi Woo and Lorete [Ernestina] Moreno, 2 April 1906, Benson, Cochise County, Arizona Territory, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>. The birth certificate lists the mother as Lorete Moreno, but it is undoubtedly Ernestina, because the 1920 census indicates that the couple already had children in the early 1890s, before they married in 1898. Population schedules, district 7, p. 16A, line 1, city of Benson, Cochise County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1920, r. 46, MT625, RG29, NARA.
 48. For other couples whose census or vital records place them in Arizona at around the time they claimed residence in New Mexico, see Marriage license for Sing Sang and Amelia [Emilia] Lee, 23 December 1912, p. 971, Book 4, Marriage Record, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico; Population schedules, district 114, p. 13A, line 30, city of Nogales, Santa Cruz County, Arizona Territory, Federal Census, 1910, r. 41, MT624, RG29, NARA; Marriage license for Fong Ling and Juanita Moralez [Morales], 4 July 1915, p. 1611, Book 6, Marriage Record, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver

- City, New Mexico; Certificate of Birth for Adele Fong Ling, 27 April 1916, Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>; Marriage license for Yee Get and Eliza Nais, 16 April 1917, p. 2110, Book 7, Marriage Record, Grant County Clerk's Office, Silver City, New Mexico; and Certificate of Birth for Virginia Yee Get, 22 September 1918, Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>.
49. These statistics come entirely from a database created by the author based on information from the marriage records at Grant and Hidalgo counties in New Mexico cited throughout this study. The most common of these marriages were (groom listed first): fifteen Chinese-Mexican, four Japanese-Mexican, four black-Mexican, and five Chinese-white. The two other men were the aforementioned white and Mexican men who married women of Chinese-Mexican ancestry. In addition to the five white women, the brides were as follows: twenty-three Mexican, two Chinese-Mexican, one Spaniard, and one Puerto Rican.
 50. Benton, "Border Jews," 20, 40–42. Hiram Stevens received the name *Domingo*, which appears in the baptismal registry of St. Augustine when the Stevens' served as godparents of the child of Emmett and Leonicia Woodley. Baptismal entry for Maria Manuela Woodly [Woodley], 24 August 1876, p. 363, St. Augustine Baptismal Register, Volume 1, Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson Archives and Library, Arizona.
 51. See the following letters from Bishop Jean Baptist Salpointe: to the Central Council of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, 14 March 1871 and 11 September 1871; to the Treasurer of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, 23 February 1875; to the President of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, 9 October 1876; to the Directors of the Propagation of the Faith, 25 October 1883; and in Jean Baptist Salpointe, Correspondence, 1867–1884, Special Collections Library, University of Arizona, Tucson. The letter to the treasurer expresses abhorrence at the success a Protestant minister had in attracting Indian children to his school, and requests money to carry out its "destruction." In the same letter, however, Salpointe also delights in attracting Protestant white children to his Catholic schools in Tucson and hopes that some of them will convert to Catholicism. I wish to thank Amy E. Grey, in the History Department at the University of Arizona, for alerting me to these documents and the Aguirre article below, and for lending them to me.
 52. For the reference to concerns over the establishment of public schools, see Wagoner, *Arizona Territory*, 70; and Mamie Bernard de Aguirre, "Spanish Trader's Wife," *The Westport Historical Quarterly* 4 (December 1968): 22.
 53. According to Benton, all Jewish-Mexican marriages in the 1870s and 1880s involved foreign-born men, who were more likely to favor fraternal associations over religious ties. They acquiesced to the Catholic disposition of their Mexican wives. Benton, "Border Jews," 20, 40–43, 46, 57–61.
 54. For the conversion of another man from Hong Kong, see Baptismal entry for Francisco Ah Piom, 3 March 1890, p. 124, St. Augustine Baptismal Register, 1888–1891, Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson Archives and Library, Arizona.
 55. A notable complication occurred in 1901, when the orphan Chinese-Mexican child, Don Ah, gained the interest of his Chinese relatives, who convinced the Mexican and Chinese friends of his dead parents to allow him to relocate so that he could

- attend school in China. In all likelihood, such an education would also involve the inculcation of Chinese spiritual values. "Brief News Items of the Town," *Tucson Arizona Daily Star*, evening edition, 18 February 1901.
56. Certificate of Death for Maria Ahloy, 29 May 1910, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>.
 57. Certificate of Death for unnamed child of Dong Yet and Rosario Ramirez, 19 May 1924, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>.
 58. Certificate of Death for Maria Dolores Lee, 15 March 1953, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>; and Certificate of Birth for Jose Vicente Lee, 14 December 1901, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona Territory, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>.
 59. In this case, it did not matter if the mother was considered white or Mexican because the children of nonwhite men were to follow the race of the father for census purposes, regardless of the race of the mother.
 60. Rosa and Berta Llango, their two married sisters—Maria Garcia and Refugio Medel—and the widow Rita Back, were all listed as Mexican. Population schedules, district 44, p. 10A, lines 38, 40–41, 43, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1930, r. 61, MT626, RG29, NARA; and Population schedules, district 66, p. 12B, line 54, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1930, r. 61, MT626, RG29, NARA. Maria Teresa, George and Ludovina Lem, and Maria Dolores and Jose Vicente Lee appeared as Chinese. Population schedules, district 44, p. 15B, lines 65–67, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1930, r. 61, MT626, RG29, NARA; and Population schedules, district 43, p. 12B, lines 74–75, city of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Federal Census, 1930, r. 6, MT626, RG29, NARA.
 61. Elsa Corrales was the daughter of Ignacio Corrales (born in Mexico) and Concepcion Llango (born in Tucson of a Chinese father and a Mexican mother). Certificate of Birth for Elsa Corrales, 27 May 1913, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>. According to the birth certificate of their son, Tong Lee was a grocer born in Canton, China. Certificate of Birth for Howard Lee, 22 July 1933, Tucson, Pima County, Arizona, Arizona Department of Health Services, accessed 4 April 2012, <http://genealogy.az.gov/>.
 62. Rita Lee was the daughter of Santiago Lee (born in China) and Concepcion Moreno. A margin note on her baptismal record (1893) indicates that she married Alexander McMinndie in Tucson in 1914. Alexander's surname appears as MacMinn on the county marriage license. Baptismal entry for Rita Lee, 4 July 1893, p. 217, St. Augustine Baptismal Register, 1893–1896, Roman Catholic Diocese of Tucson Archives and Library, Arizona; and Floyd R. Negley and Marcia S. Lindley, *Arizona Marriages, Pima County, Marriage Books 5–10, February 1912 through December 1926* (Tucson: Arizona State Genealogical Society, 1997), 186.
 63. Based on her age in 1920, Mary Lee was most likely the daughter of Andres (Heng) Lee and Ernestina Ayala. Marriage license for Manuel Samaniego and Mary Lee, 13 March 1920, p. 8, Book 1, Marriage Record, Hidalgo County Clerk's Office, Lordsburg,

New Mexico.

64. Zhu, *A Chinaman's Chance*, 1–4, 87, 114, 119–20, 132–35, 142–46, 159, 165–66, 171–74, 179, 183–84, 188–89; and Zhu, “Ethnic Oasis,” 289–329.
65. Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally*, 133, 138–39, 150–54, 207–8.

