“With great joy the Mexican American Cultural Center presents this first portrayal of the history of the Church of the Hispanics in the United States of America. While not claiming to be definitive, this collection of historical essays written almost entirely by United States Hispanics challenges others to make their own contributions. Its uniqueness lies in the fact that it is the first time such a task has been attempted.

“In the past we have studied the history of Mexico and of Latin America; we have studied the history of the United States. But our own history -- that of the Spanish speaking in the United States -- we have experienced only as seen through the eyes of the North American conquistadores or of Mexican historians little interested in areas far removed from the imperial city of Mexico.

“This book deals with the quest for liberation of United States Hispanic groups, a struggle different from that of our neighbors in Latin America. It relates how these struggles have involved the institutional Church in the continuing task of building the People of God, the Church, in this country.”

Ricardo Ramírez, CSB and Virgilio Elizondo

“In Fronteras are the salient landmarks of the historical evolution of the Hispanic Catholic Church in North America. Hopefully, the contents of some of the essays will motivate other historians to assess the finer points of a fascinating saga.”

Felix D. Almaráz, Jr., Ph.D., K.H.S.

“For a people seeking to discover who they are, the loss of their history prevents them from deepening their self-knowledge. Now the Hispanic people in the United States will begin to understand the meaning of their presence in these lands for more than four centuries. This is a history that in itself is a historic event.”

Enrique Dussel
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After several years of research, writing, editing and delays this volume on the history of the Hispanic Church in the United States has reached its present printing. It is truly a milestone in the story of “el pueblo en marcha.” (“the people on the move” a favorite way Hispanic Catholics like to call themselves).

The idea for this book came from Church historians from Latin America, particularly from Dr. Enrique Dussel, president of CEHILA (the Commission for the Study of the History of the Church in Latin America). CEHILA has existed for over 10 years and has begun to write and publish a new history of the Church in Latin America, which will eventually be a collection of twelve or more volumes. This book is part of the collection.

CEHILA looks at history from the point of view of the oppressed in their quest for liberation. History in this light concentrates on the victories and defeats of a people seeking to be full human beings. The starting point in this way of making history is that history is usually written by conquerers and not by the conquered. In the case of Latin America the oppressed are the poor and those whose human dignity and rights have in many instances in history been trampled upon and denied. Their story from their own perspective is necessarily critical of all those institutions that have denied them the privilege of determining their own destiny.

It is imperative to point out, however, that this history is written in the context of the ongoing history of salvation. Its interest is not only on the social and the political, but also on the theological, pastoral, sacramental, spiritual, in a word, on the ecclesial development of people.

In the United States a parallel story of struggle for social liberation has taken place among Hispanic groups, very different of course, from that of their neighbors in Latin America. This book deals with some of the social struggles of the Hispanics in the United States, but more with the way the institutional Church has related to them and how they have contributed to the
continuing task of the building up of the People of God, the Church, in this country.

One of the unique aspects of this volume is that it is written almost entirely by United States Hispanic authors. Its uniqueness also lies in the fact that it is the first time such a task has been attempted. Insofar as it was written by different authors, it will be criticized for its variation in style and themes that each writer treats. This to be expected in a collection of historical essays.

It will no doubt create healthy discussion on the subject matter treated. We honestly hope that future histories of the Hispanics in the United States will be written. The writers and editors understand that someday a definitive volume will be written on the topic. Perhaps this book will serve as an impetus to that end.

This volume provides various stories within the whole. The various Hispanic groups that make up the Church in the United States have their own particular history. Each group has its own story of arrival in this country, each has related differently to the Church and the Church to it. There are commonalities they all share, such as language, certain prayer forms, a missionary background, a common liturgical art inspiration, a spirituality influenced by the European Catholic Church of the sixteenth century, a social and religious uprooting and the cultural-religious shock experienced upon arrival in this country, or in the case of New Mexico, the arrival of the United States into their cultural-religious milieu.

History can be a powerful tool in the clarification of a people’s identity and in the unification of its various components. In their quest for identity, Hispanic groups of our country need to hear the story of one another. Of crucial importance is their religious past, for the personal character of a people is intimately bound to its spiritual life. This is especially true of Hispanic peoples, for their life experience cannot be subdivided into the spiritual and material, the transcendent and the mundane, the religious and the secular, for their cosmic view is usually an integration of all that has an impact on one’s existence. Furthermore, the mystique of la raza compels Hispanics to listen to each other's story, for only through this can they realize that cohesive oneness for which they so apparently aspire.

It is gratifying to see an attempt made to bring in the Protestant dimension. Dr. Edwin Sylvest of the Perkins School of
Theology of Southern Methodist University has added a wide-angle perspective to the book and is a further indication of the richness of the historical past of the Hispanic Church.

The reader will notice the open-endness of the book. This reflects the situation in which Hispanic Christians find themselves at this point. Much is happening in the Roman Catholic Church that relates to Hispanics. Bishops and other Church leaders are beginning to respond pastorally to their needs. Much is being done among the other Christian faith traditions as well. History is being made. We hope that this humble volume will inspire more documentation and research in the writing of this history, for it's the continuation in a specific group of people of the history of salvation.

Ricardo Ramirez, CSB
Bishop of Las Cruces, New Mexico
September 14, 1983
Feast of the Triumph of the Cross
INTRODUCTION

Chicanos, Mexican Americans, Mexicanos, Latin Americans, Spanish-speakers -- who are we? ¿Quién somos? When we are together, we have no doubt that we constitute a family. Pues somos en todo sentido una familia. Yet when someone asks us who we are, we find ourselves divided. We know who we are. Yet we cannot find a word that expresses our identity to the satisfaction of our human group. Perhaps one of the deep reasons for this is the painful lack of a name, for no one likes to walk through life namelessly, or anonymously. We have been deprived of much, but worst of all, we have been deprived of recognition -- a real consciousness of our historical becoming. We have studied the history of Mexico and Latin America; we have studied the history of the United States. But our own history -- the history of the Spanish-speaking of the United States -- we have studied only through the eyes of North American conquistadors who occupied the Southwest and Puerto Rico or of Mexican historians little interested in the areas far removed from the imperial city of Mexico.

Even so, we ourselves have known our history. I remember quite well that my father and my grandparents had a deep consciousness of the historical situation of the Southwest. I also experienced this in frequent contacts with older people in New Mexico, Arizona, California, and other parts of Texas. Our people were not writing, for they had not been given the privilege or the ability of learning how to use the instruments of the civilization that had conquered and oppressed them. But they did not forget their story -- the story of their hurt.

In his book, Occupied America, Rodolfo Acuña beautifully brings out the Chicano struggle for liberation. The fact that we have not written our history in a formal way does not mean that we have not recorded it. Our historical consciousness indeed lives on. The French historian Nathan Wachtel who has written much about the folklore of Peru, Guatemala, and Mexico says that in those areas the sources of living history are found in the
songs, folklore, customs, and religious celebrations of the people. Since we people of the Southwest have not written our history, this means that we have not fossilized it by burying it in books and storing it away on library shelves. Our history is not dead and finalized, but much alive in a dynamic historical consciousness -- in our cuentos, leyendas, corridos, pinturas, murales, and religious celebrations in honor of our common mother, La Morenita.

Our people have suffered. Our Indian forefathers suffered through their conquest by Spain, for our Spanish forefathers brought suffering with them. Then the descendants of both Indians and Spaniards suffered through their conquest by the United States. But our people have not died nor have they become embittered. The experience of European alienation has not been ours -- an alienation stemming first from the enforced unity of the Roman Empire then from the Protestant-Catholic clashes, and finally from the class struggles produced by the Industrial Revolution. The experience of Latin Americans is not comparable. They have been conquered and dominated by outsiders, but have remained free in spirit. They continue to live and to celebrate this freedom in the course of their history. Although this historical process is meaningful to Latin Americans, it may appear incomprehensible to outsiders who have not participated in this experience.

We are a people with a long tradition -- a people for whom tradition is in continuity with the life of our ancestors. We project a future in continuity with that past; our future will be a different but not a disjunctive experience. For continuity is one of the characteristics of our people. This, for us, is the fifth age of our history, for we have lived through los cuatro soles. We have struggled and continue to struggle. But through all of these experiences, life for us is good in itself; it is a gift to be celebrated, a mystery to be enjoyed, a symphony to be harmonized. We survive -- and we celebrate.

¿Quién somos? We are a people with a long history recorded in our cuatro soles and being created in the quinto sol of today. We are a people who have come down from the Olmecs, Mayas, Aztecs, Chichimecas, Pueblos, Yaquis, and the many other groups that seem to have risen mysteriously almost out of the very soil we today call America. Scientifically, we know that they came across the Bering Strait and traveled by canoe from island to island along the ocean currents until they reached Latin America. All this took place many generations ago. Over
thousands of years of human history, the American Indians have met and mingled with Spaniards, Africans, and immigrants from Europe and Asia to form a new people, which José Vasconselos prophetically calls “La Raza” -- a cosmopolitan race that is truly made from the union of psychologically, culturally, and religiously diverse groups of the whole world. Today this new people is meeting the Anglo-Saxon mentality -- an extension of European culture that has been a formative influence on the “American way of life.” Out of this encounter is emerging a new people, una raza nueva, una raza aún más cósmica que la raza cósmica de la América Latina.

With great joy and pleasure the Mexican American Cultural Center presents this first attempt to portray the history of the church of the Hispanics in the United States. This is only a first attempt, and we hope that many others will follow. To bring the role of the church to light is one of our purposes. In a way sometimes positive and sometimes negative, the church has always been significant in the life of the Spanish-speaking people of the United States. We have attempted objectivity, knowing the futility of refusing to learn from the mistakes of the past. Forgiving those mistakes, we claim both the good and the bad in our past as we continue to build for the future. Our future, too, will have its errors; we hope not to be judged too harshly.

Just as our aim has been to be truly objective, we also hope to evoke objective criticism. We offer this book as an encouragement to others to question and amplify our findings, to bring new evidence forward, and to develop different aspects. The writing of the history of a people -- a history previously unwritten -- is a long, involved, and complex task. This volume does not claim to have completed the story; it challenges others to make their own contributions.

We are grateful to the Church Historical Association of Latin America and its director, Dr. Enrique Dussel, for inviting the Mexican American Cultural Center to undertake this project. We are especially indebted to Our Sunday Visitor Press for helping to finance the work. We express our gratitude to José Roberto Juárez, PhD, historian and academic dean of Laredo Junior College for his editorial assistance. To Mr. Robert Cunningham of the state of Illinois, his suggestions, scholarship, and support have been invaluable.

Finally, we are most grateful to all who have taken an intimate part in this primer ensayo de nuestra historia as seen and
studied by ourselves in order to help our own people and others to know us better. Porque, ¿quién es somos? Somos nuestra historia encarnada en el presente que se lanza hacia el futuro.

Virgilio P. Elizondo
President
Mexican American Cultural Center
San Antonio, Texas
PART ONE

The Early Evangelists of the North American Mainland (1513-1808)
La Gran Pascua Florida

Just twenty-one years after Cristóbal Colón (alias Christopher Columbus) “discovered” the New World, one of his companions, Juan Ponce de León landed on what he described as an “island” lying north of Puerto Rico. De León, who had been searching for the reported island of Bimini, landed on April 2, 1513, on the feast day of La Gran Pascua Florida and so named the said “island.”

De León sailed along the coast of Florida for about two weeks and finally landed near an Indian settlement. The Indians on shore had beckoned the Spaniards to land but attacked them as soon as they set foot on land. The Spaniards set sail and continued south along the coast and landed at a cape which de León named Cabo de las Corrientes. The cape was later renamed Cabo Canaveral by the Spaniards. It retained its second name for over four hundred years until it was renamed Cape Kennedy. The brief change of name for a cape significantly involved in two of humanity’s greatest events (the discovery of the American mainland and the space flights leading to the landing on the moon) did not last long. It soon reverted to its second, longest lasting, and best known name: Cape Canaveral.

The intrepid Juan Ponce de León made a second important discovery of long-lasting value. While rounding the tip of Florida, he encountered the Gulf Stream between Cuba and Florida. The stream, later to be described as “flowing with the power of a thousand Mississippi,” was to allow the wooden vessels to move up to thirty miles a day on their voyages from the New World to Europe. The discovery of the Gulf Stream was to be considered one of the most important navigational discoveries by the ever-wandering Spanish explorers.

After rounding the tip of Florida, de León attempted another landing in the area later to be known as Pensacola. According to the explorer’s report, the native Indians sent out a fleet of a “thousand canoes” to attack the two Spanish vessels. De León had no choice but to abandon the landing. He returned to Puerto Rico leaving one ship behind to search for Bimini.
Juan Ponce de León lost no time in petitioning the Spanish Crown for a patent to the Island of Florida. He received it on September 27, 1514. The patent, however, introduced a new clause in Spanish-New World charters; it ordered him to summon the Indians to submit to the Catholic faith and the authority of the Crown. The Indians were not to be attacked or captured (for enslavement) if they submitted. Since the days of Colón, the Indians of the Caribbean had been enslaved by the Spaniards.

By the time the new patent reached de León, he was busily engaged with the war on the Carib Indians. He did not return to La Gran Pascua Florida for seven more years.¹

The Spaniards, however, were not all engaged in the war. Others were already exploring the rest of the Gulf of Mexico. By 1517, captains Francisco Hernández de Córdoba and Juan de Grijalva had reported the existence of a wealthy kingdom directly west of Cuba on what was either a large island or a mainland of sorts. The Indians along the coast of what was later to be known as Yucatán had varied in their reaction to the Spaniards. Some had attacked, killed, and eaten them in view of their shocked Iberian brothers. Others had traded golden trinkets with them and reported the existence of a large, powerful, and wealthy kingdom in the interior.

Cuban Governor Don Diego Velázquez then ordered his own secretary to organize an expedition to the reported kingdom. The Governor later changed his mind but the first conquistador of North America, Don Hernán Cortés, could not be stopped. He sailed on February 18, 1519. His flotilla consisted of ten ships carrying one hundred mariners, 508 soldiers, 16 horses and mares, and the corresponding amount of arms and munitions. Within two years, the fearless and much feared Hernán Cortés had conquered the Aztec-Nahua kingdom and established the Kingdom of New Spain, later a viceregency and much later, the Republic of Mexico.²

Even while Cortés was fulfilling his role in destiny and history, the Spaniards in the Caribbean were not sitting by idly. In 1519, Jamaican Governor Francisco de Garay dispatched Captain Alonso Alvarez de Piñeda to map and explore the Gulf of Mexico. He was the first to successfully sail along the entire Gulf coast and map it. He was also the first to ascertain that Florida was not an island but a peninsula of the mainland. He named it Bimini.

Alvarez de Piñeda also discovered and named a river which
he called Río de las Palmas, later to be known as the Río Grande (Bravo) de Norte. He reported sailing up river and encountering a number of Indian settlements. He then returned to Jamaica and reported to Governor Garay, who in turn sought the King’s permission to explore and settle the newly discovered land.3

While de León and Garay were awaiting word from the King and Cortés was busily engaged in México Tenochtitlán, another Spaniard appeared on the horizon. Lucas Vásquez de Ayllón, a wealthy landowner and judge at Hispaniola, asked and received permission from the King to explore and settle the Florida mainland. In 1520, he dispatched a caravel commanded by Captain Francisco Gordillo to explore the land north of the claim filed by Juan Ponce de León. While enroute, Gordillo encountered another Spanish vessel commanded by Pedro de Quexos sailing for another judge from Hispaniola. The second captain, Quexos, was on a slave-hunting expedition and even though this was against Gordillos’ instructions, they decided to sail together.

The two captains made several landings and ended up by enslaving 150 Indians whom they took to Hispaniola. Upon their arrival, Vásquez de Ayllón chastised Gordillo and took the matter before Admiral Diego Colón who ordered the Indians be set free. Most of the Indians, except one, converted to Catholicism and baptized Francisco, were returned to the mainland. Vásquez de Ayllón and the converted Indian went to Spain to appeal directly to the King for permission to colonize the mainland. Pedro de Quexos, sailing for a different judge, eluded Colón’s decision and managed to keep his Indian slaves.4

While at the Spanish Court, Vásquez de Ayllón must have met his two competitors Juan Ponce de León and Francisco de Garay. Both de León and de Garay received permission to colonize their respective discoveries on the mainland. Both set sail in 1521; de León for Florida’s eastern seaboard, and Garay for what was considered Florida’s Gulf coast in a sub-section called Amichel by Garay and later to be known as Texas.

De León set sail in two vessels carrying some 250 settlers, livestock, farming implements, arms and munitions. He also reportedly took Dominican missionaries to minister to the religious needs of his colonists as well as the Indians. The settlers landed within de León’s claim on the eastern seaboard and began to establish a settlement. The surrounding native Indians, however, were not disposed to having the Spaniards in their
midst. They constantly attacked the Spanish settlement until Juan Ponce de León himself was mortally wounded. The project was abandoned and the two ships sailed toward Hispaniola. For some unknown reason, the ships were separated and misguided. The one carrying de León landed in Vera Cruz where Hernán Cortés confiscated the ship and its goods. The final misfortune was the failure to record the date and place of de León’s settlement, the historic first Spanish colony, church, and missionary effort, on what was later to become the continental United States.

The colonizing expedition of Francisco de Garay did not fare much better. It did not sail until 1523. Even then, it sailed along the Gulf coast passing Amichel (Texas) and landed at Vera Cruz and Cortés’ Kingdom of New Spain. Garay was arrested and taken to Mexico City, where he died mysteriously shortly thereafter.

While Francisco de Garay was meeting his destiny in Mexico City, Lucas Vásquez de Ayllón was given his second chance. He received a royal charter from the King to explore the coast of Florida for 800 leagues and establish a colony. The patent was issued on June 12, 1523.

Vásquez de Ayllón was under instructions to search out the Indians and convert them to Catholicism. He was ordered to take whatever was necessary to fulfill the royal command. Because of this special command, the colony was to be known as “The Land of San Juan Bautista.” Historically, it was the first time the King of Spain was specifically ordering a colonizing conquistador to convert the Indians.

Vásquez de Ayllón did not sail from Hispaniola to the mainland until July 1526. He sailed with three vessels carrying some 600 colonists and three Dominicans; Fr. Antonio de Montesinos; Fr. Antonio de Cervantes, and Br. Pedro de Estrada. The heavily laden vessels sailed north along the coast as far as Chesapeake Bay. It was here that the settlement of San Miguel was founded along the river which the Spaniards christened Guadalupe. The six hundred men, women, children, and African slaves erected a chapel, houses, and the necessary structures for the protection of the settlement.

A “pestilential fever” attacked the colony and Francisco Vásquez de Ayllón fell to the mysterious malady. He reportedly died in the arms of the Dominicans on October 18, 1526. The harsh winter which followed further disillusioned the settlers as discontent began to grow. The new commander, Don Francisco
Gómez, could not control the men who were constantly usurping his authority. The mutineers finally provoked the African slaves and Indians to rebel and this brought an end to the colony.

One hundred and fifty surviving settlers of the original six hundred, plus an undisclosed number of African slaves, finally abandoned the colony. They sailed for Española in the winter of 1527. Seven men reportedly froze to death during the voyage.7

The old site of San Miguel de Guadalupe was not entirely forgotten by history. Not withstanding the unfortunate experience of Don Francisco Vásquez de Ayllón, the site was re-colonized eighty-one years later by British settlers, who named it Jamestown.8

Unbeknownst to the survivors of the Vásquez de Ayllón expedition, the most ambitious colonizing effort had already set sail for the mainland. In 1526, Don Pánfilo de Narváez had secured a charter to explore and colonize the claims of Juan Ponce de León and Francisco Garay. On June 17, 1527, Narváez had sailed from Spain in five vessels carrying some 600 colonists and Franciscan Missionaries to settle Florida. It had been a much-heralded expedition which had attracted even Fray Suáres and Br. Juan de Palos from their work in New Spain. This was not a small task, for both religious had been among the first twelve Franciscans to enter New Spain. According to Fray Agustín de Vetancurt (quoting historian Antonio de Herrera), Fray Suáres had been appointed Bishop of the Diocese of the Río de las Palmas which, if true, would predate the Diocese of Mexico established in 1530, as the first bishopric in North America.9

Narváez's ships sailing from Spain to the port of La Havana, Cuba, were caught in a hurricane which threw them upon the coast of Florida in the vicinity of Apalache Bay. Being told by the Indians that there was a wealthy kingdom known as Apalche in the interior, Narváez decided to split his command. He took 300 men and marched into the interior. The other men were to sail along the coast and meet up with them. They never met or saw each other again.

After many hardships in the interior, Narváez returned to the coast, where he ordered the construction of five boats to sail to Cuba or south along the coast towards New Spain. They set sail (in boats made from the skin of their own horses) in September, 1528. The Spaniards moved along the coast discovering the Mississippi River which they mistook for a bay and named it Bahia del Espiritu Santo. Another storm soon overtook the makeshift
boats and Panfilo de Narvaez, Fray Suárez, Fray Juan Palos, and their boats were never seen again. Only one boat carrying fifty Spaniards is known to have been shipwrecked. But of the fifty passengers, only four were destined to survive. The Secretary of the Narvaez expedition, Don Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca was destined to lead his three companions through years of Indian slavery, trading, healing, and a monumental trek over the vast terrain from Texas through northern Mexico and probably a part of the U.S. Southwest. The four reached the Spanish outpost of Culiacán in the Kingdom of Nueva Galicia (now in the Mexican State of Sonora) on April 1, 1536. The odyssey had lasted eight years.¹⁰

The stories told by Cabeza de Vaca to the first Viceroy of New Spain in Mexico City, Don Antonio de Mendoza, were to send a covey of would-be conquistadores and adelantados (regional military-political commanders) scurrying throughout the face of North America. There, in the terra incognita north of New Spain and west of Florida, said Cabeza de Vaca, lay several wealthy kingdoms. There were seven cities of gold, there was a strait connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific, there was a kingdom ruled by Amazons, and the land was so rich that it was truly another Mexico, another Peru. It was, in fact, a “New” Mexico.

Cabeza de Vaca was so convinced of the stories himself, that he lost no time in going to Spain to seek permission to explore and settle the land. There were others in North America and the Carribean, however, who felt they had prior claim.

A veteran of Pizarro’s conquest of Peru, a man who had already seen duty in Peru, Nicaragua, and Darién (Panamá), was the first to receive permission to re-trace the steps of Narvaez and Cabeza de Vaca. He was Don Hernando de Soto.

Appointed Governor of Cuba and Adelantado of Florida, de Soto sailed from Spain on April 6, 1538, with the right to colonize the lands of Narvaez and Vásquez de Ayllón. Six hundred men, women and children from the highest Spanish social circles accompanied de Soto. Together with the mariners and a total of twelve priests, the total number of people in the expedition neared a thousand souls. The nine ships first landed in Cuba where the Governor left his wife before heading towards Florida.

The Spaniards landed at or near Tampa Bay in May 1539. Urged onward by the tales of Cabeza de Vaca, de Soto lost no
time in striking overland towards the interior. In the next three
years, de Soto and his men traversed a span of land later to be
known as Florida, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Ten-
nessee, Alabama, and Louisiana. Hernando de Soto died and was
buried near the banks of the Mississippi River on May 21, 1542. A
council of war was held by the survivors and Luis de Moscoso was
elected to command the expedition which would search the
Spanish settlements of the Pánuco River in New Spain. The
Spaniards then crossed over parts of what would be later known
as Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma.

Unable to find the fabled Kingdom of Apalache, or the
Pánuco River, the Spaniards decided to return to the Mississippi
River and sail downstream. They sailed south along the coast in
their makeshift boats reaching the Pánuco in 1543.11 Centuries
later, historians would theorize that Moscoso had at one time
been less than fifty miles away from another Spanish expedition
also searching for the fabled kingdoms reported by Cabeza de
Vaca. That expedition had been under the command of Don
Francisco Vásquez de Coronado. In spite of de Soto and
Moscoso’s failure, the Viceroy of New Spain, Don Antonio de
Mendoza still offered to finance a second expedition by Mos-
coso. The weary conquistador had had enough. He refused the
offer.

Alerted by the Viceroy’s interest, Dominican Fr. Luis Cancer
then approached Mendoza and asked permission to lead a
spiritual conquest of Florida. The request, received in Mexico
City in 1546, was forwarded to the King who did not approve it
until 1549. The Dominican quickly outfitted an unarmed vessel,
named Santa María de la Encina and sailed from the port of Vera
Cruz. He was accompanied by Fathers Gregorio Beteta, Diego
Tolsá, and Juan García. They were accompanied by a small but
undisclosed number of soldiers. They landed near Tampa Bay
within view of an Indian village.

Father Tolsá and a sailor named Fuentes, ventured ashore to
speak with the Indians. Before they could return a Spaniard
showed up unexpectedly. He said he had been living among the
Indians as their prisoner and had come to report the deaths of
Tolsá and Fuentes. Fr. Cancer refused to believe the report and
demanded to be put ashore. The Captain of the Santa María, Don
Juan de Arana, refused to obey. Fr. Cancer then jumped ship and
swam ashore. The mariners and the other two missionaries saw
him climb a small rise where he was quickly surrounded by
Indians. Fr. Cancer then knelt in prayer as the Indians fell upon
him with their knives and tomahawks. The Santa María then returned to Vera Cruz ending the shortest but best intended conquest of Florida.¹²

The martyrdom of Fr. Luis Cancer de Barbastro was not in vain. In 1555, the Archbishop of Mexico, the Bishop of Cuba, and the Viceroy of New Spain all encouraged King Felipe II to colonize Florida. The monarch approved the request and ordered the Viceroy of New Spain, Don Luis de Velasco, to oversee the expedition. He also ordered him to assign the religious conquest to the Dominican Order. The Viceroy chose well. He named Don Tristán de Luna y Arellano to command the expedition.

De Luna y Arellano had come to New Spain with Hernán Cortés in 1530, but had returned to Spain shortly thereafter. He came back to New Spain in 1535, with Don Antonio de Mendoza, the first Viceroy. In the 1540's de Luna y Arellano had been second in command to Francisco Vásquez de Coronado during the great search for Cíbola and Quivira. Since then he had served as a troubleshooter for the Viceroy's of New Spain.

On July 11, 1559, Don Tristán de Luna y Arellano set sail from Vera Cruz with thirteen ships and a force of 1,500 men. Three of his six captains had been in Florida with the de Soto-Moscos expedition. In charge of the religious component was Dominican Fr. Pedro Feria. Their plan was to establish three settlements and convert the Indians by their own Christian examples of being good men and good neighbors.

The flotilla reached the vicinity of Pensacola Bay and a group of Spaniards went ashore to explore the area. The rest of the expedition stayed aboard ship not daring to venture ashore. On September 19th a hurricane sank five ships, a galleon and a small boat. De Luna y Arellano then identified a new landing site and named it Santa Cruz. The Spaniards soon returned to Pensacola where the entire force was finally grouped. In 1560, the conquistador took ill and temporarily relinquished command to his second, Don Jorge Cerón. Although the conquistador finally regained his health and reassumed command, his men had been divided into two warring camps. A council of war was held to solve the problem and the men decided to return to New Spain. They reached Vera Cruz in 1561, and Felipe II then ordered no further attempts to be made to conquer and colonize Florida.¹³

French and British pirates soon forced the Spanish King to reconsider his decision. The treasure- and merchandise-laden Spanish vessels sailing through the Bahama Channel to and from
Spain and the New World were being mercilessly attacked by the buccaneers. Moreover, Spanish vessels shipwrecked or sunk on or near the Florida coastline had prompted a trading alliance between the Indians and the French. The Indians were salvaging and collecting Spanish goods and trading with the French and either killing or enslaving Spanish survivors. Spanish King Felipe II began to search for a military champion to rid him of the French and British intruders.

The son of Spanish Naval Commander, Don Pedro de Menéndez, had been shipwrecked on the Florida coastline. The agonizing and distraught father, unable to raise support in the New World, went to Spain to appeal directly to the King. Menéndez had created such a commotion that he had been arrested and imprisoned for disorderly conduct. On being set free he went directly to the King and succeeded in getting an audience. Felipe II must have been duly impressed with the resourceful if not boisterous Menéndez, for he offered him the option of leading an expedition to conquer and occupy Florida. Menéndez was named Captain-General, Adelantado and Governor of Florida.

While the newly appointed Governor was gathering in force and supplies the Spaniards learned of the establishment of a French post in Florida. The Spaniards had long held claim to the entire eastern coast of the American continent. Unless quickly rooted out, the French post in Florida could have bad consequences for His Catholic Majesty. Menéndez was thus outfitted with royal ships and royal funds to reaffirm Spanish claim and control of Florida. The French, not willing to give up so easily, outfitted their own flotilla under the command of Jean Ribault. Both sides set sail in May and June, 1565.

Menéndez set sail with twenty ships carrying over fifteen hundred people. Four other ships carried over 250 more. A number of smaller ships carried an undisclosed number of passengers. All total, the fleet carried some 2,646 people. Of the religious, there were four secular priests with Menéndez and in other boats a total of twelve Franciscans, one Mercedarian, and eight Jesuits.

The armada was scattered in a storm and Menéndez managed to arrive at Puerto Rico with only a third of his force. He then set out for Florida and landed on the feast day of San Agustín, August 28th. He then set out in search of Ribault and his men. It was to be a brutal fight, for the stakes were high and no one (French, Spanish, or British) was in the habit of taking prisoners.
On September 4th, Menéndez arrived at Fort Royale protected by Ribault with four ships. The fortress was destroyed, its garrison put to the sword, and the French vessels chased north and into a hurricane. The Spaniards then returned to the site of their first landing. On September 6th, one of the Spanish captains went ashore and began tracing the outline of a fortress. Two days later Menéndez himself went ashore to formally establish Nombre de Dios better known as San Agustín.

The French fleet, however, was still somewhere near by as was the second French fortress. On September 16, Menéndez set out overland towards the French Fort Caroline. He reached it five days later and again put the defenders to the sword. The Spaniards were now in full possession of Florida. The next era in the history of La Gran Pascua Florida would be led by the missionaries.

THE NORTHERN TERRA INCognITA OF NEW SPAIN

As a reward for having conquered the Aztec-Nahuatl Empire, Emperor Charles V of Spain on October 22, 1522, named Hernán Cortés “Captain General and Governor of the Kingdom of New Spain.” Not one to be satisfied with past accomplishments, Cortés soon embarked on a series of explorations ranging from the Pánuco River on the Gulf of Mexico, south to Honduras and Guatemala, and along the Pacific Coast, where he founded the Port of Acapulco from which his mariners discovered the “Island of California” and the “Gulf of Cortés.” The conquistador’s movements and accomplishments created much discontent based on envy and jealousy from would-be or unsuccessful conquistadores. The problem reached such a point that the Spanish Crown was forced to send a Judge to New Spain to investigate the allegations.

Judge Luis Ponce de León assumed the Governorship of New Spain on July 2, 1526. He died twenty-two days later. His successor, Marcos de Aguilar, died within a year.

The Spanish Crown then established the Audiencia de México to investigate the charges against Cortés and govern New Spain temporarily. The court was established on December 13, 1527, with Nuño Beltrán de Guzmán as its first President. In 1526, Beltrán de Guzmán had been the Governor of the Pánuco Territory where he engaged in the trading of Indian slaves. In 1529, he resigned from the Audiencia and received permission to estab-
lish the Kingdom of Nueva Galicia described as being north of New Spain. Once again he engaged in the enslavement of the Indians and established a number of villages and outposts in the northern terra incognita. The foremost outpost was the historic Culiacán.

On April 17, 1535, the Spanish Crown resolved its problem in New Spain by raising it to a viceroyalty. Don Antonio de Mendoza was appointed the first Viceroy. Cortés was to continue to hold the rank of Captain General but subservient to Mendoza. As awkward as the political situation must have seemed to the participants, it was, nonetheless, the beginning of order.

It was at this time that Cabeza de Vaca and his companions appeared unexpectedly at Culiacán. His reports and accounts of the supposed fabled kingdoms in the northern terra incognita threatened to disrupt the order. Hernán Cortés was the first to react. He sent out four maritime expeditions north along the Pacific Coast. They sailed in 1532, 1533, 1536, and 1539. They failed to find the seven cities of Gold or the Strait of Anian connecting the two oceans. Instead, they found the pearl rich bays which were christened "the Island of the Caliph." California.

Viceroy de Mendoza then assumed the leadership. He authorized Franciscan Fr. Marcos de Niza to explore the land north of Culiacán and either verify or refute the claims of Cabeza de Vaca.

The Fray received his formal instructions from the Viceroy via the Governor of Nueva Galicia, Don Francisco Vásquez de Coronado in November, 1538. He made all the necessary arrangements and finally departed from Culiacán on March 7, 1539. He was accompanied by one other Franciscan and Estebanico, the black Moor who had accompanied de Vaca. A small group of converted Indians were also taken as cargo bearers, guides and translators.

The expedition travelled north along the Pacific coast, meeting Indians along the road who kept verifying the existence of the reported rich kingdoms of the north. Estebanico tired of the slow moving priest and soon dashed ahead, promising to send word as soon as he found anything of value. The Fray continued at his own speed, speaking with the Indians of the mysteries of the Faith and hearing them describe the "Kingdom of Cíbola". He learned that the Indians there wore woven clothing much like his own. They also cultivated turquoise and used them for making jewelry which had been much prized at Mexico City since pre-Columbian days.
The peaceful march was broken on May 21st, when an Indian messenger arrived bearing bad tidings. He reported the death of Estebanico at the hands of the Chief of Cibola. Only the messenger had escaped the reported massacre. Fray Niza decided to march onward and at least catch a glimpse of Cibola. Having done so, he returned to New Spain and reported he had seen the Kingdom of Cibola as reported by Cabeza de Vaca.

Viceroy Antonio de Mendoza had his hands full with an Indian uprising in north-central New Spain which soon turned into a full fledged war when Niza returned. The Mixtón War, however, did not deter the Viceroy from ordering Francisco Vásquez de Coronado to raise an army to march into Cibola. The order was dated January 6, 1540, but the expedition did not set out until April 22nd from Culiacán.

The army marched north and found the reported golden city of Cibola some twenty miles away from the Gila River. The fabled city turned out to be nothing more than an adobe village of the Zuñi Indians. Vásquez de Coronado divided his army into two major sections and moved in the reported north-northeasternly directions. One of the armies marched into what would later be known as Arizona and practically stumbled upon a great discovery; the Grand Canyon. In awe they beheld and recorded the existence of the magnificent creation.

The southern branch of the army soon reached the Tiguex Indian villages on the upper reaches of the river later to be known as the Río Grande. The Spaniards were dutifully impressed with the sky-high village of Acoma, but disappointed with their failure to measure up to the reported images of Cibola. It was the autumn of 1540, with winter about to enter when Vásquez de Coronado dispersed his army among the Indian villages. The Indians did not take kindly to the Spaniards appropriating their women, houses and blankets. The Indians rebelled and most of the winter was spent in fighting for survival.

A Pawnee prisoner of the Tiguex who had already shown his disposition towards the Spaniards by leading them to the buffalo plains to the east, then confessed he knew of the existence of the Kingdom of Quivira. As soon as winter ended, Vásquez de Coronado set off with El Turco as guide, in search of this other reportedly rich kingdom. The Pawnee took the Spaniards across the Llano Estacado and thence north and northeast over what would later be called the Texas Panhandle, Oklahoma and Kansas. At last they reached Quivira but discovered it to be a
wretched village of the Indians of the Great Plains. El Turco was executed by the Spaniards and Francisco Vásquez de Coronado ordered a retreat to New Spain.\textsuperscript{15}

Three missionaries, however, decided to remain with the Indians. Fray Juan de la Cruz stayed at Tiguex. Luis de Escalona headed to Pecos, and Fray Juan de Padilla decided to return to Quivira. Padilla was accompanied by brother Andres do Campo. The missionaries were all killed by the Indians and do Campo barely managed to escape. He wandered southwardly over the mountain ranges and deserts of the terra incognita and finally reached Mexico City five years after Vásquez de Coronado.\textsuperscript{16}

The failure of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado to find the reported Kingdoms of Cibola and Quivira ended Spanish interest in the northern terra incognita so richly described by Cabeza de Vacá. Moreover, Spanish attention had been drawn to other, more promising sites. Heading the list of attention-grabbing activities was the discovery of ore-rich deposits at Zacatecas in 1546. The road from Mexico City to Zacatecas became the vein through which the Spaniards were to flow into the north-central part of New Spain. Thousands of miners, prospectors, merchants, businessmen, and related tradesmen and their families poured and channeled their way along the road soon christened El Camino de la Plata. The gold-rush which was to occur in California three hundred years later would never compare with its predecessor. The latter day prospectors had the advantage of having at their disposal the art, knowledge, and techniques developed along the Camino de la Plata by those who paved the way for the settlement of northern New Spain and the temporarily forsaken terra incognita of Cibola and Quivira.

The Spanish Crown acted swiftly in establishing order on the ore-rich northern lands. On February 13, 1548, a Royal Order formally established the Audiencia de la Nueva Galicia which soon became known as the Audencia de Guadalajara.\textsuperscript{17} In the days when no one was sure of geographic or topographical descriptions, the boundary of the Audiencia was simply described as being north of New Spain encompassing the old Kingdom of Nueva Galicia and stretching northerly to the terra incognita. With a stroke of the pen the Crown had put an end to the age of the fiery conquistadores who wandered over the face of the continent conquering whoever and whatever they pleased. A new era had been introduced; the era of the colonizers. Gone were the likes of Hernán Cortés, Nuño Beltrán de Guzmán, Pedro de Alvarado, and Francisco Vásquez de
Coronado. The era of Francisco de Ibarra, Luis de Carvajal y de la Cueva, Antonio de Espejo, and Juan de Oñate was about to begin.

The first to receive the royal favor of exploring, pacifying and colonizing the ore-laden land was Don Francisco de Ibarra. He set out in 1554, and headed north from Zacatecas towards the hostile land of the Chichimeca Indians. Ibarra discovered a number of silver mines and established as many towns as there were deposits. His march was relentless as he travelled northwest towards and beyond Culiacán, and north towards and beyond Casas Grandes, the renowned pre-Columbian Indian site in present-day northern Mexico. He turned northeast and ventured as far as his settlements known as Saltillo, Parral, Parras, and a mining site later renamed Monclova. As a reward for having delivered such a rich prize to His Catholic Majesty, Francisco de Ibarra was named Captain-General and Governor of the Kingdom of Nueva Vizcaya in 1562. He established his capitol in Durango and continued to govern until his death in 1575. Don Francisco de Ibarra had been sixteen years of age when he started in 1554, twenty-four years old when he became Governor, and thirty-seven years of age at his death. The Kingdom of Nueva Vizcaya encompassed the breadth of land later to be known as the Mexican States of Durango, Chihuahua, Sonora, Sinaloa, and parts of Coahuila, New Mexico and Arizona.18

The second conquistador to receive a charter to pacify and colonize part of the northern terra incognita was Luis de Carvajal y de la Cueva. On June 14, 1579, he was granted an area of two hundred square leagues beginning at the mouth of the Pánuco River near the port of Tampico along the Gulf of Mexico. Little did the King know that his informal description of 200 square leagues would create havoc in his three kingdoms of New Spain, New Galicia, and New Vizcaya. The said boundaries of Nuevo León, as Carvajal chose to call his kingdom, encompassed a bit of all three, older kingdoms. That, however, was the least of Carvajal’s problems. His own family caused his downfall. Unknown to the conquistador, his entire family and most of his colonizers were Sephardic Jewish. Although some were converts to Catholicism, commonly called Nuevos Conversos, a number were also crypto-Jewish and practiced their religion in secret. Both crypto-Jews and Nuevos Conversos, however, were barred by law from migrating to the New World. The Carvajal family was eventually arrested, tried and executed by the Holy Office of the Inquisition. The Governor, a devout Catholic, but Nuevo Con-
verso, was removed from office and ordered exiled from New Spain. He died in prison before beginning his exile. The Catholic lieutenants of Luis de Carvajal y de la Cueva continued to inhabit the Nuevo León, and parts of Coahuila, Tamaulipas and Texas. Among the cities founded by Carvajal and his men were Cerralvo, León, Monclova, and Santa Lucia (now known as Monterrey). 19

Sometime between 1602 and 1605, the Bishop of Guadalajara, Fray Alonso de la Mota y Escobar, authored his famous Descripción Geográfica de las Reynos de Nueva Galicia, Nueva Vizcaya y Nuevo León. He gave the first description of the religious activities and accomplishments on the land of the Chichimecas. The Bishop reported the existence of 78 Indian pueblos with 4,505 inhabitants, and 75 Spanish owned encomiendas with 3,154 inhabitants for the three kingdoms. He noted there were three cities in the kingdoms: Campostela, Guadalajara, and Zacatecas. He also noted there were 14 townships of various sizes and status. Finally, he reported the existence of 46 mining settlements in Nueva Galicia and Nueva Vizcaya.

In as far as religious communities were concerned, the bishop, reported there were 45 doctrinas teaching catechism to the Indians. The missionary convents, on the other hand, were much more numerous. The Franciscans had a total of 47 in all three kingdoms. The Dominicans had two in Nueva Galicia and the Carmelites had one. The Augustinians had five convents in Nueva Galicia and Nueva Vizcaya, and the Jesuits had fifteen.

Fray de la Mota y Escobar then painted a rather dismal picture of Nuevo Leon. He began by stating that it hardly merited the title of kingdom, for it more closely resembled a “ring in the wilderness.” He noted there was only one small settlement in the kingdom and this was Monterrey, its capital, with a total population of 20 Spaniards. He went on to say that the kingdom was so poor that the people could neither support nor maintain themselves nor regular clergy, and that the Franciscans had the only religious house in the area. And that, he added, was a doctrina. 20 Little did the Bishop know that there were Spaniards in Nuevo Leon who chose not to appear on anybody’s census for fear of falling into the hand of the Holy Office. Accurate reports emanating in the kingdom were hard to come by and left a great deal to be desired. This is reflected in the Indiæ descriptionem (Description of the Indies) by Carmelite Fray Antonio Vásquez de Espinoza, who fails to record the existence of the Nuevo Reyno de León. In describing the outer reaches of Nueva Vizcaya, he
states that beyond Saltillo is the "New Kingdom of Santa Lucía which is being explored and settled and contains a settlement of 30 Spanish residents and a Franciscan convent." By the time Fray Vásquez de Espinoza authored his description, the town of Santa Lucía had been renamed Monterrey and the Nuevo Reyno de León was well on its way towards becoming one of the most progressive and richest areas in North America.

El Nuevo México de la Santa Fe de San Francisco Custodia - Reyno - Colonia

On June 6, 1581, a small group of Spaniards and Indian allies set out from Santa Barbara in Nueva Vizcaya for the northern land previously visited by Francisco Vásquez de Coronado. The leader of the expedition was Franciscan Fray Agustín Rodríguez, accompanied by Fathers Francisco López and Juan de Santa María. The religious were protected by twelve soldiers under the command of Francisco Sánchez Chamuscado.

Technically, the expedition had started in Mexico City when Fr. Rodríguez had been given permission by the Viceroy to re-enter Cíbola. He had returned to his post at Zacatecas via the Camino de la Plata and has recruited his companions. From there they proceeded north to Santa Barbara from whence they formally launched the expedition. Setting off from Ibarra’s Santa Barbara, they passed Nuño de Guzman’s Chiaametla, Cabeza de Vaca’s Corazones, and entered Vásquez de Coronado’s Cíbola. After traveling a total of 400 leagues from Mexico City they reached a Tigua Indian Pueblo later known as San Pablo.

Fray Rodríguez christened the land “El Nuevo México de la Santa Fe de San Francisco” and ordered Fray Juan de Santa María to return to Mexico City and file a report with the Viceroy. The soldiers had already returned so he had to make the trip alone. Attempting to return over a new route, he was ambushed and killed by warring Indians. One converted Indian ally, however, managed to escape and returned to New Spain where he reported the death of Fr. Rodríguez. He was not sure that Fr. López had been killed but feared he had met the same fate.22

Both the Viceroy and the Franciscans were alarmed at the turn of events and sought to raise an expedition to rescue the survivor(s). Wealthy land-owner Don Antonio de Espejo offered to finance an expedition at his own expense and was given permission to enter Nuevo México. Accompanied by Fray Bernardino Beltrán and fourteen soldiers, they set off on
November 10, 1582. They arrived at their destination in January of the following year and verified the deaths of the Franciscans. Espejo then set about exploring the surrounding countryside while Fr. Beltrán went about speaking with the Indians. The father reported having found three Indians who had been converted to Catholicism during the expedition of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado some forty years earlier.

Satisfying themselves that the land was worth further attention and consideration, the Spaniards returned to New Spain. Fr. Beltrán went directly to Mexico City to seek permission to return to New Mexico and establish missions among the Indians. Antonio de Espejo also sought permission to pacify and colonize the land. The samaritan and would be conquistador, however, lacked political clout. The appointment was issued to Don Juan de Oñate in 1588. Due to a number of delays, including some from would-be competitors, final approval for the Oñate expedition was not issued until August 24, 1595. It took three more years for the expedition to get underway.

The wagon-laden caravan followed by droves of horses, cattle and sheep, accompanied the 400 men of Oñate of which 130 had brought their wives and families. Franciscan Fr. Alonzo Martínez headed the nine man religious contingent. The Spaniards were once again accompanied by converted Indian allies. The expedition reached the banks of the Río (Grande) del Norte in April and Oñate took formal possession of New Mexico. After enjoying a dramatic production by Captain Farfán concerning their arrival at New Mexico, Oñate voiced his personal prayer:

“O Holy Cross, who art the divine gate of heaven, altar of the only and essential sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Son of God, path of the Saints, and possession of His Glory, open the gate of heaven to these unbelievers, found the church and altars on which the Body and Blood of the Son of God may be offered; open to us the way of security and peace, for their conversion and our own conversion, and give our King and me, in his roayl name, peaceful possession of these kingdoms and provinces for His Holy Glory. Amen.”

The expedition continued northerly along the banks of the Río Grande del Norte and arrived at the Onke Pueblo on July 11, 1598, where Oñate established his headquarters. The Spaniards renamed the settlement San Juan de los Caballeros. Here they erected the first church of New Mexico on August 23rd. By September 7, they had finished their first garrison. On the
following day the church was formally dedicated to San Juan Bautista. Fr. Martínez then dispersed the missionaries among the Indians.

Father Francisco de San Miguel was assigned to Pecos. Fr. Francisco de Zamora went to Picuries and Taos. Fr. Juan de Rozas was assigned to Cheres and Fr. Alfonso de Lugo to Jemez. Fr. Andres Corchado went to Zía and Fr. Juan Claros to Tiguas. Brother Cristóbal de Salazar stayed at San Juan Bautista with Br. Juan de San Buenaventura. The missionaries then began their chore of converting the Indians. It was no easy task. Already five Franciscans had been killed in New Mexico. The Indians, meanwhile, still remembered Francisco Vásquez de Coronado who had burned a number of Indians at the stake.

The status quo did not last long. In December the Indians at sky-high Acoma attacked a group of Spanish soldiers and killed one of Oñate’s lieutenants. The Governor laid siege to the village and succeeded in defeating the Indians and burning the town. Hardly had Oñate returned to camp when the Indians attacked San Juan Bautista. Once again the Governor defeated the Indians and held out during the winter.

In the Spring of 1599, Oñate sent a group of soldiers and friars to report his activities to Mexico City. In the meantime, he moved his headquarters to San Gabriel on the Chama River. The group which had gone to Mexico City returned in October bringing 200 soldiers and eight more Franciscans. Oñate then set out to explore New Mexico. He surprisingly retraced the steps of Vásquez de Coronado and sought to find Quivira. In his absence the settlers and some of the Franciscans became discouraged and sought to make their way back to Santa Barbara in Nueva Vizcaya. Oñate was furious when he learned of their departure and ordered them arrested and executed for desertion. His soldiers found them at Santa Barbara and induced several to return to New Mexico.

In October, 1604, Oñate set off once again to explore his territory. This time he went westwardly and reached the Gila and Colorado rivers of which he took possession on January 25, 1605. His settlers, meanwhile, were complaining of the Governor’s long and continuous absences. Oñate returned to San Gabriel by April where he learned that his position was being undermined. In June 1606, the King ordered an investigation into the activities of Juan de Oñate and the Governor had no choice but to resign in August of the following year.25.
The religious aspect of New Mexico was in much better standing. In 1604, Fray Juan de Escalona had been named Commissary of the Church in New Mexico. The following year he had been replaced with Fray Francisco de Escobar to whom Oñate had officially delivered the religious province of New Mexico. With the province officially named a commissary of the Franciscan Province of El Santo Evangelio de México, the missionaries could begin to devote their attention and labor to the conversion and assimilation of the native Indians. Their vehicle for accomplishing this was the reducción, the mission. It was a self-contained Indian settlement under the tutelage and leadership of the missionaries in which the church was the physical, political and spiritual nucleus of the community. In reality, however, there were four types of church activities and operations in New Mexico.

First, there was the parish church in the Spanish populated settlements. Second, there was the self-contained, fortress-type mission resembling more a walled city than a religious community. Third, there was the open mission which was nothing more than a parish church located in the midst of an Indian settlement. The fourth and lesser known institution was that of the congregación or visita administered by circuit (walking, not riding) missionaries who erected makeshift chapels which they visited periodically.

Regardless of the system of reducción that the Indians were exposed to, the approach and objective was the same: to convert and possibly assimilate the neophyte. In order to accomplish this, the missionaries were armed with both civil and ecclesiastical law outlining and detailing the treatment of the Indians by the Spaniards. Las Leyes de Indias, Las Nuevas Leyes de Indias, Papal Bulls and a seemingly continuous out-pouring of Reales Cédulas governed all Indian-European relations.

The actual instrument of communication, conversion and assimilation of the Indians was bilingual education. The missionaries lost no time in learning the various Indian languages and dialects. Having accomplished this, they then set out to use the Indians’ own tongue to teach them the Spanish language as well as the Mysteries of the Faith. Where time and numbers allowed and warranted it, bilingual liturgical Manuales were authored by the missionaries.

The missionaries’ success creating bilingual Spanish and Uto-Aztecan and Hokan-speaking Indians in New Mexico was to
become as debatable as their success in assimilating them. The 16th and 17th century missionaries of New Mexico, however, were not concerned. The method has worked elsewhere in New Spain and would work again on the frontier.

The mission (in contrast to the religious *pueblo, congregación* and/or *visita*) was to become the best known, although not necessarily the most reliable or successful type of *reducción*. The small, walled religious community with its vast land holdings, was composed of a church, chapel, granary, *convento* or living quarters for the missionaries, workshops, offices, and Indian quarters. The lands surrounding the mission were used for farming as well as cattle and sheep grazing. The mission was self-sufficient and self-contained. It grew or manufactured everything it needed. In many cases, over-production of goods led to trading with surrounding neighbors. This, in turn, often led to competition, arguments, discontent, disagreement and criticism by the surrounding civilian merchants who lacked the mission’s abundant and free labor force. This would eventually lead to the downfall of the missionary system but that would occur centuries later and the 16th and 17th century missionaries could have hardly imagined it.

In spite of the seemingly efficient missionary system, there were several flaws besides the over-production of saleable goods. The first and perhaps most perplexing to the missionaries was the attitude of the Indians towards labor. In their native state, the Indians fished, hunted, and/or harvested what they needed without waste and over-production. The missionaries, on the other hand, saw manual labor as a means of keeping the Indians occupied and productive. It was, in fact, a well accepted belief, that the Indians were lazy and had to be constantly watched. The missions, nonetheless, were similar in one respect to the Indians’ previous lifestyle. Both in their *pueblos* as in the missions they lived in communes sharing everything equally including the labor. What the Indians found difficult to comprehend was the over-production and constant laboring.

Notwithstanding the material and spiritual benefits offered by the missions and the missionaries, some of the Indians would periodically return to the so-called “wild state of nature.” The missionaries would react by sending the soldiers assigned to the mission to bring back the Indians. Once returned, the Indians would be punished for the sins and misdeeds. The punishment varied with the severity of the misdeed, but any type of
punishment for an Indian guilty of what was only natural to him was nonetheless a puzzlement to the neophyte.

In fact, it was "doing what came natural" that caused most problems for the missionaries in attempting to understand the Indians. The Indian chieftains and warriors found it somewhat difficult to understand what the missionaries had against polygamy (especially since the missionaries were celibate). This was particularly hard for those warriors who had taken over a deceased relative's wife and family. The well intended Indian warrior who had thus extended his family as well as number of wives was suddenly faced with having to reduce his family and above all, with having to select only one wife from his two or more. The Spanish soldiers did not help matters any.

By law, the soldiers could not set up house with an unconverted Indian maiden. To do so was to break a series of civil and ecclesiastical laws. On the other hand, a soldier could live in sin with a converted Indian maiden. Although sinful, it was nonetheless, a common practice introduced with the arrival of Hernán Cortés and not against the law. A child born to this illicit relationship was recognized by his father and considered a Spanish citizen. Again, Cortés and Doña Marina, La Malinche, had set the pattern. Meanwhile, a child born to an unconverted maiden and fathered by a Spaniard had no rights whatsoever. Legally, the child did not exist.

If all this was confusing to the Indian warrior, the Spaniards' dress code was even worse. Indian women were required to wear skirts, blouses and/or dresses. Although women were already accustomed to wearing such attire (or at least similar apparel), there were days in New Mexico when the strict dress regulation seemed an imposition to say the least. In so far as the men were concerned, they were required to wear trousers instead of the more familiar, lighter, god-given skin protection of the makeshift loin cloth. The missionaries persisted and insisted. They even went as far as to include in their dress code the banning of the body painting and the body tattooing. Indian tribal, religious and political standings or designations reflected in this manner were thus lost to the Franciscans who not only dressed alike, but must have all looked alike to the Indians.

To further complicate matters, the missionaries insisted on the Indians abandoning all their beliefs and allegiances to their native gods and goddesses. At least in this area there was some room for compromise. It was the exclusion and prohibition of
peyote, alcoholic spirits and the rousting mitote that caused problems. It was not surprising that the Indians found the Spaniards so difficult to understand.

They had welcomed the strangers to their land only to find the strangers taking it over by force. Regardless of how many they killed, others would soon replace them. At least the soldiers were somewhat easier to get rid of. All an Indian had to do was tell them a story of some far, rich land, or show them a handful of gold, pearls, silver or turquoise. The next step was easy, just point them away from where you did not want them to be. The soldiers would follow as they had followed ever since the days of Vásquez de Coronado.

The dark-brown robed, ever-walking, ever-talking missionaries were different. They were lifeless, dull, ever-working bores. They walked all over the wilderness in all forms of weather. They were always unarmed. Yet, they were a mysteriously powerful group of men for even the soldiers and their leaders bowed to them and knelt before them. To kill one of them (which was very easy since not only were they unarmed but they also submitted peacefully) always produced a violent reaction from the soldiers. As strange as it seemed, only the horses were so well protected. The Indians soon learned not to kill a missionary or steal a horse.26

With the Indian-Spanish relations stabilized a bit, the Church then proceeded to raise the Commissary of New Mexico to a Custodia. Thus in 1622, Fray Alonzo de Benavides was appointed the first Custodian and authorized by the Viceroy to take twenty-six additional missionaries to New Mexico. Five years later the King ordered the Viceroy to send thirty additional Franciscans. Only 19 and the new Custodian were sent, however. Fr. Benavides then went to Spain to personally hand-deliver his Memorial to the King.27

The Benavidez report recorded the existences of ten conventos in New Mexico. He also reported the baptism of some 80,000 Indians in the 43 churches. All this pleased the King, for he has recently approved the establishment of a diocese at Durango to which New Mexico had been attached. The move had come about on the insistence of the Archdiocese of Guadalajara, which felt it could not be of much help to New Mexico because of the distance between them. Therefore, on September 1, 1623, the Diocese of Durango had been established for the far northern reaches of Nueva Vizcaya and New Mexico.28
As far as the eye could see, and it could not see below the surface, everything was fine in New Mexico. Even the settlers seemed to be enjoying some benefits. As founding families, they had the privilege of becoming hidalgos, the lowest rank of Spanish nobility. They had special rights which they guarded jealously. They could, for example, bequeath their titles and holdings to their heirs. Among the benefits included here were that of being perpetual members of the city council. This was no small privilege.

The cabildo, city council, was the most autocratic form of self-government in the Spanish American colonies. It allowed the colonists to govern themselves through appointments as well as elections to the august body. The positions available included those of alcalde (mayor), alderman, notary public and public scribe, constable, sheriff, justices of the peace, field judges (enforcing farming, water rights and diverse laws), fiel executor or sindico (city attorney), and justices of the Mesta (grange law). Altogether, the members of the city council represented not only self-government, but also self-taxation, education, defense, commerce and sanitation. They were subservient to the Governor (who was subservient to the Viceroy) in all military-political-judicial matters. Moreover, they were subservient to the local priests and missionaries who in turn were subservient to a Provincial General or Bishop, in all ecclesiastical matters. The Cabildo, nonetheless, was the third corner as well as pivot point in the triumvirate which governed the Spanish American colonies.

The Indians, unfortunately, were at the bottom of the scale. They were subservient to all three forms of government; religious, military and civilian. The Indians had to answer to every whim and desire of all the Spaniards. Very often they were caught in the middle of the Spanish political struggles. Everybody taxed the Indians. Everybody had special rules, laws and regulations for the Indians to follow and obey. And everybody also had their own forms of punishment for law-breaking Indians. From the Indians' point of view, it was but a time bomb with a slow burning fuse.29

Both in 1640 and 1650, there were two small Indian uprisings caused by a conflict between the medicine men and the missionaries. The situation passed and only the infrequent Yute and Apache attacks disturbed the peace for a while. In 1675, however, a priest at San Idelfonso charged some Indians with practicing witchcraft. Forty-seven were arrested and four were
hanged. A delegation of Indians then demanded the remaining
prisoners be set free. Among those released was one called Popé
who soon began to plot the expulsion of the Spaniards from
New Mexico.

Popé travelled from pueblo to pueblo enlisting the Indians
to his plan. After five years of careful plotting he announced
August 13, 1680 as the date for the uprising. The plot was reported
to the Spaniards by a loyal Indian and Popé had no choice but to
up the date to the tenth. On that date the Indians rose in arms
and fought the Spaniards in their homes and ranches as well as
villages. Some of the Spaniards fought their way to Sanra Fe and
others held out at Socorro. Finally, on August 21st, the Spaniards
at Santa Fe fought their way to Socorro where they discovered
the Spaniards had already moved further south to El Paso del
Norte. The refugees were re-united on September 13, and from
their southernmost point began to contemplate the re-conquest
of New Mexico. Behind them lay dead twenty-three Franciscan
missionaries and 380 Spaniards. This was the biggest upset the
Spaniards had suffered in North America since the ouster of
Hernán Cortés from México Tenochtitlán.30

LA PROVINCIA DE LAS TEJAS O LAS NUEVAS PHILIPINAS

West of La Gran Pascua Florida, southeast of El Nuevo
México de Santa Fé, and northeast of El Nuevo Reyno de León,
lay the unpacified, uncolonized land once known as Amichel, or
"the land of Narvaez." Ever since the days of Alvarez de Piñeda
and Cabeza de Vaca, the Spaniards has been frequently ship-
wrecked on the land with disastrous results. The gulf coast
Indians, later called Karankawas, had developed a taste for
Spanish flesh and Spanish slaves and took every opportunity to
enjoy the company of Iberians. As a result, the Spaniards had
deliberately avoided contact with the natives during the six-
teenth century.

To make matters worse, there were no legends, reports, or
tales concerning lost treasures, wealthy Indian kingdoms, or rich
mineral deposits on the land. Much to the contrary, the land was
as inhospitable as its native inhabitants. West along the coast
from La Bahia del Espiritu Santo (Mississippi River) the land was
swampy and infested with mosquitos and alligators, this was
followed by the miles long arid islands protected and inhabited
by the Karankawa Indians. West from the Río de las Palmas (Río
Grande del Norte) was the semi-desert coast line of Nuevo León
and the Pánuco Territory inhabited by the warlike Tamaulipescos and few remaining Chichimecas. As far as the Spanish eye could see, and it was only along the coast line, the land was not worth pacifying.

There were other men who saw things differently though. They were the brown-robed conquistadores of mind and soul. They did not dream of seven cities of gold and bullion paved streets. They did not seek the land of the Amazons, or the treasures of El Dorado. These conquistadors ignored much of what lay on the surface of the land. They overlooked the rattlesnakes, mosquitos, scorpions, and alligators. They ignored the scorching sun, which could blind one during the day in the vast deserts, the ever-changing and unpredictable weather where sun-devils gave way to tornadoes, and a southeasterly wind could herald the approach of a hurricane. They were not blind. They saw these dangers and detractions, but they also saw the untapped treasure of the land awaiting their arrival.

Notwithstanding the topographical and political drawbacks of the land, it had the greatest treasure this conquistador could ever yearn for: unconverted souls waiting to be shown the path of the Holy Faith. That was the real wealth of the land. It was not a rose without thorns. The possibility of losing one’s life was a commonly accepted risk. He was fully aware of this. Tenochetitlán, Guadalajara, Zacatecas, Durango, Monterrey and Santa Fé had not been conquered by the faint-hearted. What better reward could a man achieve than to die a martyr for “God and Country?”

So he went into the land, and a little bit mas allá. He went as the new conquistador of soul and mind. Armed only with a wooden cross and faith, barefooted and frequently alone he ventured around the next bend, beyond the next mountain top, into the darkness of the wilderness following the Camino de la Santa Fé and casting the shadow of the Vera Cruz.

Bishop Alonso de la Mota y Escobar of Guadalajara had been one of the first to recognize the wealth of the land. He had written in his Descripción Geográfica de los Reynos de Nueva Galicia, Nueva Vizcaya y Nuevo León., that the Indians were “poor but friendly and ready to be converted and shown the light of God’s true word.” He felt their conversion and assimilation would be easy because the land was so harsh that the Indians spent their entire life hunting in order to exist and had thus not had the time to develop any form of religious beliefs. He
ended his description of the Indians of Nuevo León and surrounding area by stating that the Indians were not idolaters. They were waiting for God to move someone to save their souls.

The Bishop's desire did not go un-heard. In 1622, Pope Gregory XV decreed the creation of the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith -- La Congregación de Propaganda Fide. The congregation was meant to assist the Franciscans in their missionary activities. The immediate problem, however, was the lack of colleges in which the missionaries could be taught everything they needed to know in order to be effective. Eleven years after the issuance of the Papal Bull, the Franciscans met at Toledo and decreed the creation of fifty such colleges for the propagation of the Faith. It took fifty years, however, for the first to be established in North America.

On November 20, 1683, Fray Antonio Linaz, accompanied by twenty-two Franciscan missionaries formally established the Colegio de la Santa Cruz de Querétaro for the Propagation of the Faith. Fray Linaz was aptly qualified for the task. For years he had been laboring on the frontier as a missionary with the Franciscan Province of San Pedro y San Pablo de Michoacán. Until the creation of the College of Querétaro, the Province of Michoacán had been responsible for the Franciscan missionary activities in the northern provinces and kingdoms of New Spain.31

By the time Fray Linaz and his missionaries arrived in New Spain the hands of fate had begun to spin the web which would bring the religious north and east of the Río Grande del Norte. The series of events had begun in early 1682, when French adventurer, René Robert Cavelier de la Salle had sailed down the Mississippi River from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. La Salle had claimed the river basin for France and King Louie XIV. He then sailed for France to seek permission to colonize the area.

Having received permission from the King, he then set sail for the Mississippi. By mid-December 1684, La Salle and his men were near the mouth of the river. The French passed the Mississippi and continued to sail down the coast and landed on what was later called the Texas Gulf Coast on January 1, 1685. Knowing they were on Spanish-claimed soil, the French continued to look for a safer harbor out of view of the patrolling Spanish ships. The French encamped at a bay which the Spaniards later named Bahia del Espiritu Santo and which much later became known as Lavaca Bay. Just to be safe, La Salle built a fortress which he christened Fort St. Louis but changed its position several times within the bay.32
The Spaniards soon learned of the French intrusion and ordered a search for La Salle. The Viceroy of New Spain assigned the maritime expeditions; and the first Marquis de Aguayo, Governor of Nuevo León, was charged with the overland expeditions. The Governor assigned the commission to Captain Alonso de León. The captain made his first trip in June of 1686, and marched to the mouth of the Río Grande del Norte without finding any traces of the French. In February and March of the following year he made his second expedition. Once again he explored the mouth of the river, but this time he actually crossed the river. He still failed to find the French and returned to Monterrey.

In 1688, the Viceroy of New Spain created the Province of Santiago de Coahuila and named Captain Alonso de León as its first governor. Hardly had the governor assumed his post when he learned from the Indians that there was a Frenchman living with a tribe of Indians somewhere east of the Río Grande. De León set out in May and crossed the river at a much more northern point. He succeeded in finding and arresting the Frenchman, who by now had become the chief of the local Indian tribe. The area which he found would later be known as the Nueces River in the vicinity of Crystal City.

Frenchman, and Indian chief, Jean Henri, was taken to Mexico City where he verified the arrival of La Salle and the construction of Fort St. Louis. Governor Alonso de León then set out to find the fortress. He crossed the Río Grande at a low water crossing later to be known as Paso de Francia on April 1, 1689. He proceeded east-southeast over the un-named land and reached the ruins of Ft. St. Louis on April twenty-second.

The Spaniards learned that La Salle had been murdered by his own men and that the rest of the men and women had been killed by the Karankawa Indians. de León ordered the remains of the French to be buried and then set out to explore the surrounding area. It was during this side trip that the Spaniards first met the Indians called Tejas. In reality, they were the Hasinai Federation of the Caddo Indian Nation. Tejas meant ally; that is, allied against the Apache.

The expedition returned to Coahuila but only to make the necessary arrangements in order to establish missions in the land of the Tejas Indians. In March of 1690, Governor and Captain General Alonso de León made his fifth and final expedition east of the Río Grande. Accompanied by Franciscan Friar Damián
Massanét and several other missionaries as well as a substantial military force, equipment, supplies and provisions, he headed out to establish the first Texas mission. The expedition went by way of Ft. St. Louis which de León reduced to ashes on April 26th. The Spaniards then proceeded to the "land of the Tejas" which they reached the latter part of May. On the 25th of May, 1690, Alonso de León and Fray Damián Massanét founded mission San Francisco de los Tejas. The "mission" was nothing more than a makeshift altar sitting in a makeshift hut in the middle of the East Texas piney forest. It was, nonetheless, a beginning. 33

Governor de León returned to Coahuila leaving a handful of soldiers and missionaries as the sole representatives of Spain in the wilderness of Texas. Fray Massanét was not content with the efforts of the Governor and went directly to Mexico City to appeal to the Viceroy to establish missions and Spanish settlements in Texas. The Viceroy agreed and appointed General Domingo de los Ríos the first Governor of the "Province of the Tejas Indians." He was ordered to establish eight more missions, a fortress, a settlement for the soldiers and their families, and explore the surrounding area and expel any foreign intruders. He was also ordered to name the rivers, creeks, waterways, and establish a Camino Real.

The expedition set off in May 1691, and the Governor and Massanét immediately got into an argument. Their differences of opinion were historically reflected in their respective diaries and particularly in the naming of the waterways. Regardless of what name one of them gave to a river, the other one gave it a different one. They did manage to agree at least once, on June 13, 1691. They had arrived at an Indian settlement called Yanaguana by the resident Payaya Indians of the Coahuiltecans Nation. Both Terán de los Ríos and Fray Damián Massanét agreed to name it Río San Antonio de Padua.

The expedition continued on to East Texas and reached it in July. The Governor then proceeded to formally claim the land for Spain. He also chose to re-name it. He christened it El Nuevo Reyno de la Montana de Santander y Santanilla. Fray Massanét continued to call it "the land of the Tejas Indians."

Terán then set out for Fort St. Louis where he met a Spanish ship with instructions from the Viceroy for him to explore the area as far as the Mississippi River. Terán returned to Mission San Francisco de los Tejas from where he explored as far as the Red River. The Governor tired of his meanderings through the wilderness and returned to the missions and made preparations
to return to Coahuila. Fray Massanét, however, refused to give or lend him any horses from those assigned to the mission. The Governor had no choice but to sail to Vera Cruz and then proceed to Mexico City directly. He got even with the missionaries by not sending any provisions or supplies. Without government support and assistance, the missionaries were forced to abandon East Texas and returned to Coahuila in 1693.34

It seemed for a while as if the land of the Tejas were soon to be forgotten by the Spanish Government, which no longer felt threatened by foreign intrusion on its territory. The Franciscan missionaries, however, were not about to give up the newly discovered souls. There might have not been any economic, political or materialistic value to Texas, but it did have Indians; thousands of Indians. The Franciscans continued to appeal to the Viceroy for the establishment of missions among the Tejas. The King’s representatives in Mexico City, however, turned a deaf ear to the costly proposals.

Fray Francisco Hidalgo, one of Fr. Linaz’s original twenty-two missionaries and a companion of Fr. Massanét in the early Texas expeditions, set out to solve the problem. He had heard from the Indians of Coahuila that the French had once again moved down the Mississippi and were trading with the Tejas Indians. He had also been told that the Tejas wanted the Spaniards to return. Fray Hidalgo then proceeded to play a political game of his own. He wrote letter to the French and invited them to San Juan Bautista del Río Grande to trade with the Spaniards.

French commercial Governor of Louisiana, Antonie de la Mothe Cadillac, received the letter and commissioned one of his captains to seek out the author. Louis de St. Denis set out from Louisiana and crossed Texas overland and arrived at San Juan Bautista on July 18, 1714. He was immediately arrested. Fray Hidalgo and the commandant of San Juan Bautista, Don Diego Ramón, were “scandalized” at the nerve of the Frenchman who had actually shown up at a Spanish fortress with goods to trade. Captain Ramón confiscated the merchandise and kept St. Denis under house arrest until he could be taken to Mexico City. The transfer to the capital, however, was not fast enough. St. Denis had already had enough time to woo and court Ramón’s granddaughter, Señorita Manuela Sánchez de Ramón.

St. Denis was taken to Mexico City where he stayed long enough to convince the Viceroy that he should appoint him
scout and guide for a new Spanish expedition into the land of the Tejas Indians. The Frenchman then returned to San Juan Bautista where he married Manuela in 1714. Two years later he led the Ramón expedition to Texas.

Taking a total of 65 men, Captain Diego Ramón established six missions and one fortress among the Tejas Indians. He then returned to San Juan Bautista. St. Denis, in the meantime, had strayed off to Louisiana where he once again received authorization to take another load of goods to Coahuila. He was arrested again and dispatched to Mexico City one more time. The Frenchman, however, jumped bail and made his way to Louisiana and was eventually joined by his wife.

In 1718, the Viceroy appointed the second Governor of Texas Don Martín de Alarcón and ordered him to establish a half-way point between Coahuila and the land of Tejas. The Governor mounted an expedition consisting of 100 soldiers (thirty of which took their families), and a number of Franciscan missionaries. Among the religious were Fray Félix Isidro de Espinoza and Fray Antonio Olivares de San Buenaventura. They arrived at the valley of the river San Antonio de Padua in the last week of April. On May 1, 1718, the Governor and the Franciscans founded Mission San Antonio de Valero later to be known as “the Alamo.” Alarcón then proceeded to establish the Real Presidio de San Antonio and the Villa de Bexar. The religious, military and civilian representatives of Spain had settled down along the San Antonio River to await the growth and development of their offspring which was destined to have a precarious childhood, a rambunctious adolescence, and a tormenting middle age before becoming a metropolitan center. The founders, however, could have never imagined it. All they wanted was a stopping place between Coahuila and Texas.

After the formalities were over in San Antonio, Governor Alarcón continued to East Texas in a well planned show of force meant to impress the Indians as well as the French. Having done what he thought was necessary, he then returned to Coahuila. Neither the French nor the Indians were impressed. The Indians took the gifts given them by the Spaniards but still refused to be converted to Catholicism. They then accepted gifts and traded goods with the French just to make sure that both European representatives would continue to be interested.

Unknown to all the parties involved, war had been declared between France and Spain on January 9, 1719. The French in
Louisiana then attacked the Spanish garrison at Penzacola on May 14th. Almost a month later they attacked the fortress of San Miguel de los Adaes in East Texas. The raid was a complete surprise. It was recorded that only the chickens put up a fight and managed to claw and peck some of the Frenchmen who eventually overpowered them and dragged them off to become the main ingredients in some French plate. The Spanish soldiers had been quicker to react; they fled immediately to San Antonio. The missionaries had no choice but to follow suit.

Back in Coahuila, the extremely wealthy second Marquis de San Miguel de Aguayo was the first to react to the news of the invasion. He quickly offered his arms, shield and sword to defend the sovereignty of the Spanish flag over Texas and drive the intruders back to wherever they had come from. The Marquis then offered to finance the entire expedition himself. The Viceroy appointed him Governor of Texas, or as it was also known, The Kingdom of the New Philippines.

Don Joseph de Azlor y Vitro de Vera, second Marquis de San Miguel de Aguayo, took office in December, 1719. Even before he could set off for Texas, Fray Antonio Márgil de Jesus petitioned the Governor for permission to establish a mission along the banks of the San Antonio River. The Marquis agreed and on February 23, 1720, Márgil founded Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo. The mission was originally located three leagues downstream from Mission de Valero and on the east bank of the river. In years to come it was to be moved at least twice due to hurricanes and flooding. It eventually ended up on the west bank of the river and about four leagues from Valero.

The Marquis finally entered Texas in November of 1720, but by that time the war had ended and Spain and France had signed an armistice. The Governor was not deterred. He went on to East Texas where he re-established the missions. He also re-established the Presidio de los Adaes and founded a new one near Nacogdoches. Upon his return to San Antonio he founded Mission San Francisco Xavier de Nájera and ordered the reconstruction of Presidio San Antonio de Bexar. The ever working Governor then proceeded to La Bahia del Espiritu Santo where he established Mission Loreto and the Presidio de la Bahia. Having cemented Spanish control of Texas, Don Joseph de Azlor y Vitro de Vera then returned to Coahuila.36

Not everything the Marquis did worked out well, however. Both the mission and presidio at La Bahia were moved to a better location. Meanwhile, Mission San Francisco Xavier de Nájera
closed down within two years and moved its Indians over to Mission de Valero. Three of the East Texas Missions were moved to San Antonio in 1731, and renamed missions San Juan Capistrano, Nuestra Señora de la Purisima Concepción, and San Francisco de la Espada. Moreover, none of the four presidios actually began by the Marquis were ever finished. Notwithstanding the re-arrangements made after the departure of the Marquis, he, more than anyone else, brought an end to the period of exploration and conquest of Texas and introduced the missionary era. The Spanish government’s attention then shifted to the far northwest along the Pacific coastline.

PIMERIA ALTA AND THE ROAD TO CALIFORNIA

In 1620, when the Bishopric of Nueva Vizcaya (or Diocese of Durango) was established, the far northwestern edges of New Spain were still unexplored, unpacificed, and uncolonized. The maps of that era still showed blank spaces without designation of land or water masses. Some cartographers, seeking to be more accurate than their competitors, would indiscriminately stamp “terra incognita” or even more impressive, “Cibola”, “Quivira”, or “Nuevo Mexico”. The legendary Straits of Anian would periodically appear on some maps connecting the Atlantic and Pacific. Still others featured an island of various sizes and shapes stamped “California”.

Fray Antonio Vásquez de Espinosa in his Description of the Indies authored at about the same time that the diocese was erected, bluntly stated that California was an island and not part of the continent as some cartographers had reported. He based his opinion on the reports of the expedition of Captain Nicolás de Cardona who sailed to California in 1614. Cardona left Acapulco on March 21st of that year and reportedly coasted the Pacific for 100 leagues. He had been ordered by the King to explore the coastline and ascertain the existence of the pearl-rich Island of California. According to Fray Vásquez de Espinosa, Cardona found mountain ranges paved with rich veins and ore deposits of silver.

California continued to be a disputed island and stopping point in the sea route from Acapulco to the Phillipines of great value to the Manila Galleon trade. It also continued to be an unpacificed, uncolonized pearl-gathering territory. It was not until December of 1678, that the Viceroy decided to occupy the so-called Island. Don Isidro de Atondo y Antillón was named Governor of Sinaloa and Admiral of the Kingdom of the
Californias. He was authorized to pacify and colonize the Island. As the spiritual leader and cosmographer of the expedition, the Viceroy selected the newly arrived Italian-born Jesuit Fray Eusebio Francisco Kino. The expedition did not set off for five years, for there were many tedious preparations to be made before sailing.

On November 15, 1681, while en route to the Province of Sinaloa, Fr. Kino was named Vicar to California by the Bishop of Guadalajara, who claimed jurisdiction of the said Island. The Bishop of Durango, however, also claimed jurisdiction of California and a dispute arose between the dioceses. The Viceroy settled the issue and ended the dispute by ruling in favor of the Diocese of Guadalajara. Fr. Kino who had been awaiting the results then set for Sinaloa and arrived in March of 1682.

The expedition finally set sail in January of 1683, but a storm soon forced the ships to return to the Sinaloan coastline. A second crossing of the gulf was attempted and the Spaniards finally succeeded in reaching the said Island on April 1st. Formal possession of California was taken four days later. Governor Atondo y Antillón formally christened California the "Province of La Santísima Trinidad".

Fr. Kino lost no time in ministering to the native Indians. At first the Indians were shy, but friendly. They soon helped the Jesuit erect huts and gather other neophytes to be instructed in the Mysteries of the Faith. In the meantime, Fr. Kino is said to have mastered the native’s language. Relations between the Indians and the soldiers, however, were not so good. One thing led to another and by June there was a general state of war between the two. On July 14th, the Spaniards were forced to abandon the Bay of Peace and La Santísima Trinidad.

Governor Atondo y Antillón led his expedition across the gulf to Sonora where he refitted and regrouped for another attempt. They were back on October 6, 1683. This time the Spaniards selected a site further north along the coastline which they called the Bay of San Bruno. Once again Fr. Kino lost no time in gathering the local Indians and establishing a makeshift mission. With the help of the Indians, Fr. Kino then set out to explore the territory. He went as far as the Sierra Gigante and the Pacific coastline. The missionary soon won the trust and confidence of the natives who released their children to him to be instructed in the Mysteries of the Faith as well as the Spanish language.
On August 10, a Spanish ship, the San José, arrived from Acapulco with twenty additional soldiers, dispatches and supplies. Five days later, on the feast of the Assumption, Fr. Kino made his final profession within the Jesuit Order to Fr. Juan Bautista Copart who had just arrived. The Governor then ordered everyone to prepare for an overland march to the Pacific coast.

The expedition set out in mid-December. It was led by the Governor and Fr. Kino. They were accompanied by twenty-nine soldiers, Indian guides, and eighty mules and horses. They reached their destination a month later and began to explore the area. The soldiers soon grew weary and restless so the expedition returned to San Bruno. Here the soldiers began to complain loudly. On May 7, 1685, Governor Atondo y Antillón sailed off to fish for pearls. Fr. Kino, meanwhile, crossed the gulf to Sonora to search for another mission site. They then received orders from the Viceroy to escort the Manila Galleon fleet to Acapulco. After reaching Acapulco the two men went to Mexico City where they learned that the Viceroy had suspended the conquest and pacification of the "Island of La Santísima Trini-conquest and pacification of the "Island of La Santísima Trini-

Fray Kino was not a man to give up so easily. He went to Guadalajara where he arrived in November of 1686 and asked permission to enter upper Sonora then known as Pimería Alta. His request was approved and he set out in mid-December. He reached his destination in early 1687. His new working area included not only upper Sonora, but also parts of the areas later to be known as the states of Arizona and New Mexico.

Fray Kino spent the following twenty-years laboring among the Pina, Yuma, Papago, and Sobaipuri Indians. By 1695, he had founded a chain of missions along the Altar and Magdalena rivers. He then went further north and in April of 1700 he established mission San Xaviér del Bac which was protected by the Presidio de Tucson. It was at this time that Fr. Kino discovered that the local Indians were trading blue shells from the Pacific with Indians who apparently lived along the coastline. The missionary was well aware that the discovery of an overland route to the Pacific from Tucson was an important discovery. It would be of great political and economic valued for all concerned. Fray Kino then began a series of overland expeditions seeking a connection with the Island of Santísima Trinitád. In 1702, he finally succeeded in reaching the Gulf of California after having
gone by way of the Yuma, Gila, and Colorado rivers. It was at this time that Kino proudly proclaimed that “California no es isla - es peninsula” (California is not an island - it is a peninsula). The fact that California was part of the mainland and not an island would take time to be accepted. In the meantime, Fr. Francisco Eusebio Kino continued to labor among the Indians of Pimería Alta. By the time he died in 1711, he had established twenty-nine missions and had converted thousands of Indians. He had also opened the overland routes to lower and upper California as well as the road to Arizona.37

After the passing of Fr. Kino, the Jesuits continued to expand and cement their hold in Pimería Alta through the missions. The Apache Indians, however, had other plans. They began to raid the Spanish settlements and missions, causing the Spaniards as well as the converted Indians to reconsider their respective positions. The Jesuits’ biggest threat, however, were not the Apaches. It was Spanish high-level politics.

King Charles III, the “Enlightened Monarch” sought to establish a number of reforms deemed necessary for the continued wellbeing of the Spanish Empire. Although some of the reforms were truly progressive and beneficial, at least one in particular was highly questionable. in 1767, King Charles III, ordered the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish Empire. Historians, political scientists, and economists would argue the wisdom and effect of the expulsion for centuries to come.

The task of substituting for the Jesuits in Pimería Alta and the Californias fell upon the Franciscan Order. The college of the Propagation of the Faith of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Zacatecas was assigned the vast territory. It also meant they had to leave their missions in Texas and deliver them to their sister College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro. The Apaches were not waiting; they attacked and burned Mission San Xaviér del Bac.

The chore of restoring order and Spanish control in Arizona fell on Captain Juan Bautista de Anza and Franciscan Fray Francisco Garcés. The Captain busied himself with the warring Indians and the missionary devoted his attention to the Pima Indians and the mission. He soon managed to bring the Indians back. The Friar then concentrated in rebuilding the mission and brought in architect Ignacio Gaona to do the job. The reconstructed mission San Xaviér del Bac exceeded its former glory and became known as “The White Dover of the Desert”.38

In the meantime, the Viceroy had ordered the occupation of
upper California in order to keep out the Russians. Three expeditions set out from New Spain; two overland and one by sea. The overall military-political commander of the venture was Captain Gaspár de Portolá. The Franciscan in charge of the religious contingent was Fray Junípero Serra. They went by sea, touching first at San Diego Bay and then at Monterrey and San Francisco bays. They returned to San Diego where in that same year of 1769, they founded a mission by the same name.

Captain Fernando de Rivera y Moncada was in charge of the overland expedition. He was accompanied by Fray Juan Crespi. Both expeditions met at San Diego on July 1, 1769. The Spaniards suffered many hardships caused by illness and unforeseen difficulties with the terrain. They did manage, nonetheless, to explore the California coastline and began to select future mission sites. Prior to returning to New Spain, Portolá officiated at the founding of a mission and presidio on June 3, 1770, at Monterrey. Having accomplished this he returned to Mexico City for assignment elsewhere.

Within three years Fr. Serra had founded four more missions: San Gabriel, San Luis Obispo, San Antonio, and San Carlos. All was not well, however. The Indians of California were very different from those of Texas and New Mexico. The techniques proven successful elsewhere did not succeed in California. Gifting the Indians with food, clothing, and trinkets did not work. The Franciscans surmised that the Indians were too primitive to even comprehend the most elementary instruction in the Mysteries of the Faith. Five years after the founding of the first mission at San Diego, the Franciscans had managed to baptise a grand total of four hundred and ninety-one Indian children in the whole of upper California.

The dismal situation was abated somewhat by a proposal submitted by Captain Juan Bautista de Anza from Arizona. He proposed an overland route to California to tie his region, Sonora and California. The proposal was quickly seconded by Fr. Serra and the Viceroy approved the plan. De Anza set off from the Presidio de Tubác on January 8, 1774, and arrived at San Gabriel on March twenty-second. He sent a highly favorable report to Viceroy Antonio María Bucareli y Ursua and returned to Arizona on May third. He reached Tubác on May twenty-sixth. Later that year he reported in person to the Viceroy, who then promoted him to Lieutenant Colonel.

De Anza then learned that the Viceroy had already dis-
patched several maritime expeditions to survey the California coastline and pay particular attention to San Francisco Bay. The expeditions had set sail in 1773, knowing that the site or sites they chose would soon be occupied by civilian settlements. The newly appointed Governor of California, Don Fernando de Rivera y Moncada, was already making preparations to establish the Spanish colony. Not wishing to be left out, de Anza asked and received permission to establish a mission and *presidio* at San Francisco Bay.

Juan Bautista de Anza's second overland trip to California from Arizona began in October of 1775. Once again he was accompanied by Fr. Garcés and two other missionaries. This time, however, they took along two hundred and forty people and the same number of mules plus 450 horses. The two leaders also took great pains to see that all the necessary provisions and supplies were included. They took all they could carry, from extra clothing and gifts for everyone, to six yards of ribbon and four pair of stocking for each woman. The expedition reached San Gabriel on January 3, 1776. They continued north along the Camino Real de California and reached Monterey on March tenth. Here they were joined by the Governor, who then accompanied them to San Francisco Bay. Having established the mission and *presidio*, de Anza then left on a trip of Mexico City. The mission's chapel was not dedicated until July 28th, when Fray Francisco Palou conducted the first mass at San Francisco.  

The formal dedication of the mission at San Francisco Bay during the historic month of July, 1776, coincided with other historic events in the British American colonies, which were about to overthrow their British masters. For the Spanish American colonies, however, the founding of the mission signalled the beginning of the halcyon years across the face of North America.

**THE HALCYON YEARS: LIFE UNDER SPANISH RULE**

In the British colonies of North America, the native Indian was always seen as a foreigner and never as a citizen of the empire. The Indian was dealt with through a number of territorial, commercial, or political treaties which, as a rule, were not worth the paper they were written upon. There was no effort to convert or assimilate the Indian to British American society. On the contrary, a marriage or union between a white man and an Indian maiden resulted in the man losing his status and becoming known as a “squaw man” - a social dropout and renegade. “Squaw women” were unheard of even though they did exist. Children of Indian-European unions were commonly called
"half-breeds" and considered an extremely low caste. In general, the British colonists gave birth to the idea that "the only good Indian was a dead Indian."

In the Spanish colonies, meanwhile, the only good Indian was a Spanish-speaking, Roman Catholic, tax-paying citizen of the Empire. It was not, however, a decision made overnight. The Indians of the Carribean were for all practical purposes exterminated by disease, gunpowder, or labor before the voice of Fray Bartolomé de las Casas and others could be heard. It is true that at the beginning the Spaniards practiced out-right slavery of the Indians. This was later changed to economic slavery through the encomienda which eventually gave way to the patrón system. However, both the encomienda and the patrón systems where identical to pre-Columbian social vistations by the Indians. Moreover, the Indians could free themselves once they were fully converted. They were then assimilated into the Spanish-American society which in the long run was to give the world the first duly elected Indian president of an American country. That, however, was in the far distant future.

There is no doubt that the apparition of Our Lady of Guadalupe at Tepeyac in México Tenochtitlán cemented the Spanish policy of considering the Indian to be a human being and citizen of the empire. This being so, the Spaniards could freely intermarry with the Indians and both their mates as well as their children were readily assimilated into the growing mestizaje of the colonies. This is not to say that there were no social castes in the Spanish colonies because there were twenty-eight of them to be exact. That too would eventually be resolved. The fact remains that as long as the Spaniards considered the Indian a human being capable of being converted and assimilated, he stood a better chance of surviving. And survive he did. In New Spain, later to be known as Mexico, some Indians managed to retain their language as well as a semblence of the native culture but heavily influenced by the Spanish language and culture. On the northern frontier, from Spanish Florida to California, the native Indian was totally assimilated. The only exceptions were those Indians who entered the missions at the very end. Those who waited even longer and came under the jurisdiction of the United States eventually wound up in Indian Reservations.

Centuries later, those not familiar with the evangelization program of the Spanish Government and the Catholic Church would erroneously conclude that the missions had been a fail-
ure. After all, they reasoned, the Indians were exterminated, or lived in reservations. Little did they know or realize that the reason the mission Indians could no longer be identified was because they had been assimilated into the Mexican and Mexican American communities. Moreover, the Indians in the reservations were those who had rejected the Spanish evangelization effort and had come under U.S. Government control.

The Spanish evangelization program was not without its faults. It was based on stripping the Indian of his language and culture and replacing it with the Spanish language and mestizo culture of the New World. There were, and are, some who would argue that this was a high price to pay for survival. The alternative, of course, was extermination by the Colt or Winchester, deprivation of land, water, and food by the iron horse and barb wire, and socio-economic segregation in the Reservations.

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of the evangelization program was the fact that there was no actual blueprint on how to administer a mission. From Spanish Florida to Upper California, the missionary on the spot practically made up his own program under a somewhat vague and general directive. The New Laws of the Indies, the Laws of the Indies, and the Reales Cédulas all cited the need to convert and assimilate the Indians, but none of them actually spelled out the method and manner. The missions, however, seemed to operate on the following techniques (not listed in order of importance):

1) Language - The suppression of the native Indian language and dialects and the substitution of the Spanish language. Time and again the missionaries authored bilingual manuals for the administration of the Holy Sacraments in Spanish and the local Indian language. One such manual of great fame was that authored by Fray Bartholomé García of Mission San Francisco de la Espada along the San Antonio River in Texas. The Manual was published in Mexico City in 1769, in Spanish, and Coahuiltecán. It was, however, predated by another manual authored by Fray Gabriel Vergara of Mission Purísima Concepción de Acuña also along the San Antonio River. This Manual was actually a Confesionario which had been authored circa 1732, and was itself predated by the cuadernillo de la lengua de los indios pajalates by the same Franciscan de la lengua Coahuiltecán Indians. There were other Manuales, Confesionarios, cuadernillos, and instrucciones published elsewhere by the missionaries on the frontier.

2) Religion - Language and the Roman Catholic dogma was taught simultaneously. They went hand in hand and could not be
taught separately. Texas, New Mexico, Pimería Alta (Guadalajara, Mexico and Durango) and thus expounded what would later be called Mexican Catholicism. Florida, on the other hand, came under the Diocese of Santiago de Cuba and featured a greater variety of missionaries (Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians). Florida thus was closer to Spanish Roman Catholicism.

3) Spanish Law and Authority - The Indians was expected to recognize the authority of Spain and her laws as reflected by her representatives on the frontier. This relationship encompassed an intricate system of checks and balances beginning with the relationship between the King and Pope as reflected in the Royal Patronage, and the judicial appelant system. From the Indians’ point of view, it was a simple code of do’s and no not’s.

4) Sedentary existence - The Indians were congregated in missions and pueblos which eventually became villas and ciudades, as both the Church and Government joined forces to quell the neophytes’ nomadic existence. By law, the former Indian dwellings were to be razed and the neophytes were to be moved to Spanish settlements to be the missions, haciendas or pueblos. In those cases where the Indians already lived in pueblos, the Spaniards then established a congregación or visita in their midst. A presidio was usually established near by for the protection of the missionaries.

5) Adoption of the Spanish Political System - Adoption of the Spanish law and sedentary existence could only be effective if the Indians also accepted the Spanish political system. As soon as an Indian tribe (or collection of clans or families) had acclimated themselves to the mission, pueblo, congregación, or visita, they were ordered to elect their own city council. The local chief, commonly called the Indian “governador” (ruler), was usually appointed the alcalde (mayor) until the neophytes could elect their own. The Indian city council at a mission, congregación, or visita was directly subservient to the local missionary in charge. The idea behind the system was to teach the Indians self-government and self-administration of (Spanish) justice. As a rule, only the well and long established mission Indians were known to operate their own city council. It should be noted that even though a Spanish tribunal could try an Indian, an Indian could not try a Spaniard.

6) Instruction in the Fine Arts - The missionaries seemed to have taken great pains to teach the Indians as much as they could of Spanish-Mexican fine arts. Music instruction was extremely
popular. Fray Juan Agustín Morfi in visiting and describing Mis-
sion San José y San Miguel de Aguayo in Texas reported that the
mission Indians could dance, sing, and play musical instruments
and Spanish music just as well as any Spaniard. Art painting and
sculpture was also extremely successful. This is still reflected in
the Santos of New Mexico and the numerous frescoes and sculpt-
tured facades of the missions on the frontier. Drama was
nothing more than the preservation of the religious dramatic
productions dating to the Middle Ages. Los Pastores, Las Posadas
and Las Iluminadas were reenactments of biblical scenes and
events used not only for entertainment but for instruct as well.

7) Labor - There were four types of labor introduced among
the Indians and all were confusing; some more than others.

a) Communal - The communal labor system was similar to
what the Indians already practiced in their own pueblos and
rancherías. Everybody worked for the benefit of the community.
In the missions, however, the missionaries believed in overproduc-
tion as well as continuous work.

b) Wage System - To work for another man for wages was a
confusing concept to the Indians. Fortunately, only the fully
converted and semi-assimilated Indians were hired out by the
missionaries to surrounding farmers and ranchers. These early
vaqueros and campesinos usually never saw their wages, for they
were automatically paid to the missionaries. Although this system
was generally unknown on the frontier, it did exist in north
central New Spain where it usually led the Indian into getting in
debt with the "company store".

c) Forced Labor - The encomienda system of forced labor in
as far as the northern frontier is concerned existed only in New
Mexico. It was a feudal system in which a section of land and
everything upon it (including the Indians) were granted to a
Spaniard by the Crown. It was the beginning of the peonage and
patrón system. The land owner oversaw the protection of the
Indians and attended to their religious, educational, and physical
maintenance. Technically, the Indians were to work nine months
of the year for the landowner and three months for themselves.
The landowner would reap the benefits of their labor without
residing on the land. He received the profit from the sale of
crops, cattle or Indian tribute in the form of blankets, shawls, or
similar products. The economic success or failure of the New
Mexico encomiendas is not known.

d) Slavery - Even though the Spanish Government outlawed
Indian slavery early in the sixteenth century, there was still a number of ways in which slaves could be acquired. The most common practice was in the enslavement of indios de guerra. Rebellious, marauding, warring Indians, as well as those who refused to accept the dominance and authority of the Spanish Crown were considered indios de guerra, enemies of the state. They could be enslaved for life. In 1599, 75 men and 500 women and children were arrested by Capt. Vicente Zaldivar in New Mexico for rebelling and killing his brother. The “older” men drew a term of 25 years of service to the Spaniard and had one foot cut off. The “younger” men were sentenced to 25 years of servitude. The women and children were likewise assigned to a Spaniard as personal servants. A similar incident never occurred in Texas. Here the indios de guerra were simply shipped off to Yucatán or the Carribean.

8) Spanish Social Customs - As previously mentioned elsewhere, the Indians were taught to be monogomous, wear trousers, shirts, skirts and blouses, not paint or tattoo their bodies, not practice the rite of the mitote, and not drink alcoholic spirits or smoke marijuana or eat peyote. It should be noted that the Spaniards themselves did not always practice what they preached.

Punishment for breaking or not observing any of the fore-listed rules or regulations ranged from public flogging to slavery. A common punishment for misdemeanors at a mission was to have the Indian culprit kneel for a set number of hours in the open air with arms outstretched holding a rock in each hand as he recited a set number of prayers. As harsh as any of this might seem, it would be well to remember that the Indians were fortunate in falling outside the jurisdiction of the Holy Office of the Inquisition.

MISSIONARIES

If the period of the conquest brought out the worst in the character of the Spanish conquistador, then the period of evangelization brought out their very best. Each region of North America produced its own outstanding personalities. Many fell martyrs to their cause and beliefs; others lived on to become the guiding lights for others to follow. No one particular religious order had a monopoly on these men, but the Franciscan Order had the greatest number because they were the first and longest lasting missionaries on the North American frontier.

Franciscan missionaries Frays Juan Suárez and Juan Palos paved
the road to La Gran Pascua Florida. Fray Suárez had been one of the original twelve Franciscans who had come to North America in 1524. Three years later Fray Suárez joined the expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez to conquer and pacify Florida. He enlisted Fray Juan Palos and joined the 600 colonists. Fray Agustín de Vetancurt in his Cronica de la Provincia del Santo Evangélio de México published in 1697, quoted historian Antonio de Herrera as saying that Fray Suárez had been appointed Bishop of the Diocese of the Río de las Palmas (now Río Grande) and had entered Florida in that capacity. Both Fray Vetancurt and Fray Geronimo de Mendieta (in his Historia Ecclesiastica Indiana) say that both Friars Suárez and Palos died of hunger. Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, unfortunately, did not comment on this report.42

Dominican Fray Luis Cancer, a companion of the incomparable Fray Bartholomé de las Casas in Guatemala, also gave his life in Florida. Both had gone to New Spain in 1546, where Fray Cancer asked permission to lead the spiritual conquest of Florida. He sailed three years later in the most idealistic but best intended expedition ever launched in Florida. Fray Luis Cancer was killed by the Indians as he attempted to establish communications.43

Florida-born Jesuit missionary and historian Fr. Francisco de Florencia (1620 - 1695), stands as the first American-bred religious light. He attended and graduated from the College of the San Ildefonso in Mexico City and entered the Jesuit Order in 1643. He was a distinguished orator, theologian, and historian. In 1668 he served as Jesuit procurador before the Holy See at the Vatican. He later lived the rest of his life at Sevilla as the procurador for the New World. He authored a number of works. His major works are:

Menólogo de los varones más señalados en perfección religiosa de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús de Nueva España, 1661

Historia de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús, 1694

Historia de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de México, 1688

Zodiaco Mariáno - las imágenes...que se veneran en esta américa septentrional,

Origen de los Santuarios de la Nueva Galicia, 1694.”44

The kingdom, colony, commissary of El Nuevo México de la Santa Fe de San Francisco also had its luminaries. Franciscan missionary Fray Juan Padilla led the religious contingent which accompanied Francisco Vásquez de Coronado in his search for
Cibola and Quivira in 1540. He had previously been working in Michoacán and Jalisco and had served as the first guardian of the convent of Tulancingo. He joined the expedition of Vásquez de Coronado but refused to leave New Mexico when the conquistadores retreated to New Spain. Shortly thereafter he was killed by the Indians.45

New Mexico gave the North American frontier the greatest number of martyrs. The two foremost were Fray Juan Padilla (just mentioned) and Frau Agustín Rodríguez. It was Fray Rodríguez who re-opened New Mexico forty years after Vásquez de Coronado. In 1581, he set out for the land of the Tiguex accompanied by two missionaries and 12 soldiers. Fray Agustín Rodríguez officially christened El Nuevo México de la Santa Fe de San Francisco and was later killed by the Indians as soon as the soldiers left. This led to various expeditions and the eventual occupation of the province.46

No survey of the personalities of New Mexico would be complete without the name of the missionary who practically saved the colony when it was threatened by abandonment. He was Franciscan Fray Alonso de Benavides. In 1625 he went to New Mexico as the Custodian of the province as its Commissary for the Holy Office of the Inquisition. He served for four years and was in Mexico City in 1629, and went to Spain the following year. His glowing reports and works on the colony of New Mexico put an end to the government’s discontent with the province. He authored at least two major works: Memorial que Fray Juan de Benavides de la orden de San Francisco presenta a la majestad católica don Felipe Quarto (Madrid, 1630), and Tanto que se saco de una carta que el padre Alonso de Benavides, custodio que fué del Nuevo México envio a los religiosos de la Santa Custodia de San Pablo (México, 1631).47

The Province of the Tejas Indians, also known as the Kingdom of Las Nuevas Filipinas, has less martyrs and more authors than the other frontier areas of North America. The glowing letters of Franciscan Fray Damián Massanét, who accompanied Captain General Alonso de León in the 1680’s, opened the evangelization and colonization period of Texas. Later, when the government decided to abandon the province, it was the politically shrewd letters of Fray Francisco de Hidalgo which led to the re-occupation of Texas in 1716. Once the province was firmly established, the other Franciscan authors took over.

The first, and most outstanding colonial Texas author, was
Fray Félix Isidro de Espinoza. He was born at Querétaro, Mexico on November 26, 1679. He entered the Franciscan College for the Propagation of the Faith at Santa Cruz de Querétaro in 1696, and was ordained a year later. By 1709, he was stationed at Mission San Juan Bautista del Río Grande at the gateway of Texas. In April of that year he entered Texas and in the course of the expedition re-named the Río San Antonio de Padua and christened the San Pedro Creek. He commented that it was suitable for a settlement as well as a mission. In 1715, he was elected president of the Franciscan missions in Texas and entered the province the following year and established three missions among the Tejas Indians. Two years later he met Governor Martín de Alarcón along the banks of the San Antonio River, where they founded Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Presidio de San Antonio, and the villa de Bexar. Late in 1721, he was recalled to Querétaro where he was elected the guardian of the college. In 1731, he went to Mexico City where he founded the Hospicio de San Fernando, which was soon raised to a college of which he was the first president. It was at this time that he authored the historic *Chrónica Apostólica y SerÁphica de todos los Colegios de Propaganda Fide* published in Mexico City in 1746.48

Meanwhile, in San Antonio, Fray Gabriel de Vergara was busily developing his linguistic studies of the language of the Coahuiltecan Indians. In 1732, he authored a yet unpublished *Confesionario de Indios en Lengua Coahuilteca*. The bilingual confessional was obviously based on his coahuiltecan dialect studies called *El Cuađernillo de la Lengua de los Indios Pajalates*. The notebook of Spanish-Coahuiltecan terms was not published until 233 years later (Monterrey, 1965).49

Father Vergara was not the only primitive linguist in Texas. One of his contemporaries was destined to become better known. He was Fray Bartholomé García of Mission San Francisco de la Espada, also along the Río San Antonio de Padua. His *Manual Para la Administración de los Santos Sacramentos* was published in Mexico City in 1760. Besides its religious, historical, and linguistic value, it also gives an insight into the lifestyles and customs of the Indians of Texas.50

The second history book authored about Texas, its missions and its Indians, was that of Fray Juan Domingo de Arricivita. In 1792, he published his *Crónica SerÁfica y Apostólica del Colegio de Propaganda Fide de la Santa Cruz de Querétaro*. He identified himself in the title page as *predicador apostólico, ex-prefecto, y*
comisario habitual de las misiones and Escritor Titular del Seminario.51

Perhaps the best known of the Franciscan missionaries in Texas was a man who was not an author. He was Fray Antonio Márgil de Jesus. Fr. Márgil was born in Valencia, Spain in 1657, and entered the Franciscan Order in 1673. He came to New Spain ten years later and was sent to the College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro. Alone and on foot he then set out to labor in Yucatán, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. In 1706, he was named the first guardian of the College of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas. Ten years later he entered Texas as the president of its Zacatecan missions and founded three missions. In 1720, he founded Mission San José y San Miguel de Aguayo along the banks of the San Antonio River. He returned to Zacatecas two years later. He then went on to Mexico City, where he died in 1726. The life and deeds of Fray Antonio Márgil de Jesus where known far beyond the Dioceses of Mexico, Guatemala, and Guadalajara in which he labored. It was not surprising therefore, for Pope Clement XIV to assign a commission to investigate the life of Fray Márgil. Neither was it surprising for the missionary orders of Franciscans, Augustinians, Dominicans, Carmelites, Mercedarians, and Bethlehemites to ask for the beatification and canonization of Márgil in 1790. The Venerable Fray Antonio Márgil de Jesus was beatified in 1836, and an effort has been made ever since to canonize him.52

The district of Pimería Alta, better known as Arizona, had a number of illustrious men but none could eclipse the star of Jesuit Fray Eusebio Francisco Kino. He entered the Jesuit Order in 1665, and soon became known as an outstanding mathematician, cosmographer, and amateur astronomer. In 1681 he came to New Spain and soon gained permission to labor in Pimería Alta and (Lower) California. As reported earlier in this chapter, his contributions in Sonora, Arizona, and California went far beyond the missions which he founded. He was the first to verify that California was a peninsula and not an island. He also authored bilingual handbooks and vocabulary lists for the Guayacura, Cochimi, and Nebe Indians. It should be noted that upon his arrival, at Mexico City in 1681, he had published a booklet entitled Exposición Astronómica de la Cometa. Fr. Kino’s historical letters, reports, and memoirs were not published until 1913, as Misiones de Sonora y Arizona, and in English in 1919, as Kino’s Historical Memoirs of Pimería Alta.53

Second only to Kino in Pimería Alta was Jesuit Fr. Juan
Nentwig. Born in Germany in 1713, he entered the Jesuit order at age twenty. Ten years later he was assigned to New Spain, where he officiated as a university professor. He began his missionary work in Pimería Alta in 1749, and was almost killed during the Pima uprising two years later. Laboring all over Pimería Alta afforded him the opportunity to gain great insights into the life and customs of the Indians. In 1762, he published the historical Descripción Geográfica, Natural, y Curiosa de la Provincia de Sonora. Fray Juan Nentwig died in Nayarit in 1768.54

Like Arizona, Upper California had two outstanding missionaries; friars Junípero Serra and Francisco Palou. Serra was born in Mallorca, Spain in 1713, and joined the Franciscan Order in 1730. He came to New Spain in 1749, and labored as a missionary in the dioceses of Mexico, Guadalajara, Puebla, Oaxaca, and Valladolid. In 1767, he was assigned to Upper California where he succeeded in establishing its missions. They were: San Diego, 1769; San Carlos de Monterrey, 1770; San Antonio de Padua and San Gabriel, 1771; San Luis Obispo, 1772; San Francisco de Asis and San Juan Capistrano, 1776; Santa Clara, 1777; and San Buenaventura, 1782. He died in 1784.55

Fray Francisco Palou was also born in Mallorca, in 1732. He was a childhood friend of Juan Crespi who also became a Franciscan missionary and also labored in California together with their friend and companion Junípero Serra, their teacher and guiding light. Fr. Palo came to New Spain in 1749, and quickly joined Serra and Crespi missionizing in Querétaro. In 1758, all three missionaries were about to enter Texas to re-establish the Mission of San Saba but were stopped at the last minute. Fray Serra then went to the College of San Fernando in Mexico City. Fray Palou became the president of the missions in Querétaro. In 1767, Serra, Palou, and Crespi were re-united as they set out to Upper California. It was in this capacity that Serra delivered unto Palou Mission San Francisco de Asis which they co-founded. Following the death of Serra in 1784, Palou went to Mexico City, where he was elected guardian of the College of San Fernando. Three years later, in 1787, Fray Francisco Palou published his Historia de la Vida y Apostólicas tareas del venerable padre fray Junípero Serra y de las misiones que fundó en la California Septentrional y nuevos establecimientos de Monterey. He also authored but never published a history of the Californias entitled Noticias de la Antigua y Nueva California. Fray Francisco Palou died in 1790 while visiting the Franciscan College for the Propagation of the Faith of Santa Cruz de Querétaro.56
As previously stated, there were many illustrious and outstanding men on the northern Spanish frontier of North America. Yet, the handful listed above out-shined them all by leaving not only their trail, but their stamp as well upon the land. Wearing robes of brown, black, or grey, they labored, lived, and died (sometimes violently), in the wilderness which was La Gran Pascua Florida, Amichel-Tejas-Las Nuevas Filipinas, Cibola-Quivira-El Nuevo México de la Santa Fe, Pimería Alta-Arizona, and California.

ADDENDUM
A BRIEF NOTE ON THE SHORT-LIVED SPANISH PROVINCE OF LOUISIANA

The territory abutting the banks of the Mississippi River which was claimed for France in 1682, by La Salle, had until that time been considered as part of La Gran Pascua Florida. Spain, however, had failed to occupy that stretch of land west of Pénzacola and east of the Pánuco River. Even after the death of La Salle and the establishment of the missions in Texas, the boundary did not extend beyond the Red River. Consequently, the Mississippi River Basin, and specifically the land between the Red and Mississippi rivers, was considered a sort of no-man’s land.

On the weight of La Salle’s claim, the French in New France then laid claim to the Mississippi River Basin and set out from Quebec to occupy the area. The evangelization permit was issued to the Jesuits on July 14, 1698, to enter the lower (southern) regions of New France. The religious expedition was headed by Fr. Francis Jolliet de Montigny, and was accompanied by Fr. Antony Davion and Fr. John Francis Busson de St. Cosme. On December 5, 1698, they entered the Mississippi River and sailed south as far as the Natchez Indian territory.

In March of 1700, when Lamoine d’Iberville sailed down the Mississippi River to its mouth on the Gulf of Mexico, he encountered the missionaries, who happily reported having baptized 85 children. D’Iberville then continued down the river until he reached a spot where he founded a garrison at Biloxi, the first French settlement in the lower Mississippi Basin. Other Jesuits then descended the river from New France and began to minister to the Indians along the river banks. A number of them were killed by the Indians, who did not seem quite ready to embrace the faith.

On July 20, 1703, the outpost of Mobile was declared a parish
by the Bishop of New France, and it was assigned to the Seminary of the Foreign Missions of Paris and Quebec. The first entry in the baptismal records of Mobile, dated September 6, 1704, was that of an Apalache Indian maiden. The little parish was obviously attending to the instruction of the surrounding Indians. Other Frenchmen, however, were not as fortunate. In 1713, they had established an outpost on the Red River called Natchitoches. The soldiers and traders there were unable to get any of their own priests to come to their post. Much to the surprise of the Spanish missionaries in East Texas, the French asked them to conduct services! Although shocked by the request, the Spaniards consented and made the trip from San Miguel de los Adaes to Natchitoches. The arrangement came to an end with the declaration of war between France and Spain in 1716.

On October 6, 1717, the Bishop of New France appointed Fr. Dominic Mary Vallier the Vicar-General of the Mississippi River territory. The Vicar, however, did not spend more than a year in Louisiana. Fr. John Matthew then became Vicar-Apostolic of the territory. In 1718, d'Ilberville founded New Orleans and outlined the necessary blocks emanating from the sites of the future church, city hall, and military headquarters. In January of 1722 when Fr. Charlevoix arrived at New Orleans there were about a hundred temporary houses but no church or chapel. He quickly built one, but the hurricane of September 12 destroyed it. Another church was then started and completed some two or three years later.

Also in 1722, the Carmelite Fathers were given permission to labor west of the Mississippi River and north to the Ohio. Three years later, the Capuchins were given charge of New Orleans. It had 600 families. Mobile had 60 French families and 30 Indian families. In the missions themselves, there were six at Balize, 200 at Les Allemands, 100 at Point Coupee, six at Natchez, 50 at Natchitoches, and an unreported number at the other three missions. The Indians at Natchez, however, started an uprising in 1729, which soon spread up and down the Mississippi River, causing the death of a number of missionaries.

Although peace was finally restored, the evangelization of the Indians of Louisiana would never develop like that of the Spanish colonies. Dr. Gilmary Shea in his *History of the Catholic Church in Colonial Days* was the first historian to face the problem of writing about the Church in Louisiana. He stated, “Of the state of religion in the French settlements of Louisiana for some years, there are in fact no documents.”

It is with this passage
that the section on Louisiana must close, for in 1763 France lost New France and Louisiana as a consequence of the war with England. France, however, managed to transfer the trans-Mississippi territory to Spain.

Louisiana did not remain Spanish for long. In 1800, Napoleon Bonaparte regained title of the territory for France. Three years later he sold it to the United States. In the meantime, the Spanish language Church of Louisiana was lost in the political intrigues of the period.
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THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH ON THE FRONTIER

Ricardo Santos

The organization of the Church in the New World, including the far reaches of the Spanish North American frontier, was established along administrative lines formulated in Spain and executed in agreement with the Viceregal government. Decisions and directives were formulated by the Crown and ecclesiastic hierarchal policy makers to meet the expressed needs of the colonies and/or specific geographic areas.

Although on paper there existed a type of blueprint for the organization and administration of the Church in the New World, more frequently than not, those decisions served only as a vague guideline allowing the specific cleric in charge of the Church in any particular area to make whatever adjustments were deemed necessary. This was especially important on the North American frontier where the native Indian cultures were less progressive than those of Meso America. There was also so much variation in the type of quality of Indian cultures that the missionaries were forced to adapt their guidelines and techniques to serve a multitude of various cultures, languages, and dialects. Unlike Meso America, the Spanish North American frontier Indian cultures did not afford the missionaries a unified society based on a solid, social, political, military, or religious system.

Geography presented another problem not generally appreciated by decision makers living in the comforts of Rome or Madrid. The topography of Spanish North American stretching from La Gran Pascua Florida on the Atlantic seaboard to Las Californias on the Pacific Coast offered as much variation as the Indian cultures which lived upon the land.

The Church, did, nonetheless, attempt to bring order to the natural divisiveness of the Spanish North American frontier. This was accomplished through the establishment of dioceses and provincial territories for the religious orders. The missionary provincial territories always preceded the establishment of dioceses and archdioceses. Thus, from the diocese of Hispaniola at Santa Domingo de Guzmán the missionaries would first venture forth towards the North American mainland via Hernán Cortés’ kingdom of New Spain and thence towards the wilderness of the frontier.
LA PROVINCIA DE LA GRAN PASCUA FLORIDA

Politically and judicially, Florida was dependent on the Audiencia de Santo Domingo. Religiously, the province was a custodia of the Diocese of Havana de Cuba, which in turn was under the Archdiocese of Hispaniola located in the City of Santo Domingo de Guzmán. Theoretically, the geographic boundaries of the province extended from Chesapeake Bay on the Atlantic Seaboard on the north, and west to the Mississippi River. In reality, however, Spanish Florida consisted primarily of scattered settlements, fortresses and missions along the coast and apparently never beyond the first hundred miles from shore.

The native Indian cultures which occupied the land lived in settled farming communities. At the center of their villages was a public square and a council house. Their houses were built of bark, thatch, and lumber. The houses in the hotter and more humid southern regions usually did not have walls. The mountain and northern areas houses, meanwhile, had solid walls for protection against the weather. Likewise, clothing for the men in the hotter geographic areas was limited to a loin-cloth. Their women frequently wore only a cloth tied around the waist and falling above the knees.

The Creek Nation, of which the Seminoles of Florida were a tribe, had one religion, spoke one language, and followed on cultural pattern but had no central government. Instead, each tribe was governed by a mico, a chief. Moreover, each tribe was independent of the other Creek tribes. Periodically, the tribes would band together to fight Indians not of the same nation. Their chieftains were selected not for their bravery and performance in warfare, but rather for their wisdom and ability. The tribes often had sub-alternate "war-chiefs" whose duty it was to lead the tribe in warfare but not to govern.

The Creeks were a matriarchal society in which the people were identified through their mother’s lineage. The young men frequently married women from neighboring tribes and went to live with their in-laws. This helped preserve the bonds between the tribes. As in many other Indian cultures, however, the young husband was not allowed to communicate with his mother-in-law. They could send each other gifts, but they were not allowed to see or speak to each other.

The Indian tribes and nations of La Gran Pascua Florida later came to be known as Southeastern United States Indians. In general, these Indian cultures practiced warfare for the sheer
pleasure and risk involved. Since the Spaniards had forbidden the introduction of guns, muskets and cannon, into Florida, the Indians continued to rely on the spear, tomahawk, and bow and arrow as their favorite weapons. In reality, the former two weapons were more popular, for they demanded close hand-to-hand combat. The Indians reportedly felt there was little honor in shooting arrows from a safe distance.

The Southeastern Indians’ favorite game was lacrosse, for which they prepared with fasting and prayer. It was, and remains, a game for the hearty and not the weak at heart. Other games fell under a general category called “Little Brother of War.” As with lacrosse, these games also began with prayer and fasting.³

By 1602, Spanish Governor Mendez de Canzo estimated the Christian Indian population at approximately twelve hundred souls. The Governor reported to the King that the Province of Florida, as well as its evangelization program, were in a state of neglect. The Franciscans, seeking to remedy the situation, recommended the creation of a custodia to be composed of their eleven convents in Florida, Cuba, and Bayamo. The custodia was approved in November of 1609, and confirmed by the King on June 5, 1610. Four years earlier, while the paperwork was being prepared in Spain, the Franciscans had actually entered new territory in Florida to attend to the conversion of the Indians. By 1606, they had already reportedly baptized over a thousand Indians. That same year, Florida was honored with a visit by Bishop Juan Cabezas de Altamirano, who was destined to become the first Catholic bishop within the latter boundaries of the United States. On March 25, 1606, he became the first bishop to administer the sacrament of confirmation in Florida (and subsequent United States). The bishop then visited several Indian provinces before returning to Cuba.

Fray Antonio Vásquez de Espinosa, who reportedly authored his Description of the Indies in about 1620, described the Province of Florida in great detail. He identified the Indian “provinces,” citing them by their native names and identified the number of townships, their inhabitants, number of houses, and special features such as mineral and vegetable products. The friar also noted that for some two hundred leagues inland the heathen Indians had already constructed churches and were waiting for the missionaries to convert them. Quoting the Gospel, he lamented that “The harvest truly is great but the laborers are few.”

A chronological contradiction appeared in the writings of
Fray Vázquez de Espinosa. On the one hand he cited the existence of the British settlement of Virginia which has been established in 1608. On the other hand, he cited the failure of the Bishop of Cuba to visit Florida to confirm the newly converted. Unknown to the historian, Bishop Juan Cabezas de Altamirano had visited Florida in 1606. 4

The Custodia of Florida was raised to a religious Province and named Santa Elena in 1612. Little was done in the next decade to improve the condition of the Province. In December of 1630, the Spanish King ordered money be drawn from Cuba and New Spain for the purchase of clothing and supplies for Florida. Shortly thereafter, twelve additional missionaries were dispatched to the Province. By 1634, the Franciscans in Florida numbered thirty-four. They were operating forty-four doctrinas and administering to approximately thirty thousand Indians. 5

The lack of economic resources, the great number of Indians wishing to be converted, a sizeable number of Spaniards without a parish priest, and the inability of the Bishop of Cuba to visit Florida with any regularity posed a serious administrative threat to the Religious Province of Santa Elena in Florida. Understandably in 1655, the Governor of Florida, Don Diego de Rebolledo, petitioned the Spanish King to consider establishing an Apostolic See at San Agustín. The alternative, according to the Governor, was to raise Florida to a Vicariate Apostolic. The Council of the Indies and the King sought the advice of the Bishop of Cuba, the Archbishop of Santo Domingo, the Governor of Havana, and others, but nothing ever came of the request. 6

Almost twenty years later, Don Gabriel Díaz Vara Calderón, the newly appointed Bishop of Cuba, visited Florida. He arrived at San Agustín on August 23, 1674 and immediately went to work. He conferred minor orders on seven young men and then proceeded to visit the parish churches, doctrinas and missions of Florida. He ordered all Spaniards having Indian employees to send them to him to be examined in regard to their knowledge of Christian doctrine. He found the Indians so wanting in their knowledge that on October 7 he promulgated an edict requiring under pain of excommunication for catechism classes to be held for the Indians every Sunday and holiday. Employers of Indians failing to do so were to be excommunicated and fined twenty ducats. The employers were also forbidden to work their Indians on Sundays and holidays.

The Bishop then proceeded to spend eight months traveling
throughout Florida. He visited all the missions and churches, established new ones, talked with the Indian chiefs, and even went as close as possible to the British Colony of Carolina. During this time he reported having confirmed 13,152 people. Bishop Díaz Vara Calderón in attempting to correct abuses and restore order managed to alienate some people, for there was a reported attempt on his life through poison. Unharmed and undaunted, the Bishop continued on his task before returning to Cuba.7

A diocesan synod held in Havana, Cuba in 1684 enforced the decrees of the Council of Santo Domingo which had been held in 1622, and which, for unknown reasons, had never been generally enforced. The synod also passed a number of Constitutions which had a strong effect on the administration of the Church of Florida.

The Indians' game of lacrosse “as connected with superstitious usage” was forbidden. Also prohibited were “improper dances and amusements” which probably referred to the Indian ritual commonly called the mitote by the Spaniards. Married Indian men were not to stay in San Agustín away from their wives and families, and the vicars were encharged with seeing that the men returned to their villages. Indians employed in or about San Agustín were to have the opportunity to hear Mass every Sunday and holiday and were also to be sent to the Franciscan Convent to receive instruction in Christian doctrine.

Converted Indians were to receive communion every Easter and on other convenient holidays and were to be given certificates of proof for having done so. Administratively, the Franciscan missionaries were restricted to administering to the religious needs of the Indians and not the Spanish settlers. The missionaries were also instructed to keep accurate records of baptisms, marriages, and funeralsof Indians and to make sure that the neophytes were not subjected to abuses from the Spanish settlers.8

On April 25, 1693, a Spanish expedition headed by Don Andrés de Pes, and accompanied by the already reknowned scientist and mathematician, Fray Don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora of the University of Mexico, founded the Presidio and township of Pensacola. Notwithstanding the new efforts at the pacification and occupation of Florida through the conversion of the Indians, the neophytes began to rebel more frequently and viciously than before.

The rebelling Apalachicola Indians were joined and abetted
by the British Governor of Carolina to attack the Spanish settlements. On May 20, 1702, the Indians attacked and burned Santa Fé and the Spaniards gave pursuit. The Spanish commander was killed and the Europeans were defeated by the Indians. British Governor Moore then raised an army of his own and proceeded to invade Florida. The Spaniards had long decided to keep guns and muskets out of Florida, so they were practically unarmed and unable to repel the invasion. What few arms were found in Florida were located at the fortresses of San Agustín and Pensacola. By October of that year, San Agustín was under a two prong attack headed by Moore, and the Spaniards were forced to abandon the city and restrict themselves to the fortresses. Governor José de Zuniga held the fortress from the invading British colonists but lost the city, which was burned to the ground. The siege of San Agustín was raised fifty days later when a Spanish fleet came to the rescue of the Spaniards. Moore managed to escape overland to Carolina.

Governor Moore re-invaded Florida in January of 1704, and defeated a Spanish force near Aybale in the land of the Apalache Indians. The Spanish prisoners, including Fathers Juan de Parga, Angel Miranda, and Brother Marcos Delgado were tortured through mutilation before being beheaded and burned at the stake. Father Manuel de Mendoza was also killed when he answered to the call of an Indian, who shot him through the head. The leader of the Spanish force resisting the invasion, Lieutenant Juan Ruiz, was also burned alive at the stake in company with Father Miranda. British Governor Moore of Carolina finally retreated, leaving behind hundreds of mutilated and burned bodies of Spaniards and Indian men and women. He also carried off a reported thousand Indian slaves for the British American colonists.

Years of hard work and devotion were destroyed by the British American invaders. The missions, chapels, and churches were in ruins. Thousands of converted Indians were enslaved in British Carolina. And the remaining Apalache tribes began to move westwardly away from the British, and subsequently, away from the Spanish settlements and Franciscan missions. The Spanish Government responded by appointing an auxiliary Bishop to reside in Florida. Don Dionicio Rezino was named Bishop of Adramitum and auxiliary to the Bishop of Cuba in 1709. By June 26, he was at San Agustín, where he conferred confirmation in the parish church. It is not known how long he stayed in Florida, but it is known that he died at La Havana, Cuba, on
September 12, 1711.9

The British American colonists and rebelling Indians were not the only ones giving Spanish Florida problems. The French North American colonists had quietly slipped down the Mississippi River from New France to the area they had christened Louisiana. Technically, Louisiana was within the boundaries of Florida as claimed by Spain. For a while, there was no problem, for the European countries were at peace with each other. In January of 1719, however, war was declared between France and Spain and the situation changed dramatically. On May 14, 1719, the French surprised and captured the fortress of Pensacola in Spanish Florida. A month later, the French attacked and captured the fortress of San Miguel de los Adaes in Spanish Texas. Pensacola, meanwhile, had been recaptured by the Spaniards and lost again to the French in September. Both Pensacola in Florida, and Spanish Texas west of the Red River, were returned to Spain. The French, however, managed to assert their claims to Louisiana.10

Among the re-arrangements done in Spanish Florida at this time was the appointment of Fray Francisco de Sanbuenaventura Martínez de Texada Diez de Velasco as Bishop of Tricali and auxiliary to the Bishop of Cuba. The newly appointed Bishop arrived in Florida in 1735, and spent ten years of officiating from San Agustín. During this period runaway slaves from the British colonies of Carolina and Georgia were being sanctioned in Spanish Florida. In 1740, Governor Oglethorpe of Georgia invaded Florida with an army of two thousand men and a naval force of five ships and two sloops. The British American colonists again laid siege to San Agustín and ravaged the province. The siege was finally raised with the return of the invaders to Georgia. They left behind only four Spanish missions with a total Indian population of 136 who had somehow not been killed, enslaved, or run off from their missions.

Florida and the Spanish Government had hardly gotten over the Oglethorpe invasion when a British fleet captured Havana, Cuba in 1762. The British commander forcibly arrested the Bishop of Cuba on November 4, and sailed to Charleston in the Colony of Carolina. The following month, the Bishop was sent to San Agustín, where the prelate took the opportunity of turning the occasion into a formal visitation.

Unknown to Bishop Pedro Agustín Morell de Santa Cruz, the Governor of Florida, missionaries, settlers, and converted and non-converted Indians, the Spanish government was about
to trade them all for the Island of Cuba. The Treaty of Paris signed February 10, 1763, ceded Florida to Great Britain in exchange for the Island of Cuba. Although the territorial exchange was temporary (as far as Florida was concerned), it did bring about the end of a Spanish evangelization project in what later would become part of the United States. The end had come for a dream which dated back to 1513 during the days of Juan Ponce de León.

LA PROVINCIA DE LOS TEJAS

The administration of the Church in the Province of the Tejas Indians was vastly different from that of La Gran Pascua Florida. Besides coming under different dioceses and missionary colleges, Texas also differed in the type of Indians who inhabited it. The eastern part of the Spanish Province began on the west bank of the Red River (present-day, Louisiana) and was inhabited by the Caddo and Natchez Nations with a great assortment of confederated tribes called Asinay or Hasinai.

In the north central part of Texas (lying north of San Antonio) extending into the then terra incognita later known as North Texas and the Panhandle, lived the Plains Indians composed primarily of the Apache, Comanche, and Kiowa Nations with a large assortment of tribes and clans.

In the south central part of Texas (south and southwest of San Antonio) and extending to the sections of Coahuila east of the Rio Grande as well as the section of Nuevo Santander (Tamaulipas) east of the Rio Grande, lived the Indians of Northeastern Mexico. They were generally known as the Coahuiltecan Nation with Tamaulipecos and Karankawas also inhabiting the area.

All in all, the three major Indian cultures of Texas made the evangelization effort a unique but chaotic situation. Whatever techniques worked with the Coahuiltecan, Karankawa, and Tamaulipecos, did not necessarily work with the Caddo and Natchez, and least of all with the Apache and Comanche. The missionaries had to adjust and modify their evangelization techniques for the respective Indian cultures.

The Caddo-Natchez Nations and the Hasinai Confederation of East Texas, being the original Tejas Indians, were culturally related to the Southeastern Woodland Indian Nations. Theirs was the lower Mississippi sub-areal tradition dating to about 1000 B.C.

The origin and date of arrival of the native Indian cultures to the area are unknown. Yet, the culture from its beginning
seemed to have been influenced mysteriously by Mesoamerican Indian cultures as reflected in pyramid mounds used as ceremonial centers and/or burial sites, pottery, and art. However, the language of the Indians was not related to any Mesoamerican linguistic stock. It is known that the Indian cultures reached their peak at about 1200 A.D. and that it was at this time that both population and territorial extension also reached their maximum. It was apparently at this time that the people began to divide themselves into the Nations and tribes which the Europeans, and particularly the Spaniards were to meet.

The Indians lived in townships, some with as many as 600 houses, and relied heavily on agriculture. The villages sometimes had moats and/or palisades for protection against warring tribes. Although they raised many types of crops, maize was the mainstay of both their economy and religion.

The Natchez Indian Nation was unique among its peers. It was ruled by a “king” considered a descendent of the sun. He was called “the Great Sun.” He was an all-powerful autocratic ruler who also served as high priest. In political matters, however, he was controlled by an advising council of elders. The Great Sun lived in the largest house of the largest township. His house, as well as the nearby temple, were both built on a natural or man-made elevations. The temple housed the eternal flame and the remains of previous Great Suns.

The Great Sun had the power to appoint two war chiefs as well as two masters of ceremonies for the rituals and public events. With the exception of his own children, all relatives of the Great Sun were called and considered “Little Suns.” His mother (if alive), or his sister (if the mother was dead) was the Woman Sun. She had the right to choose the succeeding Great Sun from among her children or brothers.

Caste-wise, directly below the royal Suns were the Nobles. Below the Nobles were the Honored Men and Women. This caste was attainable through distinction in warfare or by displaying great knowledge and wisdom. At the bottom of the social system were the common people. They were called “Stinkards”. Helping to balance the structure was the fact that Suns could only marry Stinkards. Children of male Suns were considered Nobles and they, in turn, could also only marry Stinkards. Children of male Nobles, meanwhile, were considered Honored Men and Women. They also could only marry Stinkards. Children of Honored Men were considered Stinkards.
Being a matriarchal society, children of Women Suns were considered Suns. Children of Women Nobles were considered Nobles. Children of Honored Women were considered Honored people. Children of Stinkard parents were absolute and unquestionable Stinkards.

The women’s power and influence in the Natchez’s social structure was overwhelming. Women Suns were allowed as many lovers as they chose but their lower-class husbands (they had to be Stinkards) were automatically and quickly subjected to death for infidelity. A Woman Sun could also discard her Stinkard husband whenever she pleased. The Stinkard husband of a Woman Sun, meanwhile, was expected to wait on his wife hand and foot. They were also required to praise their Woman Sun wife after every word she uttered. Failure to do so would result in a quick divorce (at best), or death.

Homosexuals and transvestites also existed in the Natchez society. They wore skirts, kept their hair styled like that of the women, and did not participate in warfare. They generally lived and acted like women with acceptance varying from tolerance to priestly recognition.¹²

A short distance to the west of the land of the Natchez was the Caddo Indian Nation which, by the time of the Spanish occupation of Texas in the late seventeenth century, seemed to have been fairly well restricted to that area west of the Mississippi River to within 100 miles west of the Sabine River. Like their relatives the Natchez, the Caddo were also an agrarian society. They cultivated corn, beans, melons, pumpkins and other edibles.

The individual Caddo tribes were governed by a “Gran Cado.” The position was hereditary. By 1830, scientist Jean Louis Berlandier reported some Caddo tribes elected their Gran Caddo, and that some tribes had begun to follow the buffalo for sustenance.

Religiously, the Caddo had a concept of a “Supreme Being” and were reportedly “not as superstitious” as their neighbors. Unlike their neighbors, the Caddo were monogamous and punished infidelity severely. They were also the only Indian Nation to give religious significance to marriage.¹³

Great insights into the life and customs of the Caddo Indians were recorded by Fray Felix Isidro de Espinoza in his *Chronicla Apóstolica*. For instance, the friar noted that the Caddo already had horses by the time the first evangelization expedition arrived
in 1690. Although historians from that date forth have guessed at how the Caddo managed to acquire horses, no one truly knows. The animals could well have been acquired during the time of the De Soto-Moscoso expeditions of the 1540’s. Or, they could have been acquired at about the same time by trading with the Indians of far West Texas, Oklahoma, and/or New Mexico, who first met the horse during the expedition of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado. Moreover, the horses could have been survivals of some shipwreck along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico as there were indeed a great number of wrecks with loss of human life and animals. Runaway horses from New Spain or Florida could also have managed to reach the land of the Caddo either on their own or through Indian trading. Regardless of how the horse was acquired, it signalled the beginning of European influence on the culture of the Caddo. Even before the physical meeting of the two cultures, the Spaniards had begun to alter the life-style of the Indian.

Fray Espinoza also noted that the Caddo did not establish villages per se, but that they lived in rancherias in which individual houses were constructed on a family’s farming area. Each family selected an area for farming which was cleared through communal effort and then seeded in unison. Houses were built the same way. A family desiring a new house would inform the tribal chief who in turn would make the necessary announcements to the tribe. On the designated morning all were expected to do their share of the work. Some dug the holes for the wooden posts. Others carried and placed the posts in place. Other Indians would bring the material for thatching the walls and roofs. All would work together so that a new house could be constructed in about half a day’s work. Any Indian, male or female, who showed up late for the house building project, was publically flogged as a penalty. The family hosting the house building would sponsor the feast that followed. Chiefs, of course, were expected to outdo their tribal members as far as edibles for the feast were concerned.

Each rancheria had a temple, or worship house, in which an eternal flame was kept. The flame was attended by the elderly so that it would never go out. The Caddo believed their people would die if the flame were extinguished. Besides believing in a Supreme Being, the Caddo also believed in the existence of heaven, minor good beings, and demons or bad spirits.  

The Franciscan missionaries established seven missions for the East Texas-Western Louisiana Indians. In 1690, they estab-
lished missions San Francisco de Los Tejas (moved to San Antonio in 1731 and re-named San Francisco de la Espada), and Santísímo Nombre de María (abandoned in 1692). In 1716, the Franciscans founded missions Nuestra Señora de la Purísima Concepción, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Nacogdoches, San José de los Nazonis, San Miguel de los Adaes, and Nuestra Señora de los Dolores de los Aia. Of these latter missions, two were transferred to San Antonio 1731. San José de los Nazonis was moved and renamed San Juan Capistrano, and Purísima Concepción became Purísima Concepción de Acuña.15

The south-central Texas area from modern day Del Rio to San Antonio to the Galveston-Corpus Christi gulf coast area and across the Rio Grande into present-day northeastern Mexico, was the land of the Coahuiltecan and Tamaulipecan Indian Nations and their numerous tribes and clans. Technically, both the geography and the native Indian cultures of this area were caught in a wedge between the Meso-America on the south, the Southwest on the west, the Plains on the north, and the Woodland on the east. The area is not conducive to native agriculture as it varies from semiarid to arid in both topography and climate. Rainfall is usually limited year round except in those areas where there is an irregular “rainy season” which merely assures the possibility of rain. Occasional heavy rains causing unexpected flooding alternate irregularly with dry, hot, drought periods. Temperature varies from highly infrequent snow falls but annual freezes during winter, to temperatures of one hundred degrees Fahrenheit during summer months.

The native inhabitants of the area date to approximately 5000 B.C. and seem to have seen of both desert and big-game hunting cultures. Contemporarily, the Coahuiltecan-speaking Indians are known as Coahuiltecos, Tamaulipecos, Karankawa, and Tonkawa. Each of these “nations” had an unknown number of tribes and clans which roamed the area. Also known to have inhabited the area were the Athapaskan-speaking Lipan and Tobose Apache.16

Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, shipwrecked on the Texas Gulf Coast in 1528, was the first European to document and report not only his survival among the Indians, but their culture and lifestyles as well. The Relación y Comentarios del Governador Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca was first published in Valladolid, Spain in 1554.17 In the book he described not only his adventures and misadventures, but the Indians of the Texas Gulf Coast and
those whom he met along his incredible trek towards Culiacán in New Galicia.

In Chapter Twenty-Four of the Relación he described the customs of the Indians beginning with the Island of Malhado thought to be either Galveston or Padre Island. He noted that as soon as an Indian discovered she was pregnant, the husband did not sleep with her until after two years following delivery of the child. The child was then nursed until the age of twelve at which time it was thought he could fend for himself. When asked why they did this, the Indian replied that it was due to the hunger of the people and the lack of edibles.

Marriages among the Coahuiltecan Indians were arranged by the suitor and his prospective wife’s parents. Divorce seemed to have been, according to Cabeza de Vaca, the common agreement of incompatibility. Marriages with children, however, seemed to be indissolvable.

Fights between men of the tribe were allowed to go uninterrupted by the other men as long as the fighters did not use weapons. The women were the ones who usually ended such fights by separating the men. If the anger in one of the men did not subside, then he frequently chose to take his family and belongings out of the village and into the wilds where they could live apart from the tribe. The man and his family were allowed to return after he got over the anger and whatever drove him out. If the man was not married, then he would most likely change tribes even if it meant joining an opposing, or enemy tribe.

In regard to their social custom, Cabeza de Vaca noted that the Indians got drunk with a certain smoke (se emborrachan con un humo) and so prized it that the Indians drank a beverage which they made from a tree resembling oak. According to Cabeza de Vaca, they boiled the leaves until a foamy liquid was produced, they then drank it as hot as possible. As soon as the beverage was ready to drink, the brewer cried out “Who wants to drink” (?quién quiere beber?) and all the women had to stop whatever they were doing and remain motionless. Any woman who spoke or moved was promptly beaten for insulting the brewer. If such an incident occurred then the brew had to be thrown away for it was considered spoiled. When asked why they believed and practiced this the Indians replied that if the women did not remain silent and motionless then an evil spirit would enter the brew. The person drinking the brew would eventually die from the effects of the evil spirit.
If the brew was not spoiled, then the brewer drank his liquid for three days without any food. During this period, according to Cabeza de Vaca, the man acted strangely and irregularly. It was during this drinking spree that the man might seek the company of those certain Indian males in the tribe who dressed and acted like women.

Among the items eaten by the Indians was the mesquite bean. The mesquite were thrown in a hole in the ground in which the Indians would grind them into a pulp. The mesquite pulp was then put in a pot with water and dirt added to sweeten the taste. Other Indians would then gather to taste the food and took turns in adding dirt, shells, pieces of meat or skin, or whatever they thought was necessary to improve the dish. The feast of the mesquite, according to Cabeza de Vaca, usually resulted in giving the Indians a swollen stomach as a result of the amount of water and dirt added to the concoction. The Indians, however, were very pleased with both the dish and its aftereffects.19

The Coahuiltecan Indians of northeastern Mexico and south-central Texas remained fairly unchanged for almost two hundred years after Cabeza de Vaca. It was not until the 1680’s that the Franciscan missionaries began to establish missions in Coahuila for the conversion and assimilation of the Coahuiltecos. The first Coahuiltecan Texas mission was not founded until May of 1718, when Mission San Antonio de Valero (the Alamo) was established along the banks of the San Antonio River at a distance of over three leagues downstream from Valero. Two years after that, Mission San Francisco Xavier de Náxera was founded between both missions along the San Antonio River. That same year, Texas Governor Don Joseph de Azlor y Virto de Vera, Second Marquis de San Miguel de Aguayo, also founded Mission Espíritu Santo de Zuñiga near La Vaca Bay for the coastal Karankawa and Coahuiltecos.20

The three East Texas missions moved to San Antonio 1731 rounded off the Franciscan effort at converting and assimilating the Coahuiltecan and Karankawa Nations of south-central Texas. Only two other coastal missions for the Karankawas were established thereafter. They were Nuestra Señora del Rosario de los Cujanes (1754), and Nuestra Señora del Refugio (1793) along the banks of the San Antonio River, latter-day Goliad and Refugio, Texas.21

The Plains Indian cultures of Spanish-Mexican Texas as well as Nuevo León, Tamaulipas, and Coahuila (lying within the
were represented by the Tonkawa, Southern Lipan Apaches, Mescalero Apaches, Jumanos, and Borrados. The latter two Indian Nations also spoke Athapaskan and were (and still are) considered Apache. It is not known when the Athapaskan-speaking Apaches moved south into Texas and northeastern Mexico, but they were reportedly first encountered in northwest Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas by Francisco Vásquez de Coronado in the 1540’s. By the early 1700s the Spanish missionaries and military governors of Nuevo León, Tamaulipas, Coahuila, and Texas reported the Apaches within their jurisdictions.

It is thought that the Southern Lipan Apaches moved to Texas because of their split with the Northern Lipan Apaches. It is also theorized that the Lipan Apache Nation was forced to split in the late seventeenth century when the Comanches moved into the land of the Lipan. All through the eighteenth century, the missionaries and governments of Texas, Nuevo León, Tamaulipas, and Coahuila reported a state of war existing between the Lipan Apaches and the Comanche Indians. The Spaniards characteristic-ally tried to take advantage of the situation by establishing missions for the Apache in all four provinces.

In Texas, the Franciscans established missions San Francisco Xavier de Horcasitas (1748), San Idelfonso (1749), Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria (1749), Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (1756), San Saba (1757), San Lorenzo de la Santa Cruz (1762), and Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria de Cañon (1762). Stray families or clans also entered the San Antonio missions. Missions San Antonio de Valero and Purísima Concepción de Acuña both reported Lipanes, Borrados, Tobosos, and “Apaches” (no tribal designation cited for these latter few).

The Lipan Apaches continued their love-hate relationship with the Spaniards throughout the eighteenth century. They entered the missions for protection against the Comanche. Once the Indians settled their differences, they joined forces against the Spaniards. The Lipanes either abandoned or destroyed the missions. The mercurial relationship between the Spaniards and the southern Lipan Apaches began to settle somewhat in the nineteenth century. During the Mexican War of Independence from Spain (1810-1820), the Indians joined the rebels in fighting against the royalists. After Mexico gained independence in 1821, the southern Lipan Apaches were considered loyal, but not always friendly, Mexican nationals. The Indians managed to stay
Frontier Dioceses of Spanish North America 1522-1777

by Richard D. Puentes

1970
Frontier Provinces and Kingdoms of the Vice-regency of New Spain
1810
by
Richard St. John
out of the politics of the Texas Revolution (1835-1836) but not without attacking stray Mexican and Texan caravans and ranches.\textsuperscript{27} It was during the chaotic period of 1821 through 1836 that the Lipan Apaches and other Indian tribes and Nations were visited and described in detail by Mexican representatives Colonel José Francisco Ruíz, General Manuel Mier y Teran, and scientist Jean Louis Berlandier.\textsuperscript{28}

Although the Tonkawa, Karankawa, southern Lipan Apaches, and their numerous tribes and clans including the Borrodos, Mescaleros, and Tobosos never fully accepted conversion and assimilation through the Franciscan missions, they did manage, nonetheless, to survive their indigenous counterparts by eventually melting into the Mexican and Mexican-American populations of south-central Texas and northeastern Mexico. This is aptly reflected in the October 12, 1837, report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Republic of Texas which concluded that:

"The people called Lipan, Karankawa, and Tonkawa, your committee considers a part of the Mexican Nation and are not to be considered a different people from the Nation. They occupy the western part of Texas."\textsuperscript{29}

A number of Athapaskan- and Karankawa-speaking Texas Indians who have moved to the lower banks of the Rio Grande were still identifiable in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. As late as 1886, Dr. Albert Gatschet was still able to find Mexican nationals who spoke the language of the Karankawa Indians of Texas.\textsuperscript{30} The Athapaskan-speaking Borrodos, Tobosos, Mescaleros, and southern Lipan Apaches could not have been far off.

The Franciscan missionaries who operated the missions of Texas also ran those of New Mexico, California, and Pimería Alta (Arizona). Before describing the administration of the Church on the northern frontier of New Spain, therefore, it might be best to describe the native Indian cultures which the missionaries encountered from Texas to California. Only after the total panorama is presented can the actual organization and administration of the Church on the northern frontier be understood and appreciated.
The Greater Southwest Indian cultures inhabited the geographic area now known as Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, Nevada, West Texas, and north-central Mexico (Chihuahua, Sonora, and the northern fringe of Sinaloa). The native inhabitants of the area fell into one of two dominant sub-cultures; the Arid American, and the American Oasis cultural traditions. During the prehistoric period the Greater Southwest contained four major cultural groups. The Mogollon Indian culture extended from present southeastern Arizona through southern New Mexico into far West Texas and the Mexican State of Chihuahua as well as the northeastern edge of Sonora. The Anasazi Indian culture extended from present southern Utah through the southern half of Colorado, to the northern half of New Mexico and the northern and northeastern section of Arizona. The Patayan Indian culture was located in the present western part of Arizona and the abutting boundary areas of Nevada and California. The Hohokam Indian culture occupied the present south-central part of Arizona and extended south to the Mexican State of Sonora and the abutting northern edge of Sinaloa.

Sometime late in the prehistoric period the Athapaskan-speaking Indians moved into the Greater Southwest. This is thought to have displaced the Mogollon culture which either moved south into Mexico or was forced to assimilate with the Anasazi Indians. By 1600 the Greater Southwest was populated by Hokam, Uto-Aztecan, and Athapaskan-speaking cultures. These Indian Nations were dispersed over the entire area in diverse tribes, bands, and clans.

Culturally, the Indians of the Greater Southwest, when the Spaniards arrived, fell into four categories. They were the pueblo, rancheria, band, and nomadic (non-agricultural) groups. These divisions reflected not only their cultural traits, but their economic systems as well.

The pueblo, or village, people lived in compact settlements where they practiced either irrigated, or dry, farming. They lived in the eastern pueblos along the Rio Grande in New Mexico, and in the western pueblos along the Colorado River in Arizona-California. Their dwellings were typically constructed of sun-dried adobe bricks. Although there was no single language or political structure for all pueblo Indians, there was, nonetheless, great similarity in their cultural lifestyles and traditions. Each
community was tightly structured along a religious society featuring an elaborate ceremonial life headed by the local Indian priests. By 1600, the total population of the Pueblo Indians was an estimated forty thousand. All together they spoke seven different languages and numerous dialects thereof.

The rancheria Indians were the most numerous people in the Greater Southwest when the Spaniards arrived. They numbered approximately one hundred and fifty thousand. They spoke either Hokam or Uto-Aztecan, and lived in settlements more or less permanently located around their farming areas. Their houses were not closely constructed and could be as much as a mile and a half distant from the nearest neighbor. The actual dwellings varied from adobe houses to caves and subterranean dugouts.

The speakers of the Uto-Aztecan language and dialects were the most numerous rancheria Indians in the Greater Southwest. The tribes differed one from the other not only in the dialects which they spoke, but also in their respective socio-economic and social structures. The Tarahumara and Concho Indians lived in the Sierra Madre on the southeastern edge of the Greater Southwest. Further west, along the Pacific coast, and in the valleys of Sonora and deserts of Arizona, lived the Pima, Opata, Mayo, and Yaqui. The latter two actually belonged to a Uto-Aztecan-speaking Nation called Cahitan. They had the distinction of being able to rally their tribes in order to conduct a united war effort.

The Hokan-speaking rancheria Indians lived along the southern banks of the Colorado River in Sonora, Arizona, and the Californias. This linguistic group was composed of the Yuma, Walapai, Yavapai, Cochimi, Cocopa, Mohave, Halchidoma, and Cocomaricopa Indians.

The bands-culture Indians of the Greater Southwest were composed of the Athapaskan-speaking groups who combined farming and game hunting for existence. The Spaniards called them Navajo and Apache. They numbered approximately fifteen thousand when the Spaniards arrived at the end of the sixteenth century. Both Mescalero and Chiricahua Apaches did not practice agriculture and relied on hunting and wild food-gathering for existence. The Navajo and Western Apaches, meanwhile, used agriculture to support and supplement their hunting and food-gathering. They both placed greater emphasis on the hunt.
The non-agricultural bands composed the fourth type of Indian culture in the Greater Southwest. These groups, and particularly the Hokam-speaking Seri, lived strictly off the land. They hunted game, gathered wild food, and fished the Pacific coast, rivers, creeks, and waterways. The nonagricultural Indian bands were few in number, yet the Spaniards considered them the most "wild" and difficult to work with.34

The Spaniards' approach to the Indians of the Greater Southwest varied in accordance with the respective cultural style and need. In the pueblo Indian settlements the Spaniards established what can only be described as "open missions." That is, they established a type of parish church in the midst of the Indian village. As with the Caddo Indians of East Texas, this approach in the Greater Southwest would meet with limited success.

For both the rancheria and bands Indian cultures the Spaniards used the mission-fortress approach. This was a walled city surrounded by the community's agricultural and/or ranching land holdings. This approach offered protection and continuity to the Indians and seemed to have been much more successful. In many cases, however, the Indians entered a mission when faced with a superior enemy. As soon as the threat passed they either abandoned or destroyed the mission.

To the nonagricultural Indian bands the Spaniards applied the laws of Burgos of 1513 which called for the destruction of the old dwellings and resettlement of the Indians in a different setting where they could be converted and assimilated. In the new mission setting the Indians were taught farming and ranching along with Christianity. The Spaniards had a greater impact on these Indians than on the other cultures of the Greater Southwest.

THE CALIFORNIA CORRIDOR

Because of its unique geographic location, as well as topography, California was a corridor used and inhabited by a large number of varied and diverse Indian cultures. No other area in the northern frontier of the Spanish empire had as many Indian cultures and languages as California. The estimated 133,000 Indian inhabitants of California when the Spaniards arrived was the largest native population on the entire frontier and perhaps in North America.

The neophytes of California spoke six different languages and countless dialects thereof. The languages were Athabaskan,
Algonkin, Panutian, Hokan, Uto-Aztecan and Yukian. The speakers of Athabaskan occupied the extreme northwestern part of California along the Pacific Coast. They were the Hupa, Tolowa, and Wailaki, who are thought to have numbered some seven thousand.

An estimated 3,500 Wiyot and Yurok Indians spoke Algonkin. They occupied the northwestern part of California and extended across to the Pacific Coast. The Yuki and Wappo Indians who spoke Yukian and numbered approximately 4,000 also occupied the same general area.

The largest linguistic group were the Penutian who are thought to have numbered some 57,000. They occupied the central part of California and were composed of the Yokuts, Miwok, Olamentke, Costanoan, Maidu, Wintu, and Modoc. The latter group (Modoc) numbered only 500 and lived along the northeastern California-Oregon border.

The second largest linguistic group was composed of the 37,000 Hokan-speaking Indians. They stretched from north central California to the northern regions of Baja California. The Hokan-speaking groups were known as Achomawi, Shasta, Karok, Chimariko, Yana, Pomo, Salinan, Esselan, Chumash, Yuman, Seri, Cochimi, Diegueno, Kamia, and Washo.

The Uto-Aztecan speakers were the third largest linguistic group. They were known as Shoshonean, Tubatulabal, Luiseño, Cahuilla, Gabrieleno, Kawaiisu, and Serrano. Of these groups, the Shoshonean alone numbered some 23,500. The Uto-Aztecan speaking Indians occupied the largest land area, extending from northern California south along its central and eastern sections to northern Baja California and spilled over to Arizona and Sonora.\(^{35}\)

Spanish missionary activity in California was fairly limited to the Pacific coastal area and its interior valley region with little, if any, contact with the Indians of the Sierras and beyond. Still, from north to south, the Franciscans established the following missions: San Francisco Solano (1823), San Rafael Arcangel (1817), San Francisco de Asis (1776), San Jose (1797), Santa Clara de Asis (1777), Santa Cruz (1791), San Juan Bautista (1797), Nuestra Señora de Soledad (1797), San Antonio de Padua (1771), San Miguel Arcangel (1797), San Luis Obispo (1772), La Purísima Concepción (1787), Santa Ines (1804), Santa Barbara (1786), San Buenaventura (1782), San Fernando Rey de España (1797), San Gabriel Arcangel
(1771), San Juan Capistrano (1776), Pala (1816), San Luis Rey de Francia (1798), and San Diego de Alcala (1769).  

Notwithstanding the number of Franciscan missions, the large native population, great diversity of languages and dialects, and small but important differences among the Indian cultures did not allow the Spaniards to develop an encompassing evangelization program in California. The location of the missions within linguistic regions limited the missionaries to work primarily with the Hokan and Uto-Aztecan speaking cultures. These particular missions were established in the eighteenth century and ranged from San Francisco to San Diego. Threat of Russian encroachment on Spanish California prompted the Franciscans in the first quarter of the nineteenth century to venture north of San Francisco to establish a mission among the Hupa Indians. It was too late (1823) and the Spaniards would have little or no effect on the culture of the Athabascan-speaking Hupas.  

The Indians of the south-central, coastal, and interior valley regions were affected to various degrees by the Franciscan evangelization program. There is no reason to doubt that some mission Indians were assimilated into the Spanish-speaking labor force of colonial California. It is known, however, that the later mission Indians (those who entered at the dawn of the nineteenth century and who were still at the missions during the Gold Rush and when they were secularized) eventually ended up in the reservations established by the U.S. Government. Many other Indians were despoiled of their land, killed, or simply removed and/or restricted to reservations.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHURCH ON THE NORTHERN FRONTIER OF NEW SPAIN

The Church on the northern frontier of New Spain operated on two levels. The oldest and most powerful was that of the Episcopal Sees’ established government. The second level was that of the missionary colleges for the Propagation of the Faith. Although the missionaries operated within a specific geographic area in accordance with the limitations and regulations set forth by the local diocese, they did nonetheless wield greater administrative and mobile freedom than the regular clergy. Both the diocesan and missionary systems were subservient to the Archdiocese of Mexico as the highest and ultimate pivot point in the administration of the Church in New Spain.

Technically, the Diocese of Tlaxcala, also known as the Carolense Bishopric, had been the first diocese in North America. It had been established by Pope Leo X in 1518, and Fray Julián
Garcés had been named its first bishop the following year. The diocese, however, existed more on paper than in reality. No one knew its boundaries and Fr. Garcés was not able to effect the establishment of the bishopric until 1532 when he finally settled down in Puebla de Los Angeles. Two years earlier, the Diocese of Mexico had been established in México Tenochtitlán. Fray Juan Zumárraga had been named its first bishop. The same decree, dated February 20, 1534, also established the dioceses of Michoacán, Mixteca, and Guazacualco.

In 1546, Pope Paul III raised the diocese of Mexico to an archdiocese, making the others subservient to it. Its boundaries at this time extended from present-day Nicaragua on the south, the Orient on the east (namely the Philippine Islands), and as far north into the terra incognita as there were Spaniards. The arrival of Cabeza de Vaca in 1535 and the expedition of Francisco Vásquez de Coronado had made the northern frontier of New Spain an incomprehensible and boundless vastness unknown.

The first diocese on the northern frontier was established on July 13, 1548 by Pope Paul III. It was to be known as the Obispado Campostelano and was to be located in the city of Campostela in the Kingdom of Nueva Galicia. In the Bull establishing the diocese the Pope instructed the bishop to see to the instruction and conversion of the natives to the Faith. The Pope also placed the diocese under the Archdiocese of Mexico.

The first bishop of Campostela, the Rev. Pedro Gómez Maraver, set out to the city of Campostela but once he reached Guadalajara decided to go no further. There in 1550, Bishop Gómez Maraver instituted a special hearing to ascertain if the episcopal seat should be moved to Guadalajara. It was pointed out by the commission that Campostela had a population of seventeen Spaniards and that the Indians were so "skinny" (flacos) that it would be impossible to erect the cathedral. They also pointed out that the climate was too hot and humid to be sanitary and therefore not conducive to the establishment and management of the diocese. Finally, they informed the Bishop that it was such an inhospitable place that the clergy resisted being assigned there. Even the deacon of the newly established cathedral had refused to assume his appointment at Campostela and no increase in salary could make him change his mind. The argument against Campostela was topped with the observation that it was so poor that it would never be able to raise the necessary tithes to support the bishopric. The special commission then recommended that the diocese be headquartered at
Guadalajara. Outstanding (and wealthy) citizens of Guadalajara, merchants, politicians, and influential Indian leaders of the surrounding area appeared before the Bishop urging him to establish the bishopric at Guadalajara.

The petitioners lauded the city's location, climate, population, and wealth in comparison to that of Campostela. They also pointed out that Guadalajara was nearer to the pueblos of the unconverted pagan infidels as well as to the blacks and other slaves who worked in the surrounding ore mines and that the Bishop could easily attend to their conversion and salvation. Bishop Gómez Maraver collected all the observations, petitions, and assorted documents and forwarded them to the Audiencia de Nueva Galicia to make the final decision.\(^\text{42}\) The outcome was highly predictable from the very beginning and especially because the Audiencia itself had just moved to Guadalajara from Campostela. Bishop Pedro Gómez Maraver, however, died the following year (1551).\(^\text{43}\) The actual transfer to Guadalajara was executed during the term of the second bishop, Fray Juan de Ayala, O.F.M. in 1560.\(^\text{44}\)

In the next half century the Diocese of Guadalajara saw its northern boundary extended beyond management. First came the establishment of the Kingdom of New Vizcaya in 1561 by Captain-General, Governor, and conquistador Francisco de Ibarra. This undefined land mass included those areas presently known as the Mexican States of Durango, Chihuahua, parts of Coahuila and Sonora, and part of Arizona. Its capital was the Villa de Guadiana (later renamed Durango).\(^\text{45}\) The second kingdom to follow was that of the Nuevo Reyno de León established by Luís de Carvajal y de la Cueva in 1579. Its land mass included those areas now known as Nuevo León, Tamaulipas, Coahuila, and part of south-central Texas. Its capital was Santa Lucía (later renamed Monterrey).\(^\text{46}\) Just two years after the establishment of Nuevo León, the Franciscan missionaries literally pushed the Spanish government into the area called El Nuevo México de la Santa Fé. After many delays, Captain-General Juan de Oñate finally established the government of the Kingdom of New Mexico in 1598. Its original capital was at San Juan Bautista but this would later be moved to Santa Fé.\(^\text{47}\)

Fray Alonso de la Mota y Escobar was the sixth bishop of the Diocese of Guadalajara. He took office in 1598, and served for nine years. During his term of office he visited as much of the diocese as possible and was thus able to author his famous Descripción Geográfica de los Reynos de Nueva Galicia, Nueva
Vizcaya y Nuevo León. The diocese was immense and notwithstanding its great mineral deposits, quite poor. The poverty and the vastness of the diocese soon prompted the Church and Viceregal government to seek a realignment on the northern frontier.

On October 11, 1620, Pope Paul V decreed the establishment of the Diocese of Guadiana in the Kingdom of Nueva Vizcaya. Its first bishop, Fray Gonzalo de Hermosillo, assumed office in absentia on October 22, 1621, and personally took command of his office in September of 1622. It was at about this time that Fray Antonio Vázquez de Espinosa authored his Description of the Indies, in which among other things he described both dioceses of Guadalajara and Guadiana. It is he who is first to point out that the Diocese of Guadiana was established to alleviate that of Guadalajara. The 104 encomiendas of Indians, the vastness of the old diocese, and the impossibility of making episcopal visitations had prompted the creation of the new diocese. Its territory included that area now known as Durango, Chihuahua, Sonora, Sinaloa, part of Coahuila, Nuevo Mexico, and that northern portion of Primería Alta later known as southern Arizona.

The rapid growth and development of the north-central frontier of New Spain which had prompted the establishment of the Diocese of Guadiana was not repeated on the northeastern or northwestern frontiers. The Nuevo Reyno de León on the northeastern frontier progressed quite slowly during the entire seventeenth century. The threat of foreign incursion and particularly the advance of the French-Americans from Canada south along the Mississippi and La Salle’s brief stay in the terra incognita east of the Rio Grande del Norte finally prompted the Viceregal government to act in the northeastern frontier. The Province of Nueva Extremadura (Coahuila) was formally established in 1688. Theoretically, the Province of Las Nuevas Filipinas (Texas) was established in 1690 with the appointment of its first Governor General Don Domingo Terán de los Rios. The governor, however, only served two years and thereafter the Governor of Coahuila officiated until the appointment of Captain Don Fernando Pérez de Almazán in 1722.

The coastal area of Nuevo León north from Tampico to La Bahía del Espíritu Santo in Texas, had been left unpopulated, ungoverned, and apparently unclaimed by Nuevo León. In 1746, the Viceroy of New Spain named Colonel José de Escandón, Count of Sierra Gorda, to head the conquest and pacification of what was generally known as El Seno Mexicano. In nine years
Escandon established a number of missions and villages along both sides of the Rio Grande. He called his colony La Colonial del Nuevo Santander and established his capital at La Villa de San Miguel de Aguayo. Almost a century later the Colonia would become known as Tamaulipas and its capital would become Ciudad Victoria. One of the last settlements founded by Escandon was San Agustín de Laredo, which, by lying on the northern bank of the Rio Grande, would eventually become the northeastern gateway to Mexico.

The conquest and colonization of the northwestern frontier was much slower. Although the missionaries entered Baja California in the late seventeenth century, they did not advance into Upper California until the second half of the eighteenth century. San Diego de Alcalá, the first California settlement, was founded in 1769. The population growth of California depended not so much on creole and mestizo colonization, but on the slower conversion and assimilation of the native Indian population.

The rapid growth of the northeastern frontier and its unmanageability finally prompted the King to establish a new diocese. On December 15, 1777, the Diocese of Linares was officially established. It would encompass the provinces of Coahuila, Nuevo León, Texas, and Tamaulipas. Its episcopal seat was to be located in the town of Linares. Fray Antonio de Jesus Sacedon was named the first bishop of Linares but he died before assuming the post. The second bishop, Fray Rafael José Verger was appointed in 1783. At this time there was a raging argument concerning the episcopal seat. The King (and Viceroy) had designated Linares, Nuevo León, as the episcopal seat. The Commandant-General in charge of all military and political functions on the frontier, favored Santa Rosa, Coahuila. Fray Verger solved the problem by establishing temporary residence at Monterrey for title to a small hill overlooking the city. It was on that hill that Fray Verger established his "temporary residence" from which he refused to budge. In 1791, the government finally gave in and approved Monterrey as the episcopal seat for the Diocese of Linares (which became known as the Diocese of Monterrey). The "temporary residence," meanwhile, became an episcopal palace better known as the Obispado.

Simultaneous to the establishment of the Diocese of Nuevo León (also known as Linares and/or Monterrey), there had been attempts to establish another diocese on the frontier for Sonora (including Arizona) and the Californias. This was finally accom-
plished on May 7, 1779, with a Bull from Pope Pius VI. Its territory included Sonora, Sinaloa, the Californias, and what would later be known as southern Arizona. The episcopal seat was established at Hermosillo, Sonora, and Fray Antonio de los Reyes assumed the bishopric in 1783. He was allowed an annual income of five thousand pesos. This diocese would eventually be divided in the mid-1800’s to form the Diocese of the Californias.

THE FRONTIER MISSIONARIES

The Church in El Nuevo México de la Santa Fé was in the hands of the Franciscans from the province of El Santo Evangelio de México. They had been charged with the spiritual aspect of New Mexico since its occupation by the Spaniards. In 1621, the reported progress of the religious prompted the Church to raise New Mexico to a custodia named La Conversión de San Pablo. Nine years later, the missionaries boasted of already having baptized some 16,000 Indians and on the strength of this claim asked that a bishopric be established in New Mexico. Before a decision could be reached, a number of Indian uprisings and political impediments blocked the creation of the diocese. Notwithstanding the ouster of the Spaniards and the reconquest of the province at the turn of the century, by 1710 New Mexico claimed a population of 20,110. This figure included only mission Indians and Spanish settlers of all castes.

By 1776, the mission Indian population was cited at 11,175, and the Spanish castes at 19,778 for a total New Mexican population of 30,953. The capital of Santa Fé had a population of 2,419, but was second to the town of Guadalupe del Paso with a population of 3,622. The two other townships of San Felipe Neri de Albuquerque and Santa Cruz de la Cañada each had 1,650 inhabitants.

There were also nineteen missions and six visitas administered by thirty-one friars and one brother. The friars received an annual salary of 330 pesos each and the brother received 250 pesos a year. The total expenditure of the Church in New Mexico was 10,480 pesos a year. To further assist the New Mexican missionaries, all male Indians under fifty years of age were required to donate twelve reales or half a bushel of corn a year to their local parish (or mission) priest.

Not everyone was pleased with the evangelization progress in New Mexico. In 1793, the Viceroy of New Spain, Don Juan Vicente Guemes y Pacheco de Padilla, second count of Revilla Gigedo, issued a blistering report on the Indian missions.
Concerning the conversion of the New Mexican Indians he stated that it was painful to note that after two hundred years the Indians were still as ignorant of the faith as they were of religion in general. He also noted that, like the Spanish settlers (whom he apparently did not like, either), the Indian still dressed in buckskins and refused to adopt “Spanish clothing.” The Viceroy was also upset with the fact that even though the Indians reportedly understood Spanish, they refused to use it. This was also reflected in the fact (according to the Viceroy) that the Indians never used their Christian names given at baptism but preferred to use their native, pagan names.

Viceroy Guemes y Pacheco de Padilla did not seem to like the civilian settlers any better. He complained that they lived in ranchos widely dispersed one from another. In this manner, he reasoned, they managed to practice their “vicious habits” without being seen or controlled.56

As we have already seen, the Church in the Provincia de los Tejas or Las Nuevas Filipinas was represented at various times by three colleges of the Propagation of the Faith. The earliest was the College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro, which had sent its missionaries to Texas at the very beginning in the 1680s and has established the earliest missions among the Tejas. The College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas was established in 1707 and began to send its missionaries to Texas shortly thereafter. They established their first missions among the Tejas in 1716. The third college to send its missionaries to Texas was San Fernando el Grande. These missionaries came in the mid-1700s and established the ill-fated missions for the Apache. This latter group did not stay long in Texas.

As far as the secular clergy was concerned, there was only one parish church in Texas during the eighteenth century. The parish church of San Fernando de Asturias at San Antonio was administered by priests and brothers of the Diocese of Guadalajara until 1777, and then by the Diocese of Nuevo León. The Vicario Foraneo de Texas overseeing the secular Church was also the parish priest of San Fernando.

The missionaries, on the other hand, were governed by local “missionary presidents” who oversaw specific regions within a province. They answered to the guardian or presidente in capite who governed the college to whom the missionaries belonged. All the colleges in turn answered to the Comisario General of the Franciscan Order in New Spain at Mexico City.57
Texas, acting as a buffer province between French Louisiana and the interior provinces and kingdoms of New Spain, had traditionally been neglected by the government. This in turn put a special burden on the missionaries who relied upon government support for the expansion and administration of the Church. The very nature of various Indian cultures and their respective reaction to the missionaries also hampered the progress of evangelization. By 1731, for instance, three of the six East Texas missions had been moved to the San Antonio area. The Apache missions of the 1750s had been disastrous and it seemed as if only the Coahuiltecan and perhaps the Karankawa Indians could truly be converted in Texas.

The expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish Empire, and specifically from the Viceroyalty of New Spain in 1767, created additional problems for Texas. The Jesuit missions of Pimería Alta were assigned to the College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro. The missionaries found it very difficult to operate in both the far northeast (Texas and Coahuila), and the far northwest (Sinaloa, Sonora, and present-day southern Arizona). Thus in 1772, the missionaries of the College of Querétaro decided to abandon their missions in Texas. The college of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de Zacatecas and the secular clergy of the Diocese of Guadalajara were left in charge of the spiritual governance of Texas.

Also in 1772, the Villa de San Fernando de Bexar (better known as San Antonio) was declared the capital of the province. The following year the government decided to close the three remaining East Texas missions. It was also decided to move the civilian population to San Antonio, thus abandoning all of East Texas. The three principal reasons were the ceding of Louisiana to Spain by France, the departure of the missionaries from Querétaro, and the apparent failure of the Church to fully convert the East Texas Indians.

Not everyone agreed with the changes, however. The East Texas civilians who had been moved to San Antonio immediately sought permission to return to their homes and properties. Permission was finally granted in 1779 when Gil Antonio Ibarvo was named Lieutenant Governor of Texas and ordered to return to East Texas to re-establish a civil township. Ibarvo was also granted an annual salary of 500 pesos. He was assigned one religious at an annual salary of 450 pesos. Ibarvo, the priest, and the civilians then returned to East Texas where they eventually
founded the Villa de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe de los Nacogdoches, also known as Nuestra Señora de Pilar de Bucareli.\textsuperscript{58}

Comanche and Apache raids on the ranchos, villas, pueblos, and missions were a constant threat to the people of Texas. During the eighteenth century there were repeated recommendations by various government officials urging the abandonment of the entire province. A questionable census taken in 1783 to support these recommendations cites a total Texas population of 2,819 people! This figure reportedly included three secular and eight regular clergymen as the total number of religious in the province.\textsuperscript{59}

In the report of the missions issued by Viceroy Guemes y Pacheco de Padilla in 1793, he noted that the missionaries had had great success with the Coahuiltecan and coastal (Karankawa) Indians. He noted that in San Antonio (the capital of Texas), the Indians spoke Spanish very well and were intermarried with the Spanish settlers. Both converted, as well as in-going mission Indians, he stated, took good care of the cattle and agricultural belongings of the Church. To further emphasize the progress among the Coahuiltecs and Karankawas, the Viceroy then noted that the latter had originally abandoned their missions in 1781 but returned ten years later where they were living quite peacefully and well. It was thus in 1791 when Mission Nuestra Señora del Refugio had been established for 450 Karankawa Indians.\textsuperscript{60}

The requisition of Louisiana by France ended all discussion concerning the Spanish abandonment of Texas. The extended neglect of the province, however, would surface in the nineteenth century when Texas would be constantly in turmoil and caught in the historical and political movements destined to change the face of North America.

The Jesuits had worked exclusively in Sinaloa and Sonora from 1591 until they were expelled in 1767. They had bven the first to sub-divide the area into four administrative (ecclesiastical-political) districts. They were known as Sinaloa, Sonora, Pimería Baja, and Pimería Alta. The latter district extended north to the Colorado and Gila Rivers and included the area later known as southern Arizona.

Viceroy Guemes y Pacheco de Padilla was highly complimentary of the Jesuits in his 1793 report on the missions of New Spain. He noted that the Jesuits had divided the area into districts called rectories so that the missionaries could have an immediate
superior nearby at all times. In this manner, the superior could solve or attend to any problem arising at any of the local missions.

As far as the mission Indians were concerned, the Viceroy noted that they were friendly, discreet, and very obedient to their local missionary. It was, in the opinion of the Viceroy, one big happy family where Indians of both sexes and of all ages lived in peace. Most Indians spoke Spanish and never failed to attend mass daily as well as on special feast days. They were well instructed in the catechism and in the ways of Christian life. The Viceroy also noted that the Indians were humbly but well dressed and did not go about naked as others might. They also built houses and lived quite comfortably in the pueblos they had established.

Everything changed once the Jesuits were expelled. According to the Viceroy, the settlers and converted Indians abandoned their homes and pueblos en masse. The agricultural fields were left to decay, and the church structures began to suffer from lack of attention. Not only was there no government and no police enforcement, there was no religious cult for the residents to follow. The government in Mexico City resolved to convert the missions of Sinaloa and Sonora to parish churches. The missions of Pimería Baja and Pimería Alta were transferred to the Apostolic College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro. In 1790, Viceroy Guemes y Pacheco de Padilla decided to establish the custodia of San Carlos de Sonora to be administered by missionaries from the colleges of Querétaro, Zacatecas, and San Fernando. Father Francisco Barbastro was appointed custodian, president, and guardian of the custodia. The King approved the actions of the Viceroy the following year with several small changes. The missions of Sinaloa, Sonora, and some of Pimería Baja were secularized and converted to parish churches. They were placed under the Province of San Francisco de Jalisco. The remaining missions of Pimería Baja and all of Pimería Alta were delivered to the college of Querétaro under Fr. Barbastro. The bishops of Sonora and Durango agreed to the viceregal and royal decisions. The estimated 87,644 Christians of the province of Sonora (including the unrecorded number of Indians and settlers in Pimería Alta) were thus saved from total abandonment by the Church and government.⁶¹

The missions of Alta California had been established by the Franciscans of the College of San Fernando el Grande de Mexico beginning in 1769 with the founding of Mission San Diego de Alcalá. By 1793, Viceroy Guemes y Pacheco de Padilla reported
that there were 8,431 Indians at the missions. He noted that they were learning Spanish, farming, ranching, and Christian doctrine. Each mission had two missionaries with an annual salary of 400 pesos each. What apparently struck the viceroy the most was the economic success of the missions of Alta California. He noted in his report that there were 24,640 head of cattle, 26,286 wool-giving sheep, 4,040 goats, 402 hogs, and 3,338 head of horses, mares, and mules. The farms were as successful as the ranches. They produced 15,197 bushels of wheat, 7,625 bushels of corn, 2,497 bushels of barley, and 1,791 bushels of beans and garlic.

There were other products being produced and sold in the Californias such as furs, fruits, and edible seeds. These products were usually sold to the soldiers stationed in the presidios or to the mariners stopping at the ports. To create further sources of revenue the Viceroy authorized a feasibility study concerning the development of new industries in the Californias. These included the establishment of the whaling, seal, pearl diving, sardine, salmon, fur trading, and ore-mining industries. The development of cotton, hemp, and flax for exportation was also recommended. Moreover, wheat and flour, already being produced in abundance, was also recommended for exportation.

The Viceroy's optimistic plans were obviously based on what he considered a successful precedent. As he noted in his report, the revenues earned at the missions plus the money raised through the Pious Fund had allowed the Jesuits to leave 800,000 pesos in their treasury! Unfortunately, the Viceroy's plans were blocked by political machinations. First, the administrative re-alignments occurring at the end of the eighteenth century hampered the viceroy's authority. Second, he had recently forgotten, or had chosen to ignore, the fact that the Jesuits had been expelled from the empire and were highly out of favor with the Spanish Crown. His unabashed praise of the Jesuits automatically fell on deaf or alien ears.

THE FRONTIER AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

With theceding of Louisiana to Spain by France, one of the greatest threats to the Viceregency of New Spain was removed. The government no longer had to worry about a potential foreign invasion of its northeastern frontier provinces. However the ever-constant harassment of the frontier settlements by rebellious and marauding Indians prompted the government to re-evaluate and reconsider its status in the far-flung northern provinces. The governmental "second thought" also pressured
the Church to re-evaluate its progress on the frontier. For instance, it was generally thought that a mission should only last ten years at any particular site while the local Indians were being converted to Catholicism. Neither the government nor the Church believed that more than ten years was necessary. Therefore, there was growing concern for other frontier Indian missions which after twenty to one hundred years were still attempting to convert the Indians in their locales. From the point of view of Madrid and Mexico City, the missions and Spanish settlements on the frontier seemed to be a failure. The frontier missionaries, on the other hand, argued that there was a constant flow of Indians through their missions. They argued that even though the mission complex was stationary, the Indian population was not. As Indians of a particular site were being converted and assimilated, other Indians from other areas were showing up at the missions to replace them. From the government’s point of view, the best thing to do was to personally inspect each and every single settlement on the northern frontier.

The first of the major inspection tours of the northern frontier was the one headed by Field Marshall Don Cayetano María Pignatelli Rubí Corbera y San Climent, better known as the Marquis de Rubí. He was accompanied on the expedition by Captain of Engineers Don Nicolas de Lafora. They started off from Mexico City on March 18, 1766, and returned February 8, 1768, after having travelled some 3,000 miles on horseback. During the twenty-three months of their expedition they personally inspected all of the northern frontier provinces of New Spain, leaving an accurate report and description of the missions, fortresses, settlements, climate, terrain, and people.53

Nueva Vizcaya was the first province to be visited by the inspection team. Lafora described the territory of the north-central frontier-province as best he could (there were no well-defined boundaries) and noted that the major settlements were Durango (the capital), Saltillo (later transferred to Coahuila), Parral, and San Bartolomé. The major fortresses were Pasaje, Cerro Gordo, Guajoquilla, Junta de los Ríos, San Buenaventura, San Felipe de Chihuahua, Nombre de Dios, and Cosiguarichi. It was noted that the fortresses were accompanied by townships which existed in their vicinity. Lafora also noted that there were countless other hamlets and haciendas scattered throughout the province. There were also mining camps and Indian missions in the vast province of Nueva Vizcaya and no one knew the
population of the province because it was too large and because no one had bothered to raise a census.

Due to the terrain and climate of the province, it was best suited for raising livestock of all types. It was also good for growing grapes and thus had a growing wine industry. The biggest problem in the province were the constant Apache raids. The large Apache nation which surrounded the province was constantly causing depredations on the east, north, and west portions of Nueva Vizcaya.64

The northwestern province of Sonora was described by Lafora as being divided into administrative sub-districts under a military-political governor. The capital was located at San Miguel de Horcasita. The other municipalities recognized as political sub-districts were Metape, Quisuaní, Guadalupe de la Ventana, Santa Ana de Tepache, Oposura, Nacozari, Fronteras, Motepore, Concepción, Soyopa, Opodepe, and Primería Alta (the northern edge of Sonora and southern half of present-day Arizona including Tucson). Since Lafora visited Sonora one year before the expulsion of the Jesuits, he correctly noted that the spiritual administration of the province was composed of regular clergy from the Diocese of Durango and by Jesuit missionaries.

Geographically, Lafora noted that most of Sonora was fertile and well given to the ranching and agricultural industries. Pimería Alta, however, was desertlike and lacked the water which flowed in abundance in the southern leagues of the province. The Presidio of Tucson, noted Lafora, was fifty leagues from the nearest settlement on the Gila and only five leagues from mission San Xavier del Bac. Both the presidio and mission were the northern outpost of the province of Sonora. The presidio had a small detachment of troops headed by a corporal. The mission had one missionary. Lafora could not help but praise the dedication and heroism of the men and families isolated in the land of the marauding Apache.

As with Nueva Vizcaya, from which it was separated by the Sierra Madre Occidental, no one really knew the population of Sonora. The settlements were too scattered, a census had not been taken, and the Indians (namely Apaches, Seris, and Pimas) had been at war with the Spanish settlers.65

Lafora did have a much better description of Nuevo Mexico. He noted that it had thirty-seven settlements with an estimated population of 2,703 Indian families for a total of 10,524 people. The Spanish castes numbered 9,580 people divided into 487
families. The total Christian population of Nuevo Mexico was thus 20,104 people. The people, he said, produced a great number of agricultural products and livestock for their own sustenance. For commercial purposes the New Mexicans produced leather goods and pelts which they traded in Chihuahua of Nueva Vizcaya. In exchange for their leather goods they accepted cloth and whatever they needed to bring back to New Mexico. As a rule, however, the women of New Mexico made their own clothing from the leather and wool produced by their families. According to Lafora, the women were very good at making excellent pieces of attire, from dresses, trousers, shirts, and blouses to boots, shoes, and special leather leggings with which they protected their legs. This latter item would years later become better known as *chaparreras* — chaps. Although the chaps were common throughout the frontier and wherever there were horsemen, it was in New Mexico that they caught Lafora's attention.

The New Mexicans' outstanding talents as horsemen also caught Lafora's eye. Both the settlers and the Indians, he noted, learned to ride horseback from infancy. Because of this, both Christian and Indian were well adapted for warfare; both offensive and defensive. Only firearms gave the Christians a slight advantage over the various Apache and Comanche tribes and nations of New Mexico. The Indians, however, were beginning to acquire arms from their French who periodically traded with the neophytres.

After noting the number of different animals, trees, rivers, creeks, fish, and natural products, Lafora turned to the Rio Grande del Norte. He pointed out that its place of origin was still unknown, but that it was known to flow into the Gulf of Mexico. Therefore, reasoned Lafora, the River could be used for navigational purposes and thus improve the economy of New Mexico and the frontier. Wine, whiskey, farming seeds, timber, and many other products could be developed for exportation and trade up and down the Rio Grande.66

Further south and downstream along the Rio Grande was the province of Nueva Extremadura (Coahuila). It straddled both banks of the river extending from its capital Monclova on the west to the Rio Medina on the east. The Medina River, which acted as the boundary between Coahuila and Texas, was at the outskirts of San Fernando (San Antonio). The northern boundary of the province was the Bolsón de Mapimí and Llano Estacado (west and east sides of the river respectively) which was popu-
lated only by the fierce marauding Indians of the Apache and Comanche Nations. On the southern boundary were the provinces of Nuevo León and Nuevo Santander (Tamaulipas). On the west, the boundary extended to the river opposite Saltillo which at that time still belonged to Nueva Vizcaya.

The Province of Nueva Extremadura, or Coahuila, at the time of Lafora was a developing area with a highly uncertain and undetermined population. According to Lafora there were only three small cities in the province; they were Santiago de la Monclova, San Fernando de Austria, and San Pedro Gigedo. There were also two townships and a small number of haciendas with a population of 777 inhabitants. There were also three presidial companies at the three fortresses of Monclova, Santa Rosa, and San Juan Bautista del Rio Grande. The Franciscans had nine missions in Coahuila for the Coahuiltecan and Apache Indian tribes and nations. According to Lafora, there were at that time only one hundred and twenty-six Indian families at the missions. Like all other inspectors and chroniclers of the frontier, Lafora did not cite the number (or even an approximation) of non-Christian Indians in Coahuila. He did point out that the population was composed of Spanish settlers, mestizos, Christian Indians, and some mulattos.

Like the Province of Nuevo Mexico, the residents of Coahuila depended on agriculture and livestock for their livelihood. They cultivated a variety of agricultural products, horses, cattle, sheep, and timber for their own use as well as for trading. Although Lafora did not mention it, the residents of Coahuila, as well as Texas and Nuevo León, relied heavily on the annual trade fair held at Saltillo in the Province of Nueva Vizcaya for their trading.

Directly east of Coahuila, on the opposite banks of the Medina and San Antonio rivers, was the Province of the Nuevas Filipinas also known as Texas. This province was bounded on the north by the terra incognitaa occupied by the Apaches and Comanches. On the east was the sometimes French, sometimes Spanish, but always difficult Province of Louisiana. On the south was the portless Gulf of Mexico. On the southwest on the opposite (south) side of the Nueces River was the Province of Nuevo Santander also known as Tamaulipas. Other than some haciendas along the east bank of the Rio Grande, neither Coahuila nor Tamaulipas had any settlements between the Rio Grande and the Medina, San Antonio, or Nueces. This section of land known as the "Nueces Strip" was as hostile as the northern
terra incognita of the Apaches and Comanches. All in all, Texas was surrounded by inhospitable and hostile geographic conditions. For this reason it was easier to engage in the illegal smuggling of contraband to Louisiana than it was to trade legally with Coahuila, Nuevo León, and Tamaulipas.

The first thing which struck Lafora, as is still true with new arrivals to Texas, was the extremity of its highly unpredictable weather. In the words of Lafora, Texas is an extremely cold in winter as it is extremely hot in the summer. He also noted that it is as wet, rainy and inundating during the rainy season as it is dry during the drought season. The river and creek beds were as difficult to cross during the rainy season when they tended to overflow and flood, as they were during the dry season when there is practically no water in the same waterways. This peculiarity of the water level of rivers and creeks made it very difficult for the Texans to draw water for irrigation purposes. Hand-built dams and painstakingly constructed irrigation ditches would help water the crops during the dry season but they tended to be washed away during the wet season.

Another negative peculiarity of Texas which caught Lafora’s attention was the abundance of mosquitoes and insects which tended (and tend still at times) to make life miserable. Lafora, however, over-exaggerated the situation by stating that this at times caused the women of Texas to become sterile as had reportedly happened at the Presidio de la Bahia along the Guadalupe River!

The inspector-chronicler was so apparently negatively impressed with Texas that he failed to mention or describe its population. Lafora, did, however, mention the abundance of wild animals and marauding Indians. He also noted that there were four fortresses located at San Antonio, La Bahia, Adays, and Orcoquizac. The surrounding missions did not apparently impress Lafora for he did not mention them at all. Finally, he recommended that Texas be done away with. This could be accomplished, he reckoned, by transferring the fortresses and missions of East Texas to Spanish Louisiana. San Antonio and its missions (and apparently La Bahia and its missions) he recommended be transferred to the jurisdiction of Coahuila.

If Texas gave Lafora a negative impression, then Nuevo Santander (Tamaulipas) must have taxed his patience beyond endurance. He wrote one sentence of one hundred and one words to describe Tamaulipas! Needless to say, it was highly negative and totally non-descriptive.
The old kingdom, now Province of Nuevo León, fared much better with Nicolás de Lafora. He described the population as numbering 3,050 composed of Spanish settlers, mestizos, and some mulattos. He also noted that there were 200 families of Tlaxcaltecan descent. At the missions, he noted, there were some 500 Indians of various tribes and nations. Lafora identified the cities as being Monterrey (the capital), San Felipe de Linares, San Gregorio de Cerralvo, San Juan de Cadereita, and Horcasita which was also known as Punta de Lampasos. The mining settlements and townships were identified as being Boca de Leones, Iguana, San Carlos de Vallecillo, and Sabinas (now Sabinas-Hidalgo). Lafora also noted that there was a great number of haciendas scattered throughout the various valleys nestled between the sierras.

The residents of Nuevo León were reported as producing an abundance of sugar cane, maize, beans, and other minor products. They also had an overabundance of all types of livestock, which represented the main industry of the province. The mining industry of Nuevo León was devoted to the exploitation of silver, which varied from excellent to poor in quality and quantity.

As with the other frontier provinces, Nuevo León also suffered from frequent Indian excursions and depredations. Once again the Apaches and Comanches were identified as the chief culprits. The largest recorded party of marauding Indians, according to Lafora, was a raiding force of one hundred warriors which harassed and destroyed (or at least did much damage) to the haciendas and ranchos.70

The report submitted by Nicolas de Lafora must have caused great consternation in Mexico City if not Madrid. In 1771, just three years after Lafora’s return, the Viceroy named Captain Hugo de O’Conor Inspector General of the presidios on the frontier of New Spain. The “red captain,” as he was called by the Indians of Texas, was no stranger to the frontier. He had been sent to Texas in 1765 to investigate the Governor’s problems with the East Texas-Louisiana contraband smugglers. Two years later, in mid 1767, he had been named Governor ad-interim of Texas. He returned to Mexico City in 1770, and was named Inspector General the following year.

From 1771 to 1776, the Inspector General, Captain Hugo de O’Conor, Knight of the Order of Calatrava, personally travelled some 4,000 leagues on horseback through the wilderness of the northern frontier. His primary interest dealt with his speciality:
the non-Christian, marauding Indians and the government's defense against their incursions. O'Conor did not dally with describing the population, industries, lifestyles, or geography of the frontier. Instead, he described the presidios and the Indian Nations in great detail. Most important, he took the extreme opposite position from Lafora in regard to Texas.

O'Conor noted that the continuation and perhaps reinforcement of the evangelization program for the Indians of Texas would be of great benefit for all involved. He also noted that the province contained untold untapped potential in fertile and agriculturally suited terrain. Above all, he stressed, Texas was the only bulwark of the Viceregency of New Spain against France and England. Texas, he reasoned, was the pivot point for defense against the French Americans and British Americans. Although Hugo de O'Conor recommended the strengthening and development of Texas, he did also recommend the abandonment of East Texas by civilians in order to put an end to the illicit smuggling of contraband.\footnote{21}

O'Conor's report verified the underlying suspicion and thought among some Spaniards that the difficult and perhaps not alluring Province of Texas was highly important for the protection and maintenance of the rest of New Spain. Ever since the days of La Salle in the 1680's, some frontier administrators had come to realize that the loss of Texas might very well mean to New Spain the loss of the northern frontier. History would eventually prove them right.

Spanish King Charles III took the reports of his North American frontier seriously. He was particularly influenced by the recommendations made by Don José de Galvez and Bernardo de Galvez. The Galvez relatives, who had become familiar with the frontier in the course of their military service, recommended the separation of the northern provinces from the Viceregency of New Spain. The formal authorization for such a move was issued in 1767, but it was not until 1776 that it was put into effect. On August 22, 1776, Don Teodoro de Croix was named Commandant General of the Interior Provinces of New Spain. La Comandancia General de las Provincias Internas de la Nueva España was established as a military-political government independent of the Viceroy of New Spain. It was composed of the frontier provinces of Sinaloa, Sonora (including Pimería Baja and Pimería Alta), Nueva Vizcaya, Nuevo Mexico, Nueva Extremadura (Coahuila), las Nuevas Filipinas (Texas) and Las Californias (upper and lower)\footnote{22}.
The creation of the Commandancy General of the Interior Provinces of New Spain did not truly help the King govern his North American frontier provinces and settlers any better. It did, however, strengthen the regional identity of the frontiersman. The Commandant General was, in effect, a military-political super-governor directly above the provincial governors of the various provinces. He was responsible only to the King and not to the Viceroy of New Spain. The Commandant General was the official representative of the King on the frontier and as such he headed all military, political, and economic affairs. All judicial matters in the Interior Provinces were still to be handled by the Audiencia de Guadalajara and its decisions could still be appealed to the Audiencia de México.

In 1785, the Commandancy General of the Interior Provinces was once again made dependent on the Viceroy of New Spain. Moreover, the vast territory was divided into three sections and placed under the command of three commandants appointed by the Viceroy. The provinces of the Californias (upper and lower), Sinaloa, and Sonora (including Pimería Baja and Pimería Alta) were placed under the Interior Provinces of the West. Nueva Vizcaya and Nuevo México were designated the Interior Provinces of the North. Texas, Coahuila, and the newly added Nuevo León, Nuevo Santander (Tamaulipas) and the districts of Saltillo and Parras (which had belonged to Nueva Vizcaya to that date) were designated the Interior Provinces of the East. This new arrangement lasted only two years.

The New Spain Viceroy, Manuel Antonio Flores, realigned the Interior Provinces in 1787. It was a rather simple and more manageable arrangement. The former Interior Provinces of the West and North were united under one commandant and given the title of Interior Provinces of the West. The Interior Provinces of the East, meanwhile, went unaltered. This arrangement lasted five years.

In 1792, the Interior Provinces were reunited once again under one commandant and again made independent of the Viceroy of New Spain. This time, however, the Californias (upper and lower), Nuevo León, and Nuevo Santander (Tamaulipas) were declared territories of the Viceregency and excluded from the Interior Provinces. It was a strange power play in which the Viceroy relinquished the north-central frontier provinces of Texas, Coahuila, Nuevo México, Nueva Vizcaya, Sinaloa and Sonora, but kept the outer coastal provinces of Nuevo San-
tander, the Californias, and Nuevo León which, although it was not a coastal province, was beginning to show economic gain.  

Improving the military-political governance of New Spain through the establishment of the Commandancy General of the Interior Provinces was not the only administrative change ordered by Charles III. He was apparently also very concerned with the economic aspect of his North American viceroyalty. Thus, in order to facilitate the collection and management of the royal revenue in New Spain, the King decreed on December 4, 1786, the establishment of the intendency system. The Vice-
regency of New Spain was then divided into twelve geographic areas and each placed under their own intendents appointed by the Viceroy. The intendents and their respective sub-delegates were charged with all economic affairs within their jurisdictions. However, they shared responsibilities with the Audiencias of Guadalajara and Mexico in judicial matters, and with the Viceroy when located outside the Interior Provinces. Technically, however, both the Viceroy and the Commandant Generals were administratively above the intendents. Just to keep the system in balance, the office of super-intendent to oversee the twelve intendents was created. As could be expected, the title of super-intendent eventually fell into the hands of the Viceroy of New Spain.

The twelve intendencies were composed of nine within the viceroyalty, and three in the Interior Provinces. Those belong-
ing to the Viceregency were (1) México, (2) Puebla, (3) Merida, (4) Veracruz, (5) Oaxaca, (6) Guanajuato, (7) Valladolid de Michoacan, (8) Zacatecas, and (9) Guadalajara. The three within the Interior Provinces were (10) Sonora, (11) Nueva Vizcaya, and (12) San Luis Potosí. The Intendency of Sonora had its seat at Arizpe (alongside the Commandant General of the Interior Provinces of the West), and was composed of the provinces of Sinaloa, Sonora, and the districts of Ostimuri, Pimería Alta and Pimería Baja. The Intendency of Nueva Vizcaya had its seat in the city of Chihuahua (also alongside the Commandant General of the Interior Provinces of the North).

The Intendency of San Luis Potosí had its seat in the city and province of the same name, and included the Interior Provinces of the East. Therefore, the intendency was composed of the provinces of Nuevo León, Coahuila, Tamaulipas, Texas, and San Luis Potosí. In this frontier intendency of the Commandant General (at Monterrey, Nuevo León), and the intendent (at San
Luis Potosí) were not located in the same city. It made communication and cooperation between the administrators slower and more difficult than in the other frontier intendencies. Being in the same city, however, did not automatically assure cooperation between the two administrators, who guarded their positions and jurisdictions jealously.

In retrospect, the end of the eighteenth century unsuspectedly heralded the end of the colonial period for Spanish North America. However, neither the residents of New Spain nor the frontiersmen in the Interior Provinces suspected as much. The Spanish King, in the relative comfort of his palaces, had decreed administrative changes for his North American viceroyalty to help produce better revenues and also keep it in line. The Viceroy in Mexico City had quietly and legally managed to recover as much of his lost power and authority as possible. The Commandant Generals, intendents, newly appointed bishops, and provincial governors found themselves caught in the power struggles, which amounted to a perfectly balanced structure where no one individual could rule autocratically. Perhaps the system had not changed much for the residents of New Spain, but they did for the frontiersmen.

The residents of the northern frontier of New Spain in the Interior Provinces had seen their provincial interests strengthened through the administrative changes decreed at the end of the eighteenth century. The establishment of the first Commandancy General of the Interior Provinces as an independent military government had united all the frontiersmen politically. Moreover, it had strengthened the realization that all frontiersmen from Texas to California had a great deal more in common with each other than with New Spain. The subsequent division of the Interior Provinces into two or three sections (East and West, or East, North, and West) had further regionalized the frontiersmen into specific geographic pockets. The regionalistic awareness caused by these military-political arrangements was truly to manifest itself in the nineteenth century, but it was initiated at the end of the eighteenth.

The establishment of the intendencies and the bishoprics also helped to reinforce the regional awareness and identity of the people on the northern frontier of New Spain. The recognition of regional economic autonomy went a long way towards bringing the people together in a specific geographic area. Perhaps more than the military-political realignment, this economic grouping under the intendencies brought the people
closer together. They now verified their feelings of regional well-being through economic dependence on each other. The regional bishoprics further strengthened this attitude by bringing the frontier pockets together through spiritual bonds.

Not to be ignored, the depredations caused by the Apaches, Comanches, Tarahumara, Seris, Pimas, and various other Indian tribes and nations also helped bring the Christian frontiersmen together. They, the Indians and the terrain, were a common enemy, so to speak. Another common problem for the frontiersmen was the distance from the central governments of New Spain in Mexico City, and the King in Spain.

In light of the common problems and the administrative realignments, it was only logical for the frontiersmen to begin to develop strong bonds reflected first in regionalistic identities and later in military-political adventures. As expected, the residents of Texas, Tamaulipas, Coahuila, and Nuevo León saw themselves as a regional people with common interests, common needs, common problems, and common goals. They were the Interior Provinces of the East. They were the bishopric of Linares. And, with San Luis Potosí, they were the Intendency of San Luis Potosí.

Likewise, the people of Nuevo México and Nueva Vizcaya saw themselves bound by common interest, needs, problems, and goals. They, the residents of that vast territory later to be known as Chihuahua, Durango, New Mexico, and West Texas, felt united and bound to each other. They were the Interior Provinces of the North, and went aligned with Sinaola and Sonora, the Interior Provinces of the West. They were also the bishopric of Nueva Vizcaya. This bond was so strong that even when Nuevo Mexico was deliberately not mentioned in the establishment of the Intendency of Nueva Vizcaya, both the New Mexicans and the governors of Nueva Vizcaya just assumed that they were automatically included.

Sinaloa and Sonora, which at times were attached to Nueva Vizcaya through the Commandancy General, were also quite autonomous in their regional identity. They did, however, lose the Californias, which were stricken from the Commandancy General and from the Intendency of Sonora. It was not until the nineteenth century that the Californias would cease being frontier territories of the Viceregency of New Spain kept separate from the other frontier provinces. The people of Sonora, nonetheless, kept identifying the Californias as fellow frontiersmen who had apparently fallen victims to far-off politics.
Pimería Alta, later to be known as Arizona, was very much a part of Sonora, its Commandancy General, its intendency, and its bishopric. It was, however, isolated in the desert and surrounded by marauding Indians. This in itself kept Pimería Alta an autonomous district within the jurisdictions of Sonora.

One final element which helped cement the regionalistic identity of the frontiersmen was the expulsion of the Jesuits and the complete takeover of the frontier by the Franciscans. Acting both as regular and missionary clergy they were the spiritual leaders and bearers of religion on the frontier of North America. Unknowingly, and perhaps truly unplanned, they brought unity of religious thought and ideals to the frontier.

The political, religious, regionalistic unity initiated during the last quarter of the eighteenth century was destined to reverberate throughout the nineteenth century in a long series of rebellions, counter-revolutions, declarations of independence, secessions, wars within and without the national governments, and eventual territorial separation of the northern half of the frontier provinces. No one, however, could have foreseen these dramatic and drastic eventualities. When the eighteenth century closed, both the governors and the governed felt that the changes would benefit them mutually.
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In presenting a history of the daily life of the North American Indo-Hispanic Christian, it is necessary to capture the spirit or soul of these people. This paper will attempt to discover and unfold the Indo-Hispano’s daily life as it was conditioned by and as it grew out of the colonizer’s established institutions.

Of the several Spanish institutions established in the exploration and colonization periods of the American Southwest, the religious institution is probably the most complex, the most misunderstood, and yet the most enduring of all.

In order to place the daily life of the Indo-Hispanic Christian in proper perspective, it is necessary to present briefly the Spanish institution often called the mission system in its varied forms of development and application. After all, it was from this system that the soul of the people called “mestizos” sprang.

THE MISSION SYSTEM

In order to have a systematized method of evangelization for the Indians, one which would be effective, the following structures were employed by the Spanish religio-military colonizers.

Reducciones: The reductions were the villages established by the mutual effort of the Spanish Cross and Crown, wherein the villagers were brought in and compelled to live in communities. In essence, the nomadic Indians were reduced to a sedentary life and were governed as wards of the Crown, with the influencing agents being the clergy. It was a form or type of trusteeship under both the Church and State. The reducciones were much more in evidence in California, Texas, Florida, and Southwestern Arizona than they were in New Mexico and Southern Colorado. There are some records of the reducciones in New Mexico. They were more often referred to as “las conversiones” or “las doctrinas.” In either case, the purpose and the aim were the same.
In New Mexico, because of the life-style of the Pueblo Indians, it was not necessary to reduce them to a sedentary or village life, inasmuch as it already existed for the most part. All that was deemed necessary was to erect a convento or mission church within the pueblo, with "visitás" or mission outposts, and to proceed with the evangelization and conversion of the Pueblo Indians.

Repartimiento: Another influencing factor was the "repartimiento." Within the reducciones there was founded the repartimiento system wherein the Indians living in the villages were compelled to labor for a period of time in specified places assigned to them: the mines, the farms, or the arts and crafts shops. Within this social institution, the landowner had a right to the labor but not the person of the Indian. This latter fact was partly due to the efforts of Bartolome de las Casas (1474-1566), a Dominican priest who earned the title "Defender of the Indians." It was through his insistent efforts that the Holy See, the Spanish hierarchy, and the Spanish civil government set up some norms for colonization and evangelization which eliminated the "slave" system.

Encomiendas: A third facet affecting the daily life of all was the "encomiendas." The abuses of the aforementioned systems, repartimiento and reducciones, evolved into the encomienda system, which required the Indian to pay some tribute, that is, a tax, which was normally done in the form of labor, for which the Indian received protection by and sometimes from the landowner. This could be likened to the European fuedal system and is sometimes referred to as a quasi-feudal revival within the Hispanic colonizing process.

The results of the above-mentioned structures are that, within them, the social and colonizing efforts were carried out. The clergy taught the Indians the common arts, farming, mining, the raising of cattle, and religion, all of which the Indian adapted and integrated into or rejected from their life-style and religious practices. But the converse also being true, the Spaniards incorporated, integrated, and adapted much of the Indian culture into their own. Hence, eventually is seen not only a mestizo people, but a mestizo culture gradually unfolding into the spirit and soul of a "new" people. These Christian mestizos began to fan out like tributaries from a great river.

The points of contact of the Spanish colonization and Spanish evangelization reach across the entire southern part of
the United States: Florida, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Southern Colorado, Arizona, and California.

The first two, namely Florida and Louisiana, were the first Spanish territories to be lost to the English, French, and Americano invaders. West Florida and East Florida were ceded to England in 1763 and then ceded to the United States in 1819. Louisiana was like a political football. It was ceded to Spain by France in 1762, receded to France by the secret Treaty of San Ildefonso in 1800 and then sold to the United States in 1803.

The last territory lost by Mexico was what is present-day New Mexico, Southern Colorado, and Arizona. This fact has a direct bearing on the stability and development of the daily life of the Indo-Hispanic Christian within the southwest area of the United States. In areas such as Louisiana and Florida, because of the early loss to the English, French, and Americanos, there is little left by way of a deeply-rooted and strong mestizo or Hispanic custom and tradition. Because of the much later loss of the Hispanic and Mexican lands to the Americanos through surreptitious aggression under the guise of Manifest Destiny, there was much more time to develop deep and strong roots in the religio-cultural tradition of the Indo-Hispanic people. Thus, eradication of the soul of the people was not only difficult, but next to impossible.

The central border lands were isolated for such a long, long time that the Indo-Hispanic roots really took hold, being deeply imbedded and nourished, as if by an underground lake, through the colonizer’s mission system. In the long run, the above-named missionary institutions, in spite of some of the abuses, were, it seems, much more favorable to and for the Indian than the Anglo-Saxon and French systems used in other parts of the United States. This appears so because the Indian still lives with us today in the Southwest, whereas in other parts of the United States where non-Hispanic or non-Mexican systems were attempted, the Indian for all practical purposes is now, or is virtually now, extinct. The alleged cruelty of the Hispanic colonizers, whether military or missionary, toward the Indian is much too much overplayed. Their successes, on the other hand, are downgraded.

In this sense, the evangelization process was not only more effective on the part of the Hispanic or Mexican people, but better adapted to the circumstances of the times.
AN OVERVIEW OF THE MISSIONS

From the hardships encountered by the preliminary explorations to the eventual establishment of mestizo settlements, there were, for the most part, a group of priests side by side with the soldiers. The priests not only ministered to the soldiers but to the Indians as well. In some instances, even the soldiers helped in teaching religion to the Indians. Hernando de Soto in Florida and other individuals throughout the Southwest assisted the missionaries. In many instances, the evangelical efforts of the missionaries were greeted by frustration, sometimes by death, and several times by both. The efforts of these missionaries and martyrs reflect the struggle and growth of the daily life of the Indo-Hispanic Christians.

The pattern of daily life, whether at one end of the continent or the other, or the parts in between known as the borderlands, was basically the same although the results did differ in degree.

Initially, when the first settlements were established, the Indian life-style was very much cramped. If they were nomadic like the Navajo, their freedom of movement was curtailed. If they were sedentary like the Pueblo, their freedom of development was diminished. The Indian was regimented and restricted by the missionary as well as the military. This was true whether or not it was within the reducciones, las conversiones, or las doctrinas. While the Indians were strictly regimented, the colonists, whether Spaniard or mestizo from Mexico or mestizo born in the new settlements, were less regimented by the missionaries and soldiers. Historically, very few Spaniards actually came into the Southwest. The colonists who came, were, for the most part, mestizos. Regimentation by the military and religious was not the only restriction imposed upon the Indo-Hispanic Christian. If there were restrictions upon the mestizos, the more harsh and rugged ones were due to the isolation, environment, and terrain within which they found themselves. Often the new settlers were confronted by either vast reaches of desert, high, harsh mountains, or irregular rains. It was to their advantage to stick together in order to survive, for everyone shared in life, just as they shared in death. Together they shared disappointment and failure, just as they shared success and progress. To these Indo-Hispanic colonizers, it was more than just a daily way of life — it was life.

Many historians summarily present a daily schedule of routine activities within a mission, without looking in detail as to what was actually occurring. Historians will, as if in passing, state
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that all colonists, as well as the Indians, were summoned to Mass at sunrise by the ringing of the bell or Angelus. Everyone came to pray at Mass, with some nominal instruction, were given breakfast, and sent into the fields or mines to work or to learn a trade or craft. They were resummoned by the Angelus at mid-day, said more prayers, had a meal, perhaps followed by a brief rest or siesta, and then they were sent back to work. They were then marched back to the mission church with the evening Angelus where they recited or were taught more prayers, given supper, and sent to retire for the evening.

This is the way some historians present the daily schedule of the Indo-Hispanic Christians. Yet a close analysis of the above schedule, cryptic though it may be, reveals a complete and thorough process of evangelization. A complex spirit was being planted in a developing society. Ordinary historians or historical novelists gloss over this routine, but the ethno-historian intuitively grasps and understands much that is omitted. What originally began as a teaching-learning process of the colonizer and colonized, the arts and crafts, drama and song, liturgy, medicine, law, proverbs, and religion evolved into a mutual intermingling, with a development of an entirely new life-style or spirit with its own identifiable soul. This can be found to be true, whether in the rancherías and pueblos or in the urban and military or mission outposts. It can be detected among the young, or the ancianos (the respected elders), within the gente de razón as well as the mestizos and the Indians. It was the beginning of the birth of a “new” people: Indo-Hispanic Christians.

There was some concern regarding syncretism of Catholic traditional beliefs and practices during the colonial period. The clergy did not want Christian customs and religio-traditional practices to be mixed with the Indian traditions, beliefs, and practices, especially since the Hispanos had just come over from a religiously split Europe. Protestantism had just begun, so the Spaniards were fearful of another division. Any syncretism between Catholic and Indian religious practices was then held to a minimum by the missionaries, insofar as they were pastorally able. It now appears that the Indian, perhaps, was able to adopt and adapt more of the southern European Catholic practices into their own cult than the reverse, although exchange did occur.
Aside from song, drama and dance are probably the most expressive revelation of the soul of a people. When song, drama, and dance are combined, a truly vivid and legitimate expression of the soul and spirit of a people occurs. Liturgy and worship result when prayer is added. Using drama and dance, an attempt will be made to discover the soul of these mestizo Christians.

The first morality play in these United States, other than those strictly Indian, was in all probability performed on June 24, 1598, in the Villa de San Gabriel near present-day San Juan Pueblo, New Mexico. The day mentioned is the Feast of St. John the Baptist, and don Juan Oñate, governor of the new colony, ordered a holiday. A Mass was celebrated with all its accompanying festivities, followed by a drama, wherein a sham battle between the Spaniards and the Moors was re-enacted. The dramatics no doubt had an impact upon the onlooking Indians, especially when the men on horseback showed not only great riding skill, but also great dexterity in handling their weapons. The Indians, rather than just being spectators, were participants in the festivities. The participation by the Indians was interpreted by the colonizers to mean the latter's being accepted.

That the two groups accepted each other is attested to in a book written in 1610 entitled, Historia de la Nueva México, by Captain Gasper Pérez de Villagrá. The author states that the Indians made them welcome and shared their homes with the colonizers. No doubt, that dramatic presentation was the grand beginning of other morality plays and dramas in this country. On the other hand, the Indians had their own drama, and not at all strange, they had their own morality plays depicting their own struggles against the conquistadores.

The Matachines is a morality play done in dance form. The company of dancers, colorfully clad with multicolored laces, ribbons, and highly adorned mitre-like headdresses, form two lines parallel to each other while the head dancer or monarca weaves his way in and out of the other dancers, crossing over from one line to the other and up and back between both lines, leading a young girl dressed in white, whom the monarca is trying to protect. The music supplied for the intricate dance step can be either a violin, guitar, accordion, or any combination of the three, or even a drum, as is the case in the Indian adaptation of the Matachines.

This dance was originally a Spanish dance, which was
adapted both by the mestizos and the Indians. And, as is the case in all adaptations, there are variations.

Among the specifics used by the Matachine dancers is the palma, an elaborately carved and colorfully painted three-pronged wand or baton. In some regions, the dancers also have bells attached to their ankles, while in other regions, along with the palma which is always in the right hand, the dancers may also have a quirt, or whip, in their left hand. In other regions, the dancers may have a maraca in their left hand. The maraca is a dried, colorfully painted gourd filled with dried seeds or pebbles.

The Matachines may be performed either at a fiesta or feria, during the celebration of the Mass, or before the celebration of the Mass.

Not only is the moral of the dance-play kept alive through oral history, with its regional variations, but the tradition of the dance is preserved from one generation to the next by the monarca (mananca is the Indian adaptation of the Hispanic term "monarca") who teaches it to the younger members of the dance group.

There has been much controversy as to the meaning of the morality play of the Matachines. Some feel that it is a presentation of the perennial battle of good and evil, light and darkness, while others contend that it is a presentation of the many battles between the Spaniards and the Moors, since the dancers paint their faces black or cover their faces with a black tassel-like cloth. Others hold to the opinion that it is the re-enactment of the tragic life of Cortés’ lover, Malinche, incorrectly identified as the daughter of Montezuma. Whichever opinion is held, the message and moral known to the monarca, his troupe of dancers, and the initiated is conveyed.

Another drama, the Christmas drama, is presented in the form of processions, songs, and prayers, and is popularly known as Las Posadas. This prayer-drama has a longstanding tradition in early Hispanic North America and is continued today. Las Posadas is the communal celebration of a search for lodging by San José and La Virgen María, on their journey to Bethlehem while María was with child. Just as María and José found their trip discouraging because they were refused lodging along the way (but, eventually became happy when the Christ Child was born) so, too, the participants in the drama of Las Posadas are discouraged when they are refused entrance to the various
homes. But, at last, they are admitted to a home and there is much rejoicing.

Las Posadas are celebrated for nine days, as in a novena, commemorating the nine months of the pregnancy of the Virgin Mary. It is also a communal celebration, that is, it is never just a celebration by one family. It is the celebration of several families or by an entire village, or whole city, or town. The dramatization is done in chorus form. Some of the participants are outside of the house while others are inside. There is the alternating song by each group: one requesting entrance, the other refusing. The lyrics are very doctrinal in content, and thus serve as a teaching vehicle for all the participants, young and old alike, as is the case with many of the songs and hymns of the time. An example of the chorus dialogue for Las Posadas is:

**Saint Joseph**
(or those on the outside)

En nombre del cielo  
Le pido posada  
Pues no puede andar  
Mi esposa amada.  
No seas inhumano  
Tennos caridad  
Que el Dios de los cielos  
Te lo pagará  
Venimos rendidos  
Desde Nazareth  
Yo soy carpintero  
De nombre José  
Posada te pide  
Amado casero  
Por solo una noche  
La Reina del Cielo.  
Mi esposa es María  
Es Reina del Cielo  
Y madre va a ser  
Del Divino Verbo.

**Home Owner**
(those inside)

Aquí no es mesón  
Sigan adelante  
Yo no puedo abrir  
No sea algun tunante  
Ya se pueden ir  
Y no molestar  
Porque si me infado  
Los voy a pelear  
No me importa el nombre  
Déjenme dormir  
Pues que ya les digo  
Que no hemos de abrir  
Pues si es una reina  
Quien lo solicita  
Cómo es que de noche  
Anda tan solita?  
Eres tu, José?  
Y esposa es María?  
Entren, peregrinos  
No los conocía.

With these verses sung, admitting the outsiders, the theme changes to one of gratitude, and blessings are asked upon the home owner, his family, and his home. Hence:
Dios pague Señores
Vuesta caridad
Y así os colme el cielo
de felicidad.

Dichosa la casa
Que abriga este día
A la Virgen pura
La hermosa María.

Then, those outside carrying a statue of Mary and Joseph enter the home, and all together join in the singing of:

Entren santos peregrinos
Reciban este rincón
No de esta pobre morada
Sino de mi corazón

The celebration does not end at this point, but is continued by the sharing of refreshments and lively dances. In some regions of colonial Hispanic North America, and is some sections of present-day United States, there was the added element of the piñata, which symbolized the battle between good and evil. The child or adult was blindfolded (sometimes several children were blindfolded) spun around and made to swat at the piñata which, naturally, cannot be seen since the person is blindfolded... just as some evil cannot be seen. The blindfolded person used a stick or a cane, representing the rod of justice, which will eventually break evil and God’s graces will flow forth upon all. There were several versions for the Piñata song all of which contain a moral. Hence, one such verse is

Si le pego recio o quedito
Se mueve y se me escapa
Y de risa se mueve
Y me hace payacito.

Which is to say, such is the way evil taunts us, and at times makes fools of us. This is one of the examples of the instructional content found in so many Indo-Hispanic songs.

It must be made clear that Las Posadas did not end after the festivities in the home of the last day of the novena. The entire nine-day drama was in preparation for everyone’s participation in La Misa de Gallo or Christmas Eve Midnight Mass.

After Christmas there was the preparation for the season of giving gifts, which for the Indo-Hispanic people was January 6, the Feast of the Three Kings or Magi. This Fiesta de los Reyes also had some dramatic presentations with songs and games, all played by the children, which also had a moral or religious value which it conveyed pastorally.

Another fully developed Christmas drama, with a complete
cast of characters, live animals such as sheep, chickens, pet dogs, and burros and a full script which was originally kept alive through oral tradition and only of recent times written, is that of Las Pastorelas.

This again, is a morality play about the birth of the Christ Child and the role of the Wise Men. Like so many of the dramas performed in the early Indo-Hispanic villages, towns, and cities, this is one that has the full participation of everyone, young and old alike. It is not only inspirational but it is also doctrinally instructional.

The pastorela is a lengthy dramatic presentation of the shepherds' journey to Bethlehem to render homage to the newborn Christ. As literary form, the pastorela is an example of the genre which developed in Europe in the fifteenth century. Although the pastorela is essentially the story of the Savior's birth, it contains shrewdly interjected into the dialogue or soliloquies vital points of the Catholic faith. As functional literature then, the pastorela became a vehicle for religious instruction used by the missionary to New Spain.

The pastorela text combines the two elements of humor and seriousness and delivers the dialogue in the simple, rustic language of the characters. Animated by dance and song, the drama becomes a lesson in Christian doctrine. The human quest for happiness is depicted by the shepherds' perseverance in their search for the Christ Child in spite of repeated threats and attacks by the devil, Lucifer. The theme of the struggle between "flesh and spirit" is represented by the sword fight between Lucifer and the Archangel Michael, who triumphs over the Evil One. Freed from the wiles of the devil, the shepherds are able to continue the journey to the stable and enjoy the vision of the God made Man as they offer their gifts.3

PRAYER CUSTOMS OF THE EARLY SETTLERS

The practice of praying by the early settlers and later those who became part of the more permanent and developed socio-religious dimensions of the rancherias, villages, or colonies, was not limited to attending church on Sunday. This was the case because, as happens so often, the people were without a priest, or were visited infrequently by priests because there were such vast distances between the parroquia and the visita or mission outposts, or because of the very isolation of the people themselves.

Yet, in spite of the isolation factor or the scarcity of priests, the mestizo Christians showed a strong tradition of prayer.
The practice of prayer, both formal and informal, permeated the daily life of the people at all levels of activity. The religious drama or the morality plays as previously described were, and continue to be, a definite and valid form of prayer.

There are other forms of prayer which developed through the generations along with the more formal and cultic prayers such as the Rosary and the Via Crucis or Stations of the Cross, the Angelus, the celebration of the Eucharist, baptism, confirmation, marriage, and burials and funerals.

Among the many cultic practices or religious customs of the mestizo or Indo-Hispanic people are the velorios (wakes), procesiones (processions) with either the Blessed Sacrament or with their patron saint, or with both. There was the custom of Los Santos, the statuary or pictures of the saints which were taken to the fields to ask for rain, for example, and the use of las velas or candles. All of these have a long tradition in Christianity. Some go back to pre-Christian or Old Testament customs and traditions, such as the custom of using candles, not only to be able to see, but to signify the presence of God as we see in the Old Testament, the Pillar of Fire.

Another much misunderstood custom is the Altarcito de Casa or the home altar. This was used for either formal or informal prayer. Occasionally, when the priest was traveling through, he would use the altarcito to celebrate Mass for all the vecinos in the region.

All these customs flow from, are dependent upon, and are an extension of the more formal prayers and worship which are normally understood and written about. The home practices for la religion casera have never been dissociated from their origins. On the contrary, those folkways of religion are deeply rooted in their origin and tradition. All these practices of informal prayer show the facility and ease which the people have in their relationship with God. It was unpretentious, very personalistic, and it is a living faith.

To classify some or all of those prayer as superstitious is to show a complete lack of understanding of history, cultural anthropology, and popular religiosity. Such categorizations as "superstitious" once again establish the paradox: the dichotomy between the people's faith and the theologian's faith — that is, between the lived faith and that abstract theorized faith. Superstitious ritual or ceremony is that which has been cut from its roots or points of origin, is now devoid of a real past, and has now
more of a fantasized past. Such was not the case with these early settlers.

For these Indo-Hispanic people God is real. He sent his Son to be our Savior. Christ is born of the Virgin Mary. Mary has a special role and place in our salvation. There have been, and there are, many good and extraordinary people who lived saintly lives. These are the saints or santos. These are legitimate and valid forms of religious expression as developed by these mestizo people. These people stuck to the basics or fundamentals. They lived, they died, and in between living and dying, they worshipped and prayed in a basic, festive way. Yet, their customs have been called superstitious.”

The conquistadores fell into the trap of referring to the Indian customs and traditional rituals as “superstitious,” much like the Norteamericanos did when they became the conquistadores of the Indo-Hispanic Southwest. These attitudes are symptomatic of a monosyndrome, that is, the acceptance of only one model or norm for anything, whether religion, government, education, or economics. Anything “else,” or anything “different” is classified as no good, wrong, or superstitious by those who suffer from such a monosyndrome. (Recent developments in ethno-historical studies based on cultural anthropological research are beginning to remove the stigma of superstition by showing another valid perspective to the many multifaceted reality of religio-cultural diversity having its own beauty and legitimacy). The beauty and cultural expression were recorded for posterity. It can be found in the relaciones of the missionaries.

The celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments for and of the mestizo people, the Indo-Hispanics, are recorded from the beginning up to the present in several historical writings. Those writings show the work of general, everyday activity. Such writings were the responsibility of every missionary. He kept a log or record of the number of converts, the number of marriages performed or blessed, and the number of Christian burials. Occasionally, along with these recordings or logs is found the word, “fiesta,” especially as related to the patronal feast of the parish, village, or town. Once in a while the term “fiesta” is found in the writings in connection with baptism or marriage.

Occasionally, there is, today, some confusion between the terms “fiesta” and “feria.” “Fiesta” is used in connection with a religious ceremony, while “feria” is more commonly used in relation to the combined religio-civil celebrations or those
purely civil. "Feria" is also a longer duration than "fiesta." The "feria" has more of a carnival or bazaar atmosphere. In either event, they are community-wide celebrations, with everyone involved.

The people and culture, a mestisaje that developed over the three hundred-year period (1500-1808), were celebrants. They had an identifiable soul and spirit of a nueva raza.” They knew and accepted the fact that the Mass was the central or focal point of worship. And, because they were a believing and worshipping people, they liturgically idealized their culture and culturalized their liturgy.

The fiesta was not only the celebration of the Mass; it flowed over into their daily lives, and thus was an extension or continuation of their celebration with God, which was shared with the extended family, compadres, padrinos, hijos, primos, and abuelos. All shared in their riches as well as their poverty, in their worship and in their fiestas.

Their wealth was found in their close family ties more than in their material or monetary possessions. Their wealth was their God, the Blessed Mother, their patron saint, their family, and their friends. Their wealth was also their ability to bring all those rich values and traditions into a harmonious, respectful, prayerful, and joyous occasion of communal sharing. It formed a mutual and familial support system.

As often as there were baptisms and weddings, there were occasions to celebrate. On the occasion of a baptism, they rejoiced with a fiesta. They rejoiced at the entrance of another member to the Christian community, and they celebrated another addition to the extended family between the new padrinos and the compadres.

The padrinos were expected to bring a gift or regalo to the newly-baptized. If possible, the gift was something practical, such as a hen from which eventually the newly-baptized would one day have several chickens of his or her own.

There was also a regular ritual after baptism when the padrinos would return the infant to the parents. This ritual was “Compadres, reciban (name of the infant) que de la iglesia salió con los santos olíos y la agua bendita.” The parents, taking the child, would say, “Recibimos (name of the infant) de que la iglesia saliste con los santos olíos y la agua bendita.”

That same child could, in his or her lifetime, have several fiestas. For example, on the occasion of the reception of the
sacraments such as Confirmation, whenever that occurred (because the bishops rarely came around), at their own marriage, and then at the baptism of their children, or also their patronal feast, their namesake, and the village patron saint. All those were occasions for fiesta, occasions for celebration, occasions for living a Christian life in communal sharing.

The marriage tradition also had its share of ritual and ceremony. There was the formality, for example, of having the parents of the groom go and request, in marriage, the hand of the bride and if the offer was accepted, there was an announcement fiesta and naturally a fiesta following the wedding ceremony itself. If the parents of the bride refused the request of the parents of the proposed groom, they were given a squash or calabaza as a sign of their refusal.

These people even celebrated the patronal feast of each individual or the saint for whom the person was named. This was a long-standing custom and it was more of a celebration of the saint's name than his or her birthday, which is the custom today. They also celebrated the patron of the church, as well as the national holidays.

There was a very close interplay between their daily lives, their religious expression and their civil lives. For example, it was not just "Good morning," or "Buenos Dias," but "May God grant you a good day." "Buenos dias le de Dios." This showed the personalism between the people themselves and between them and God. For example, God the Father was often addressed in informal heart-felt prayer, as "Mi Tata Dios" or "Mi Tatita Dios." (This is very much like that of the Aramaic concept when they addressed God as "Abba ... that is, Father.")

These mestizo people addressed the Blessed Mother in words of endearment, namely, Mi Madre and Mi Madrecita. When they addressed the Blessed Mother under the title of Our Lady of Guadalupe, they did so in the tender form of La Morenita.

These facets of a personalist faith experience, especially among the poor, found their way from the more formal, cultic celebrations, and gave the added dimensions of a living faith among the mestizo people, a living faith that extended beyond the interior walls of the church. It was a living faith that permeated their daily lives. These Indo-Hispanic people also taught their children and their children's children to live, to dance, and to die. They taught their children to pray, to sing, to
celebrate in an expressive, spontaneous, and hence creative way.

They were a creative people in spite of the fact that food was not easy to come by. They toiled hard with the crusty soil and traveled long distances on the hunt.

Morning and evening prayers were perhaps originally memorized but they also became creative and spontaneous; for example, a morning prayer might start out thus:

Bendita sea la luz del día,
y El Señor que nos la envía
Bendita la cruz donde falleció
el cordero hijo de Dios verdadero.
Según la iglesia que lo canta
Señor me redimiste con tu pasión.
Esta alma que me dieste,
Líbramel a de tentación,
que no muera triste
ni muera sin confesión.5

An evening prayer was:

Animas devotas mías
De perfecta caridad
En las penas que esta
En mi grande necesidad.
El Señor, me valga con su
poder infinito,
Mi Padre, San José de mi alma
Esposa del Padre Eterno
Por El, amor de Dios,
Le pido que me livre del infierno.6
San Antonio, Amante glorioso
Esta pena que tengo
Vuélvemela gozo
Que por tu niño querido
Que en tus brazos tienes
Humilde te pido
Que de mí te acuerdes.7

A prayer that was recited while praying the Way of the Cross, either in church, or at home in front of the altarcito was:

Alabemos y enzalémos
A Jesus crucificado
Que en una cruz le vemos
De pies y manos elevado y clavado
Por nosotros ha sufrido espinas
Llagas y cadenas
Que en una cruz le vemos
De pies y manos elevado y clavado
Por nosotros ha sufrido espinas
Llagas y cadenas
Que en una cruz
Le vemos herido y a muerto de penas
Pues, eres salvador Padre de gran
clemencia.
Esperamos tu amor
Recibe nuestros sentidos y
Te pedimos perdón.  

This was a popular prayer recited during Lent:

Rebeldes hijos de un buen Padre
Su voz nos está llamando
Su corazón tierno y amante
Ofrécenos perdón y amor.
De la penitencia es el tiempo
Nos lo ofrece el Salvador
Para implorar su clemencia
Y conseguir nuestra salvación. 

There were all kinds of prayers for all kinds of necessities: prayers for deliverance from plagues; for sicknesses; to request help for an old, tired body.

Prayer oftentimes was delegated to an official leader for the community, El Rezador, and sometimes when there was no priest present or available, El Rezador would lead the community in prayer at a wake or a funeral or any festive celebration. Once such prayer was:

El Rezador said:
   Salgan, salgan, salgan,
   animas de penas.
The people responded:
   Que el rosario rompe
   grillos y cadenas.
El Rezador:
¿Cuáles son las que salen?
The people responded:
Las benditas almas
que van para el cielo.  

We can see that the people were a prayerful and devout people. They were creative in their prayers. Their prayers were inspirational and instructional.

They were a reflective people and because they were reflective and observant of the life around them, they were able to be creative in prayer and respectful of life and death, of the young and old, of the material and the spiritual.

FOLK WISDOM
Much of their philosophy of life and practice of religion can be found by a close study and analysis of their folk wisdom, the dichos or sayings. Every culture has its share and many are very similar with different cultures.

Within the indo-Hispanic North Americans the wisdom of the ages can be found flowing from the lips of the young and old alike. These dichos and proverbs were not only inspirational but instructional as well (much like the Wisdom Books of the Old Testament.) The use of proverbs and dichos or sayings were to encourage and help one live not only a good life, but a better life. They were used to teach honesty, justice, fair play, love, work, religion, respect for others, etc.

The thinkers or “pensadores” of the people were really the philosophers of the village or town. They were often seen sitting in the sun with their backs up against the wall of the house, and because of this, they were often referred to as los resolaneros.

Silently, the resolaneros or thinkers observed the life around them. Reflectively, they analysed that which was perceptively seen. Poetically, they expressed and expounded on their silent, reflective analysis.

The following are dichos on religion, poverty, family life, and old age, and dichos on life in general.

**DICHOS ON RELIGION**
Tomo silencio porque compreendo el mundo.

In the vastness of the world, one is silent.

Quien cierra la puerta al pobre
la del cielo no hallará.

The one who closes the door to the poor
will find the door of the heaven closed.
Tarde o temprano
Dios da a cada uno
su merecido.

Solo Dios basta.

Rezarle solo a
su santa.

El hábito no hace
e el Padre.

El hombre propone
y Dios dispone.

El error del peluquero crece;
et el error del médico se en-
tierra;
El error del Padre llega
hacia al infierno.

Sooner or later
God will give
everyone his due.

God is all that counts.

Tell your problems only to
those who can help.

The collar does not
a priest make.

Man proposes and
God disposes.

The barber’s mistake grows out;
The surgeon’s error will be buried;
But the priest’s error will lead
you to Hell.

---

DICHOS ON POVERTY

Si hay razón por la pobreza
también hay motivo por el
respeto.

Vale más un mal vestido
que ir desnudo.
Un mal llama a otro.

Uno tiene que amarrarse
do las tripas.
Todos llevan su cruz, unos de
palo y otros de plata.
Para los pinos, también
hay hacha.
Soy como el rico, ya comí
ya me voy.
Siempre los pobres
son desgraciados.

If there is a reason for pov-
erty, there is also a reason for
dignity.
It is better to wear old clothes
than to go naked.
Misfortune brings misfor-
tune.
One has to keep tightening
his belt.
Rich and poor alike have
their problems.
Everyone will be taken down
a notch or two.
Just like the rich, I ate,
not I take my leave.
The poor are always the
unfortunate.
Se le compuso el ojo a la tuerta.
Quien sabe en que palo ira a parar el pajaro.

Bienes mal adquiridos a nadie han enriquecido.
Cuando no hay carne de lomo de todo como.
Dios da almendras al que no tiene muelas.
Del arbol caido todos hacen leña.
El que no llora no mama.

Entre los ciegos el tuerto es rey.
La ocasión hace al ladron.

Things are looking up.
No one knows what lies in store for the future.
Cheaters never win.
Make the most of what you have.
Success comes too late in life to enjoy it.
Everyone takes advantage of another’s misfortune.
The squeaky wheel gets the grease.
Among the blind, the one-eyed are kings.
With the opportunity, a thief is born.

DICHOES ON FAMILY LIFE AND OLD AGE
A través de los años uno comprende la vida.
Las cuentas de mi vida serán las leyendas de los jóvenes.
Cada día es un don.
Somos cautivos de malas memorias.
Soy madre, disculpe si soy orgullosa.
La familia es como un río: una parte ya ha pasado, otra hay que venir. Nada es estático, todo se mueve día por día a nuestro destino.

One begins to understand life in old age.
My life story will be the young people’s history.
Every day is a gift.
We are slaves of forgetful memories.
Forgive me for being proud of my children.
The family is like a river: some have already passed by, others are yet to come. Nothing is static, everything keeps moving, day by day, to our destiny.
Ser anciano es tener tiempo para recordar.
El cuerpo tiene su estaciones y temporadas.

DICHOS ON LIFE IN GENERAL
Costumbres no son muletas, son caminos de la vida que hemos hecho.
Las palabras luchan para salir, ya habladas se mueren, pero sigue viviendo el alma.
La buena vida es la propia.

De nada sirve hablar a los sordos.
Echar vinagre con la lengua.
El viento puede ser amigo o enemigo: nos acuerda del mal o del bien.

A cada santo se le llega su función.
Al decir las verdades se pierden las amistades.

Al que no le cuesta hace fiesta.
Amor con amor se paga.
Bala que zumba no mata.

Aunque se viste la mona de seda, mona se queda.
Cada oveja con su pareja.
De noche todos los gatos son pardos.
En boca cerrada no entra mosca.

To be old is to have time to reflect.
The body, like the world, has its season.

Our customs are not a crutch. They are the path of life that we have paved.
Guard your tongue. Spoken words die. Only the soul lives forever.
Don’t live someone else’s life.
Don’t waste your words.

A sharp tongue.
The wind can be friend or foe: destructive or refreshing.

Every dog will have its day.

You will find out who are your friends when you tell the truth.
Don’t enjoy life at someone else’s expense.
Repay love with love.
Fear less the talkative person than the silent one.
Clothes do not a personality make.
To each his own.
At night everyone looks the same.
Mind your own business.
Donde hablan letras callan barbas.  

Spoken words are useless when
up against the written word.

El golpe avisa.  

When it occurs, you will
know.

El tiempo es buen amigo y sabe desengañar.  

Time helps one see things clearly.

FOLK MEDICINE

Every culture has its history of folk medicine and in some instances there are strains of syncretism, that is to say, folk medicine with witchcraft. Witchcraft is the aberration of folk medicine and religion combined. The emphasis here will be general folk medicine as used by the curandero or folk doctor. There will also be some examples of the uses of herbs as medication. The practical knowledge of herbology comes from generations of experiential knowledge passed on through oral tradition and only recently in written form.

Several of the respected elders, los ancianos, had greater trust in the curandero than they did in the licensed medical practitioner. For the vast majority of these mestizo ancianos, the doctor was too far away and not easily reached. (Isolation, as previously mentioned, was one of the determining factors in helping the mestizo develop his ingenuity as a curandero.)

Some of the practical folk medicine customs were a mixture of Indo-Hispanic or mestizo and European practices. Sweating, leeching, and cupping were generally European importations. Added to these are several of the native American medicinal practices. The curandero, who was held in high esteem, added the dimension of prayer and fasting. This was to help the practitioner, or curandero, to be able to use his God-given healing powers for the benefit of the sick.

The curandero was often afraid that if he abused his skill, or art of healing he would lose it. God would take it away from him. Because of the folk doctor's high degree of ethics, he always had an anteroom with an alta rcito. In other words, the curandero joined his healing practice to his prayer life. The patient, and sometimes his family also joined the curandero in prayer.

Generally speaking, the poor could only afford the curandero. The poor could not afford to go to a licensed doctor, and
besides, there were not that many in the Southwest during the Hispanic colonial period. What made the curandero financially more acceptable to the general populace was that the curandero was paid with produce or animals for his work. The curandero did not practice his healing art full-time. He did not live off the people. The curandero generally had his own small farm or ranchería where he supported himself and his family. The doctor occasionally would cultivate some of the medicinal herbs he needed; on other occasions he would collect the wild medicinal herbs from the hillside or along the river bank or irrigation ditch. There was a variety of herbs that could be utilized by the curandero.

The following are a few of the medicinal herbs used, how they were prepared, and for which ailments they were prescribed. Most of these herbs were prepared in such a manner that they were made into a tea which was then drunk. Yet others were made into a paste and used as a salve or ointment and applied to a sore.

Albaca was prepared as a tea by boiling the leaves and used as a purifier of the blood or to help dissolve kidney stones.

The leaves of the hierba buena served as a good laxative when made as a tea.

Poleo was also prepared as a tea. It has been used extensively to cure a fever or cold, since it induces perspiration, and the patient was able to sweat out the cold.

Another good cold cure was the use of manstranso. When prepared as a tea and mixed with honey, manstranso induces the patient to cough up phlegm from his throat and lungs. When manstranso, in tea form, was boiled with sugar, it became a hard candy and was then used as a cough drop to help alleviate a sore throat.

The above medicines are generally from the mint plant family. Some of the medicinal herbs used by the early Indo-Hispanic people come from the sage plant. One such plant is the mariola. The mariola leaves were prepared as a tea and were used for gastritis or strong stomach gas, or to alleviate a nervous stomach, or the beginning of stomach ulcers.

Malvas leaves were boiled and prepared as a tea. This was then used to ease any inflammation, whether in the throat by gargling, or washing some skin abrasion or some slight cut. Thus far, the herbs presented, namely albaca, hierba buena, poleo,
manstranso, mariola and malvas, were prepared in the form of a tea and drunk.

There are many medicinal plants which were used in such a way that the entire plant, the leaves as well as the root, were medically beneficial. Nothing was wasted by these mestizo people. They knew what was good, useful, and medically applicable.

The root of the contra hierba plant was used, when boiled, as an eye wash. The root of the hierba del manso was used, in tea form, in dissolving growth or tumors in the lungs. The patient, by drinking the tea of the hierba del manso, coughed up or expectorated the dissolved particles of the growth or tumor. The root of the oshá plant was prepared in tea form; the patient would place his head over a boiling pan, cover his head with a towel and inhale the steam or vapor, helping him to clear up internal lung congestion or infections. The root of the immortal plant, when prepared as a tea, also cleaned out the lungs by inducing the expectoration of phlegm. Other tea forms were of the altamisa, rosa de castilla, hierba de la negrita, verbana, manzanilla, and hediondilla (also known as chaparral).

Thus far, we have seen how the curandero prepared and prescribed medicinal herbs. But the use of herbs, as medicine, was not limited strictly to the curandero. Several people, other than the curandero knew and understood the medicinal value of these herbs, and oftentimes prepared their own medicines.

But these people, poor as they were, were not limited to using just leaves and roots. They also used, for example, the resin from pine trees. Trementina, the resin from the pine tree, could be used for several medical purposes. For example, it could be washed and chewed as a gun to clean the teeth and to strengthen the gums. Trementina was also used as an ointment to clear infections because it includes a suction process. It sucks out poison or pus from a sore. It could be put on an infected place that had, for example, a deeply imbedded splinter or sticker that could not be taken out with a knife or tweezers, and the resin could draw out the sticker. Trementina not only cleaned the wound, but it helped the wound heal from the inside to the outside layer of skin.

The aforementioned cures, though not always scientifically understood, worked. Because the folk medicine worked, the curandero, as a healer, was an important person in the daily lives of the mestizo community.
Since there was widespread acceptance of the curandero, his effectiveness was greatly enhanced; his motives were more acceptable and fear of him by the patient or the family was minimized. That the fear of the curandero was minimal was based, in part, on the fact that his cures were natural. The cures were based on the laws of nature, which was very important to basically agrarian people.

These Indo-Hispano people were basically agrarian; hence their life was more conditioned by tradition and culture. It was a slow-paced life and was able to develop with a profound naturalness. They were very close to nature. They understood and respected nature and the natural phenomena they daily experienced. The feeling of these mestizo people was that illness was caused by an imbalance within the body of its relationship to what was considered normal or natural. One of the dichos was that “the body has its seasons” and perhaps from that dicho comes the idea that sickness is an imbalance within the human body, as there was seen imbalances in nature in the form of harsh rainstorms causing floods, or strong winds that were destructive. Since these mestizo people were so closely attuned to nature, and man by nature is defined as a social being, they were a people-oriented society. The Indo-Hispanic people were not an aggressive people, nor were they a competitive people, but they did complement each other’s endeavors.

Because they were basically a “people-oriented society,” they shared with each other and suffered with each other, including their illnesses. Illness was not just between the curandero and the patient. It was a family or community affair. There were strong, mutual support systems in all facets of their daily life.

**RELIGIOUS ART**

In the very beginning of the Hispanic colonial period, several factors occurred which eventually had a bearing on another form of the mestizo faith expression, as it was to develop at a later stage. One such factor was the use of religious art, which gave expression to their mestizo cultural development, especially in New Mexico’s religious art expression.

The early writings of the Hispanic colonial period in New Mexico refer to the variety of religious art that the colonizers brought with them, the statues, the paintings. Each one brought his favorite saint’s statue or painting with him. In most instances of minor Indian rebellions, when the colonizers were forced to
retreat, or leave the area where they were trying to establish a colony, most of the art work was destroyed. For example, during the 1680 Indian uprising in New Mexico, most of the religious art was destroyed.

In 1598 Captain Villagrá wrote that there were many religious articles in the possession of the colonizers. All these religious articles were destroyed in the 1680 Indian revolt. When New Mexico was reconquered in 1692, by “peacefully” subduing the Indians, we read that the colonizers brought other religious art in with them. But, it was not long before an age of religious art developed, which is expressive of the spirit and soul of those mestizo people, who were eventually to settle down in the Northern New Mexico or the Southern Colorado area. In this region the term santero was applied to those who could carve or paint santos. The age of the santeros extended from around 1750 until just a little before 1900. Most of these santeros or woodcarvers were farmers and ranchers. But they also had a fantastic, creative, and artistic talent. Those santeros had a heartfelt need to express their faith and they expressed it through their art work, just as the mestizo people expressed their faith in their song and dance, as well as in their prayer.

Their statuary and religious art work flowed from their faith. The santos of New Mexico are the only indigenous and authentic art form of the United States, other than that which is strictly Indian.

We must not confuse the santero, and the santos they carved or painted with the problem of santería, which grew out of the Caribbean Islands: Puerto Rico, Haiti, and Cuba. Santería in the Caribbean Islands is really a deviation or an aberration of religion or religious worship as known and practiced by Catholics. Santería is a combination of magic, voodoo, and witchcraft, all commingled with some of the religious practices of the Catholic tradition. Santería is one thing, A santero is another.

The santero, in the sense used in New Mexico, is the one who did woodcarving and painting; who expressed his faith, and the faith of his mestizo people in art form. The santero expressed his faith religiously, artistically, and with great sensitivity. His art work was not for commercial purposes. It was only to meet a religious need. Carving was done to satisfy a deep-seated desire to express externally an internal living faith. All the santos, the painting, the statuary were always on the life of Christ, the Blessed Mother, or any number of the saints.
They were creative, those *santeros*. Since they lived in isolation, they did not have too much upon which to rely as far as copying or duplicating other statuary or paintings. At a much later date, well after 1875, they started copying imported representations, but by then, the age of the *santero* and the product of the *santos* was beginning to wane or weaken, partially due to the influence of the then officially established French church in New Mexico.

These artists were not limited to a specific area. They were spread out in the various little valleys and on the side of the mountains where their villages existed in Southern Colorado and in Northern New Mexico. They were in Taos, Mora, Chimayo, Albuquerque, San Miguel, New Mexico, and San Luis, Colorado. Most of these artists are unknown today. Occasionally, there will be some piece of art work, painting, or statue with a name and date. That is extremely rare.

There are different types of art work. The *retablos* are flat, wooden panels, usually of cottonwood. Sometimes they used sheets of tin and occasionally they used animal skins upon which to paint. But the *retablos* were the flat religious art work.

The *bultos* were the carved statuary that were hewn out of cottonwood. It was rare that they were carved out of pine. They were then finished off with *yesso*, and painted with tempera. The tempera was locally made from plants and minerals; the colors were locally made and mixed.

So we see a whole new dimension of the life of a people. These were generally the poor people who had a strong faith and the talent to create, to express, to color their lives with their faith. The *santos* are the relics of the faith of a people, a poor people, poor materially, but rich in faith and in love of God. These paintings and these carvings were an expression of their faith. They conveyed a message of Christianity as they understood and lived it: basic, real, unpretentious. There was a leaning toward simplicity of expression, toward the unadorned, and away from the extravagant work.

They externalized themselves in their art as they did in their dance and in their song. And, in this art, we see the spirit of a *mestizo* people. We see the development of the soul of the people in art form. This folk art flows from their faith and their daily religious practices.

The *santeros* were generally farmers or ranchers. They did their carving in the long winter evenings by the fireplace or in the
summer evenings under the shade of some cottonwood trees. They would sit and carve or paint after they had been irrigating or hoeing weeds all day.

Their labor was paid in kind. For a santo or statue, perhaps they were given a bucket of grain or flour, or a chicken or two. But, for the greater number of artists, they worked at their talent because they loved it.

One interesting facet is their comprehension of the Trinity, which is depicted beautifully. The Trinity is portrayed as three distinct persons carved from one piece of wood. It was usually from some large three-pronged cottonwood root. They would take each section or prong of the root, and carve a person, all three coming from the same stem. With their homemade brushes, the santero would apply the yesso and the paint to the carving; in this case, a santo depicting the Holy Trinity.

As I said earlier, their subjects were the various episodes in the life of Christ or of their favorite saint or their patron saint. A very popular one was Santiago, the patron of Spain. Then, there was Santa Barbara, San Antonio, San Francisco, and a variety of paintings or retablos on the Blessed Mother.

They were "faithful" in and with their art work, showing a religious mind, and a religious feeling. We have seen throughout that their faith permeated their lives. This is most evident up to about the middle of the 1800s, which goes beyond the period being covered in this paper.

A mestizo culture was developing. We have emphasized, so far, their drama and their dance, their prayer customs, their folk wisdom and folk medicine. Now we see their expressiveness in all these areas being culminated in their creative religious art.

They identified with their God in a very real dynamic way. There was a personalism in their relationship with God that perhaps only poor people can fully understand. Their God was a personal, dynamic, ever-present God as evidenced in their art work, as well as in their prayer and in the dichos or sayings. They were not afraid to express themselves. They were not afraid to show their real soul and spirit. Creativity, not copying or imitating, seemed to be the norm or rule of these mestizo people.

They did not just copy what was brought over, but they took what was brought up the colonial corridor and developed it a step further, being strongly influenced by their mestizaje.
From what has been presented up to this point, it might be well to define the term *mestizaje* at this time. *Mestizaje* is the complete integration of all factors and elements that go to make up a culture, by combining, in an integral manner, two or more cultures. The *mestizaje* of which we speak is the sum total of both the Spanish culture brought over from the Iberian Peninsula and the Native American cultures encountered by the colonizers. What originally began as a *mestizo* people, popularly referred to as half-breeds, developed over a three-hundred-year period, from 1500 to 1800, into a *nueva raza* or new people, with its proper soul, spirit, and cultural values.

This *mestizaje* was admitted when Don Pedro Bautista Pino, New Mexico’s first officially elected delegate to the Parliament of Spain in 1812, reported in his *Historia* and statistical analysis of the ancient province of New Mexico: “In my province there are only Spaniards and pure-blooded Indians, between whom you can hardly tell the difference.”¹⁴ (I was unable to find anything of a similar nature or conclusion in my readings on Texas, Arizona, Colorado, and California on the subject of this *mestizaje*, yet I feel compelled to draw the same conclusions for those areas as did Don Pedro Bautista Pino).

**FARMING AND RANCHING**

In the late 1500s, when a few of the *mestizo* settlers came up the colonial corridor, they brought with them different kinds of seeds for planting. As time went on, after the settlements were established in a more firm fashion, the people would save their biggest and best plants, dry them, saving the seed for next year’s planting. They would trade their seeds with their *vecinos* to insure that their neighbors would also have a good crop or harvest, in spite of the hardships endured.

Looking at some of the hardships these *mestizo* people had to endure we can readily see that they were a hardy and ingenious lot. There are some recorded instances where an irrigation system was developed, but, by and large, the vast majority of the people were at the mercy of the sparse seasonal rains for their crops to be successful, and for the cattle to be able to graze. Most of the farming in those days would be classified, today, as dry land farming. They did not have a complete irrigation system, but where it existed, everyone in the village shared in the water rights. The people took turns growing a variety of different produce that could be bartered or traded with someone who would grow something different. After
having chanced the planting, facing the prospects of little or no rain as well as the hot, dry southwesterly winds, the people then had their cosecha or harvest.

When time came for the cosecha, all the vecinos or neighbors would help each other, moving from small farm to small farm; working together during the day and celebrating their harvest during the evening. In this fashion, they grew together as families and as a community. This, then is another dimension of their faith expression as a community of believers, collectively working and sharing each other’s abundance.

At the end of the harvest, they would prepare for the winter by storing their produce. Fruits were canned or dried. The corn (chicos) and chile (ristras) hung from the eaves of the home. Preserves were made from vegetables and melons. Beans were stored.

Another facet in their preparation for winter was the matanza or slaughter. They would have a matanza inviting los vecinos, who would share in the various cuts of meat.

The matanza, like the cosecha, was communal, festive celebration. The settlers would take turns having a matanza; one would slaughter a beef, another a lamb, and a third, a pig. From this supply all would share. Their was nothing wasted. They would make burrunates by taking the intestines of the animal, washing, cleaning, wrapping, braiding, and deep-frying or baking them. They would make chicharrones, which were rendered pork skins. The lard was then saved for future use in cooking. The head was often saved, washed and cleaned, and filled with spices and entrails, baked in an oven, and made into a head cheese. They would slice the beef into thin slices, and dry it into jerky or carne seca.

There was another old custom, that, unfortunately, has died out. When someone would be working for another person or family, the worker would be given, say ten or fifty head of sheep or cattle to care for. Or the worker would be given one-tenth of the calves born that year. In this manner, the worker would be able, eventually, to get on his own two feet. Instead of keeping the worker down and dependent, those who were economically better off would help the worker get ahead economically, and thus become a contributing member of society. In this fashion, the entire community, individually and collectively, prospered.

From the foregoing, we see a total life of sharing among those mestizo people, sharing from the oldest to the youngest,
from the smallest to the largest, from those who had a little less. Everyone shared in their cosecha, their matanza, and in their prosperity.

CUENTOS AND RIDDLES

In this section we will present some very general concepts on the early Indo-Hispanic settler’ cuentos (stories), leyendas (legends), corridos (ballads), and adivinanzas (riddles).¹⁶

The cuentos are the narratives of the exploits and the adventures of the heroes of the people, written in narrative form. They contain an element of truth and were used to convey a message or teach a moral. There were cuentos on the exploits of Padres José Alonso de Benavidez, Zárate Salmerón, Eusebio Kino, Junípero Serra, Margil, Antonio José Martínez of Taos, and many others.

There was also the leyenda which, along with the cuento, is a form of historical exposition. The leyenda or legend is an altered historical genre with some element of truth which has been embellished over the generations. Like the cuento, the leyenda is usually in narrative form. Some of the leyendas of the Indo-hispanic Southwest deal with buried treasures. Could this be because the people, in their economic poverty, dreamt of the gold at the end of the rainbow?

The corrido or ballad relates a story or incident. There are corridos de amor, de religión, ballads on government, on the church, politics, and economics as well as war. The corrido is a long series of verses on almost any issue which daily affects these mestizo people. The corridos were a form of conveying news to all the little mountain villages. They served a two-fold purpose; the more immediate purpose was to bring news to the people, the secondary effect, as is now appreciated, was to record the daily events of the people, that is their history. These ballads were then sung from village to village, the news was spread (and their history was recorded).

We also have the adivinanzas or riddles, which are another form of folk wisdom. The adivinanzas are very provocative. For example: “Blanco salí de mi casa, y en el campo enverdesí, para volver a entrar en mi casa, de rojo me vestí. Qué soy?” (I left my house dressed in white, and I went out to the field and turned green; in order to return to my house, I dressed in red. What am I?) The answer is: chile! Another adivinanza is: “Santa sin ser nacida, santa sin ser bautizada, la iglesia me llama santa y yo glorificada. Qué soy?” (I am declared holy, without having been
born, I am holy without having been baptized: the church calls me holy and thereby I am glorified. What am I?) The answer is: \textit{La Semana Santa}, or Holy Week! The third one is: "Vueltas y vueltas me doy sin cansarme mas, si no tomo, me paro al instante. Qué es?" (I turn and turn without getting tired, but if I do not drink, I will stop instantly. What am I?) The answer is: \textit{el molino}, or the windmill! This one is tantalizing: "Qué cosa es cosa que entra al río, y no se moja? No es el sol, no es la luna, ni cosa ninguna? Qué es?" (What is it that goes into the river and does not get wet? It is neither the sun, nor the moon, or anything of that sort. What is it?) The answer is: \textit{la sombra}, or the shadow! Another is: "Chiquita como un ratón y guarda la casa como un león. Qué es?" (Small like a mouse, watches and protects the home like a lion. What is it?) The answer is: \textit{la llave}, or the key.

These few riddles give you some insight into the \textit{mestizo}’s perceptiveness and creativity. These \textit{mestizos} always reflected God in their creativity. The \textit{advinanzas} also give some insight into their cognitive process (which would make an interesting topic of research by one of our own people).

\textbf{LOS PENITENTES}

Of great interest, and perhaps a phenomenon found only in New Mexico and southern Colorado, and not in other areas of the hispanized Southwest, are the Penitentes. They are generally referred to as \textit{La Hermandad de Nuestro Señor Jesús Cristo}, or the Brotherhood of Jesus Christ.

This brotherhood is perhaps one of the most concrete examples of a total emersion and theocratic way of life known to the United States. The Penitentes have been misrepresented over the years by the Anglo-Saxon historian or novelist, because of the Brotherhood’s practice of self-scourging or flagellation. The non-Hispanic writers sensationalize the flagellation while they overlook the total effect of this \textit{Hermandad} on the daily life of the community.

Up until the middle of the nineteenth century, the Penitentes never had their rules written out, but around 1853, they were forced to do so by the new French bishop, Jean Baptiste Lamy, who took over the Church of Santa Fé in 1851. Prior to that date, the Penitentes knew what they had to do for the community, and they did it. They had their councils, their duties, their officers, their spiritual exercises and prayers, and their corporal and spiritual works of mercy, all for the benefit of the community.
There is a great deal of confusion over the origin of the Brotherhood in New Mexico. Some hold that it is a continuation of the custom of medieval flagellants in Europe. Others tie in the strong influence of the Franciscans and their Third Order societies in New Mexico. Still others try to tie in some concept of penance and a purification rite. It is recorded that when Juan de Oñate settled in New Mexico in 1598, the new colonizers, in thanksgiving and in purification and in preparation for their new settlement, scourged themselves.

The purpose of the Hermandad is to render service to the total community. The needs they met were civil as well as ecclesial, especially in those areas where the church and state failed in their responsibilities to the people. Hence, the Penitentes were a mutual aid society.

They had their official cantor, the one who would chant songs for the liturgical or para-liturgical celebrations. They had their official rezador, or prayer leader, who led the people in their prayers, rosaries, and wakes at funerals. The rezador and the cantor (the one who prayed and was the hymn leader) were also catechists who taught religion to the Indo-Hispanic people in the village. They included the official grave-diggers, who would dig the graves for those in their community who had died. They had their official hospitality hostesses, similar to a Ladies Auxiliary, who made sure that the survivors of the deceased were well taken care of with food, comfort, understanding, and sympathy. They also had their official ditch rider, who would make sure that everyone received their fair allotment of water for irrigation.

All these factors, unfortunately, have been overlooked over the years. Many historians have placed unique emphasis on the Penitentes’ Holy Week services when the flagellation took place, as they relived the Passion of Christ. No one to date has ever developed or studied their total thrust and effect upon the mestizo Christian community in which the Penitentes lived.

The Penitentes, as a society, had their rules and regulations, the principles of Christian dogmas, and their moral and ethical norms, upon which the Hermandad based their conduct and community services. The Brotherhood, in the beginning, was not a secret society, and they originally used the parish church, or the village chapel to conduct their services. After the estranjeros or outsiders began arriving, and certainly after the territory of New Mexico became, first a Vicariate in 1850, and a Diocese in 1853, the Penitentes were forced to become a secret society. This was
so because the officials of the Church did not understand the Penitentes, nor did they try to understand them.

The Penitentes were no longer able to use the village church, and were forced to build their private chapels or moradas on secluded hillsides. The morada (literally a dwelling place) became the “catacombs” for the Hermandad. The pressures from the officials of the Church, upon the Penitentes, for all practical purposes brought about an “underground” church. The people, by and large, accepted the Penitentes, their customs and practices, as well as their services to the community. The Church hierarchy did not!

The Hermandad filled the gap where church and civil government failed. For the religious needs of the people, the Penitentes led the community in prayer and worship, recitation of the rosary and the Stations of the Cross, and helped in the teaching of religion. For the civil needs of the community, the Penitentes helped out by making sure that everyone had the basics for a decent life, helped in insuring equal water rights for all (an absolute necessity in an arid country). After the outsiders began arriving, the Penitentes fulfilled the role of advocates, defending the rights of the nativos against the more aggressive gringos. This did not endear the Hermandad to the estranjeros in the least. But, in this latter role, the Penitentes were most effective, because they had a strong base and constituency, namely the nativos themselves, while the newcomers had no base or constituency at all. The tactic then used by both the Church hierarchy and civil leaders was to try and discredit Penitentes in the eyes of the general populace. These attempts proved somewhat successful over the long run, but the Penitentes were able to endure the imposed suffering, as is evidenced in one of their alabados or hymns: “Adios el Mundo” (Farewell to the World). This hymn shows the religious profundity of the Penitentes, their concept of life as well as death and their appreciation for their family and friends. The alabado is sung at the velorio (wake), and goes thus:

Good-bye to all who are present
All who are here at my wake.
The time has come
When you must release me.
Good-bye to my parents
Who preserved my life.
Good-bye to my children
And my dearly loved wife.
Good-bye to all present
I now prepare for my other life.
Good-bye to all my relatives.
Farewell to my dear morada.
Good-bye to all my friends,
I now prepare to take my trip.
Farewell to all,
My time has come.
Follow me to my burial
Where I will find my rest.

This life has been a journey
And now I prepare for another life
Which has been prepared for me by God.

Farewell to everyone
As I prepare to go to the
Campo Santo.

I now leave all of you
and this world, Farewell,
Until in glory when we meet
Where there is universal justice.

Like a riddle, is this life
And it makes us dreamers.
To endure it, we play games
So as to put up with the pain.

I came from the earth,
By the power of God’s spirit,
In the hands of the Creator
I now prepare to rest.

I am a brother of Jesus,
To Jesus I will always belong.
Because I lived in Jesus
To Him I now give myself.

In God we await our rest,
In God we find our consolation,
Knowing that He will open the
Gate of Heaven for us.

Perhaps more than any other group, the Penitentes have been instrumental in preserving the faith, the dichos, cuentos, corridos, adivinanzas and surely the alabados. They were a
service-oriented society, a quasi-deacon-like ministry-directed group for the benefit of the community. The Penitentes appeared to have fully realized and recognized their commitment to Christ and the community. There is one stanza in an alabado sung during Holy Week services, which sums up the Penitentes' objective, goal and purpose. It reads thus:

Now there is no person
Who is worthless,
We are all worth everything
Now that Christ has died.

Theologically, who can argue with that? Because Christ, our mediator, "has just died," we are worth everything. And as Christ is our brother, we too must be mediators for each other. This appears to be the thrust and ethics of the society of Los Penitentes. Their concepts of the saving act of Christ is not seen or sung in the past tense, but in the present tense, thus implying a strong concept of the dynamic presence of Christ, now. Christ acts now; he lives, now; he dies, now; he works, now.

CONCLUSIONS

From the coasts of Florida to those of California, and the lands in between, namely Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, we see that the mestizos were able to survive, and survive they did, in spite of the great odds. They were able to grow spiritually, because the responsibility was thrust upon them; they knew it. They realized it, and they accepted the challenge.

They were not spoon-fed in their faith, they were not cajoled and pampered in their religious practices.

They lived a poor, harsh life, which gave them an appreciation and depth in a strong spiritual life. They were not hampered by heavy industrialization, and an over-highly structured church organization. That came at a later date.

The official Church was established in these areas well after the end of the period we are presently covering: 1500-1808. Although the Church was officially present through the missionaries, it was a different sort of presence.

In his Memorial of 1630, Fray Alonso de Benavidez, O.F.M., wrote to the King of Spain and to the Pope, requesting that Santa Fé be made an Episcopal See. Whether it was a blessing or not that the grant was not fulfilled, from 1630 to 1850, can be debated. What impact would an official Church have had on the people? Would the heritage, rich as it is, have been able to survive? The
fact is that the people accepted their responsibility. They lived their religion in a faithful and creative manner. They responded to their religious needs by creatively making sure, in song, art, in prose and poetry, that their faith would never die. Their roots go deep in these lands, and their faith is strong.

Their culture (and ours) is not eraseable. Their Indo-Hispanic stamp is indelibly planted, not only in the names of the rivers, towns, mountains, but most of all in the hearts, minds, and wills of the Indo-Hispanic people of the Southwest.

As indicated in the beginning of this paper, of all the institutions brought over by the Cross and Crown, the one that was the most complex was that of the mission system. Having looked at some of the highlights of the daily life of the Christian, we can now see and appreciate this complexity, and even more, respect it, for it was their daily life, in my opinion, that made them Christians. Hopefully, these pages have accomplished the intent, namely, to capture the "soul" and "spirit" of a people who have made an indelible imprint in the life of the Southwest Church. In spite of some of their failure, the mission system, we must conclude, was a success.

These elements of song, dance, folk wisdom, medicine, religious art, cuentos, leyendas, dichos, adivinanzas and Los Penitentes all weave a tapestry so closely knit that time will never erode it. We can see a cultural mestizaje so deeply threaded that it has been most difficult to unweave in our present generation.

We have presented the development of a conscienciousness of a nueva raza or mestizage best described in 1812 by Don Pedro Bautista Pino, when he declared: "Between the Hispanos and the pure-blooded Indians, one can hardly tell the difference." The lack of any difference between the people is the end result of the institution called the mission system.

The mission system established by the Cross and Crown has borne fruit; the fruit is seen in the daily lives of the Indo-Hispanic Christians. The Crown is no more; but the effects of the Cross continue to this day in the living faith of the Indo-Hispanos.
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PART TWO

The Church in Conflict
(1809-1898)
THE AGE OF TURMOIL

Ricardo Santos

No other period in the history of the American continent has been as important, or traumatic, as the nineteenth century. It is the historical era from which many people and countries have still not recovered. It is a period that began with the Louisiana Purchase and ended with the Spanish-American War. In the in-between, the Spanish American colonies fought and won their independence from Spain. This was followed by fifty years of turmoil as the developing countries (including the United States) experienced the conflicts of regional versus national versus federalist versus centralist versus sectional politics. In North America, and specifically in Mexico and the United States, political and military uprisings would give way to revolutions, counter-revolutions, respective civil wars, and finally, the war between Mexico and the United States. This was followed by more unrest and another set of respective civil wars.

If Mexico has Agustín de Iturbide who established himself as Emperor of the new nation, so would the United States have Aaron Burr, who would seek but fail to do the same. And if the United States had Abraham Lincoln to guide the nation during its civil war, Mexico would have Benito Juárez to do likewise. Moreover, for the territorial aggression of Monroe and Jackson seeking the western and southern expansion of the United States, Mexico offered in opposition its political giant who would reduce the losses to one third instead of a hundred percent. The Mexican equalizer to manifest destiny was also its victim. The highly misunderstood and maligned Antonio López de Santa Anna would never recover from the political vendetta of his contemporaries and from the righteous indignation of the
historical apologists turned historians seeking to ease their guilt in political propaganda. Other political personalities who did less would become historical and national heroes. Santa Anna, meanwhile, would become the scapegoat for the guilt of both Mexico and the United States.

Throughout the trauma and turmoil of the nineteenth century the Church would play an important and dominant role. It was the Church, not the government, to whom the people turned for spiritual succor and guidance. It was the Church that would expand its interest from spiritual to political in order to better the people’s plight. Parish priests, missionaries, and ex-seminarians would lead the Spanish-Mexican people to independence from Spain and to the establishment of the Republic of Mexico. As representatives of the Pope and King, the religious hierarchy would oppose its clergy and side with the Crown. Religious excommunication and the reinstatement of the Holy Office of the Inquisition would become weapons of the hierarchy. The rebel clergy and the rebellious populace placed their faith in “God and Country” and, supported by the Virgin of Guadalupe, would oppose the laws of men. Both sides won and lost. The bloodshed, loss of life, land, and conscience created political, linguistic, religious, territorial, and ethnic problems which would not be attacked until the second half of the twentieth century.

In retrospect, it seemed only logical and justifiable for the most important international personality of the nineteenth century to initiate it. In 1800, Napoleon Bonaparte demanded and received the Louisiana Territory back from Spain. For the frontiersmen on the North American continent, this far-off European intrigue was of grave consequence. Texas, Nuevo México, and the Interior Provinces of New Spain were no longer protected from the fledging United States by Louisiana. The French had always been as troublesome to the Spanish American frontiersmen as the Anglo-American had been to Spanish Florida and Spanish Louisiana. To make matters worse, Napoleon sold Louisiana to the United States in 1803 and this could only mean trouble for the Spanish North American frontier.

Already by the late 1700’s Anglo-American and French-American frontiersmen had been crossing the border into Texas and New Mexico to trade with the Spanish-Mexican frontiersmen. The people had not complained, but the provincial and viceregal governments had. Frontier governors
had been removed, and military inspectors such as Nicolás de Lafora and Hugo O’Conor had been sent to the frontier to quell the illegal smuggling of goods across the border. The problem was never solved and the smuggling continued unabated. Perhaps in an effort to control at least part of the traffic, the Spanish government had seen fit to issue special trading licenses to some Anglo-American and French-American traders. One such person was Philip Nolan, who since the 1790’s had been trading in horses and cattle in East Texas. In 1800, Nolan came under suspicion as a secret agent of the United States and perhaps associated with Aaron Burr and his reported plan to acquire Louisiana and the Interior Provinces with the aim of establishing a separate government. In March of 1801 when Nolan crossed into Texas, he was pursued by a Spanish military force. A battle ensued and Nolan was killed.¹ This seemingly unimportant incident between the government forces of Texas and a smuggler suspected as a secret agent triggered off the bloodshed that was to follow. Thousands were destined to die in countless battlefields before the nineteenth century would be over.

To officially initiate the political movements, Spain delivered Louisiana to the French representatives on November 30, 1803. Hardly a month later, on December 20, 1803, the French representatives delivered Louisiana to U.S. representatives General James Wilkinson and Missouri Governor William C. C. Claiborne. The Spaniards in the Interior Provinces reacted by strengthening the military forces of Texas and reportedly went as far as stationing one thousand men in East Texas. The United States then enlarged its military contingency in Louisiana. The two armies faced each other and war was expected. However, an agreement was reached and signed on November 6, 1806, creating a “neutral ground” between Texas and Louisiana.² The problem did not end there. The United States was still claiming the Rio Grande as the western boundary of Louisiana! That particular problem would not be solved until much later in 1821 with the Adam-Onis Treaty.

In the meantime, French Americans and Spanish Americans began to show up in Santa Fé, Nuevo México. They had arrived in 1805 and stayed at least till the following year. Other United States citizens were scampering all over the face of the Louisiana Territory and periodically crossing into Spanish-claimed frontier provinces. Zebulon Pike and the Lewis and Clark expeditions were only the best known of these incidents.³
Napoleon Bonaparte re-entered the Spanish political panorama, unleashing an unexpected series of events in mid-1808. First, he got King Charles IV to abdicate in favor of his son Prince Fernando VII. He then got Fernando VII to abdicate the Spanish throne on the same day, May 5, 1808. The following month Napoleon named his brother Joseph Bonaparte King of Spain. The Iberians began to group in political followings which supported Napoleon and King Joseph, or Fernando VII, or sought to establish a parliamentary type of government. The latter two groups eventually united to establish the Cortes de Cadiz, which was loyal to Fernando VII, but at the same time issued a liberal constitution through which the empire was to be governed.4

In Mexico City, the government did not receive news of the abdications of the Spanish royalty to the Bonapartes until June 23, 1808. As in Spain, the people of Mexico City were almost immediately divided into three camps. Officially, of course, there were those who had to recognize King Joseph Bonaparte as the successor of Fernando VII. Then there were those who by July 19, 1808, were urging the Viceroy to “declare a state of provisional independence,” for the sovereignty of Fernando had been annulled by the French takeover of the Spanish Crown. This latter group was primarily represented by the City Council of Mexico City, which on September 9, 1808, called for a general meeting of representatives from throughout New Spain. The Viceroy, meanwhile, had assumed a position of neutrality. On September 15, representatives of the Audiencia de Mexico and the Holy Office of the Inquisition arrested the Viceroy and declared their loyalty to Fernando VII.5

At this point of time, on the eve of the initiation of the long series of uprisings, counter-revolutions, civil and international wars, the population of New Spain was estimated by scientist Alexander Von Humboldt as being over 6,500,000.6 In the highly prestigious Ensayo Político Sobre el Reino de la Nueva España, Von Humboldt went on to give the most accurate and sophisticated description of the viceroyalty and its frontier provinces. He noted, for example, that there were seven major castes in New Spain. The most prestigious caste was composed of those born in Europe and called gachupines. The second caste and class was composed of the American-born Europeans commonly called creoles. The third class and caste were the people of Indian and European blood commonly called mestizos. The fourth caste were the mulattos of white and black
blood. The fifth caste were called zambos and were of Indian and black blood. The sixth caste were the native Indians, and the seventh were the blacks. Although not mentioned by Von Humboldt, there were an estimated twenty-eight castes recognized in New Spain and only the class status of the first three could be more or less verified. That is, that after the gachupines, creoles and mestizos, the other twenty-five castes vied against each other for positons of prestige.

Von Humboldt then went on to give some astonishing statistics. He stated that the pure and unmixed Indian population of New Spain was estimated at two and a half to three million. This number, however, appeared to have been only for New Spain proper and did not seem to include the Indians of the frontier. The Indians Von Humboldt referred to were also said to be speakers of twenty different languages. The language of the Aztecs, called mexicano by Von Humboldt, was described as extending over four hundred leagues. The second largest language was indentified as Otomi.

The description of the Indians of New Spain given by Von Humboldt revealed an interesting problem and its handling by the Spanish viceregal government. The scientist noted that the Indians were given to drinking alcoholic beverages made from corn, sugar cane, and agave (pulque). The Indians, however, drank the liquids to excess. Therefore, it was a common sight to see a city-owned wagon commanded by the local police picking up drunks as if they were plague-stricken cadavers. The drunks were taken by the police to the city jail where they were allowed to sober up. Once having sobered, the Indians were sentenced to three days of hard labor. The Indians were shackled and made to work on the streets repairing and cleaning them. They were released on the fourth day only to be picked up again within a week. For these habitual alcoholics it was a never-ending circle of drinking, sobering up, working off the arrest, and getting drunk again to reinitiate the process. In reporting this particular problem, Von Humboldt stepped out of character and stated that "this evil," alcoholism, would slow down the Indians' progress towards being civilized.

Physically, the Indians pleased Von Humboldt and seemed to have amazed his scientific mind. He noted, for instance, that they seemed to be immune to wrinkles, baldness, gray hair, and senility. It was reportedly very common for the Indians, particularly the women, to live to be over one hundred years of age. Von Humboldt cited the case of Hilario Pari of 143 years of
age who was married for ninety years with 117 year-old Andrea Aleá Zar. The scientist also noted that Hilario Pari walked three to four leagues a day until he reached the age of 130. He was forced to quit walking at that age because he lost his sight. When the Indian finally died at 143 years of age, of the twelve children he had had, there was only one survivor. The survivor was a 66-year old daughter.10

Of the “white people” as Von Humboldt referred to them, the European-born gachupines were the most obnoxious. Some were highly educated and wealthy. Others, simply because they were gachupines, thought themselves superior to all other residents of New Spain. This latter personality, even when uneducated and unskilled, discriminated against the creoles and other castes. The creoles, meanwhile, preferred to be called “Americanos”. According to Von Humboldt, they were frequently heard to exclaim that they were not “Españoles”; they were “Americanos”. This attitude was analyzed by Von Humboldt as being reflective of a deep-seated resentment against the abuses of the gachupines. Writing in 1808, the scientist noted that the bonds which tied the European Spaniard to the American Spaniards were being loosened. The “white” population of New Spain was estimated at 1,200,000. Excluding the Interior Provinces, the population of New Spain (over 6,500,000), was said to have only 16% “whites”.11

The black population of New Spain increased from six thousand in 1793 to some nine or ten thousand by 1808. Most of the blacks, whether slaves or freemen, lived in the ports of Veracruz or Acupulco, or surrounding coastal regions. According to Von Humboldt, a visitor could traverse the entire city of Mexico without once seeing a black person. This could have been due, according to the scientist, to the fact that only an estimated 100 out of 74,000 African slaves exported to the New World ever reached New Spain. The rest were distributed elsewhere. Von Humboldt also estimated that 111,000,000 African slaves had already been transported to the New World.12

The fact that men outnumbered women in New Spain and the Interior Provinces also caught Von Humboldt’s attention. His statistics were not truly complete, for he did not report on the Intendency of Mexico or the Intendency of San Luis Potosí (Nuevo León, Coahuila, Tamaulipas, Texas, and San Luis Potosí). Nonetheless, Von Humboldt reported the ratios among “whites”, Indians, and mixed castes. For every 100 men of “white”, Indian, and mixed caste designations, he reported 91,
95, and 99 women of the respective categories in Guanajuato. In Michoacan, he reported 97 “white” women, 94 Indian women, and 98 mixed caste women for every 100 males of their respective categories. The Intendency of Oaxaca seemed to have a closer ratio. There he reported 98 white women, 99 Indian women, and 95 mixed caste women for every 100 men of their respective categories.

As far as the frontier provinces were concerned, Von Humboldt made no ethnic designations and just lumped all together into male and female categories. For Nuevo México, he reported a total of 94 women for every 100 men. In Sonora and the Californias, he reported a total of 87 females for every 100 males. In Sinaloa and Durango (Nueva Vizcaya) he reported 98 women for every 100 men. Mexico City reported ten European women for every 100 European men. However, there were 136 creole women for every 100 creole men, 138 Indian women for every 100 Indian men, 140 mulatto women for every 100 mulatto men, and 147 women of mixed castes for every 100 men of the same category. The women also out-numbered the men in the cities of Querétaro and Valladolid (later renamed Morelia). The only case where there were less women than men in these three cities was in regard to Indian women at Valladolid where the ratio was 93 women to every 100 Indian men.  

In Chapter 8 of Book III of the *Ensayo Político Sobre el Reino de la Nueva España*, Alexander Von Humboldt described the viceroyalty of New Spain and the Commandancy General of the Interior Provinces in great statistical detail. For 1803, he noted, there were 5,837,000 people in the all-encompassing Viceroyalty of New Spain, which extended for 118,478 square leagues. This all-inclusive data revealed a population density of 49 inhabitants per square league. The 1803 data for the square-league population density of the frontier provinces were broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Area in sq. leagues</th>
<th>population</th>
<th>density per sq. league</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Reino de León</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo Santander</td>
<td>5,193</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Vizcaya</td>
<td>16,873</td>
<td>159,700</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>19,143</td>
<td>121,400</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahuila</td>
<td>6,702</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10,948</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuevo México</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower California</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper California</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Approaching the same statistical data from the regional intendency level, Von Humboldt noted the high discrepancy in geography and population density. Per one square league, the Intendency of Puebla had 301 inhabitants, Mexico had 255, Oaxaca had 120, Michoacán had 109, Merida had 81, Veracruz had 38, Zacatecas had 65, Guadalajara had 65, Sonora had 6, Nueva Vizcaya had 10, Guanajuato had 568, and San Luis Potosi (which was larger in size than Spain itself) had 12 inhabitants per square league.\(^{14}\)

The ecclesiastical data for 1810 was also given by Alexander Von Humboldt. There were 1,073 parishes, 157 missions, and 264 convents. The parishes were ministered by 2,300 clergymen. The missions were distributed throughout the various dioceses of New Spain and were reported as being eighteen in the Diocese of Mexico, 5 in the Diocese of Valladolid (Michoacán), 45 in the diocese of Durango (Nueva Vizcaya), 18 in the diocese of Monterrey (Nuevo León), and 66 in the Diocese of Sonora. Although Von Humboldt reported 157 missions, they only add up to 152. Nonetheless, the frontier missions were further described within the dioceses in which they existed. For instance, there were four custodias in the Diocese of Durango (Nueva Vizcaya). They were, the Custodia de la Conversión de San Pablo de Nuevo México ministered by missionaries from the College of Santo Evangelio, Custodia del Paso del Norte (along the Río Grande del Norte and also under the College of Santo Evangelio), Custodia de la Taraumara Alta ministered by the Apostolic College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas, and the Custodia del Parral also ministered by the Franciscans from Guadalupe de Zacatecas.

The Diocese of Nuevo León (Monterrey) had three missionary provinces. The missions of Coahuila were under the Franciscan College of Pachuca. The missions of Texas and of Nuevo León were under the Franciscan College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas.

The Diocese of Sonora also had three missionary provinces. The missions of Sonora proper were under the Apostolic College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro. The missions of Lower California were under the Franciscans from the Province of Santiago de Jalisco. The missions of Upper California were under the Franciscan College of San Fernando de México.

The data for the Apostolic and missionary colleges for the Propagation of the Faith were also given. For instance, the College of Santa Cruz de Querétaro had a total of 66 religious
and nine missions in Sonora. The College of San Fernando de México had 77 religious and 20 missions in Upper California. The College of San Francisco de Pachuca had 45 religious and 9 missions in Coahuila and Nuevo Santander (Tamulipas). Finally, the College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas had 94 religious and 22 missions in Texas and the Tarahumaras. All total, there were 60 missions on the northern frontier ministered by four different colleges.15

Such was the Viceregency of New Spain and the Interior Provinces in 1808, when events in Madrid and Mexico City prompted the residents of Spanish North America to seriously consider their political future. A group of creoles in the city of Valladolid (now Morelia, Michoacán) began to plan an uprising of dubious objectives. To further broaden their support, they enlisted the aid of the parish priest of Dolores in the Intendency of Guanajuato. The parish priest was named Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, a creole, apparently tri-lingual (Indian-Spanish-French), former University professor, and already blacklisted by the Holy Office of the Inquisition in 1780.

As a consequence of his 1780 trial by the Holy Office, Hidalgo had been removed as dean from the College of San Nicolás at Valladolid. He then served at various Indian pueblos as parish priest until 1803 when he was transferred to Dolores. It was thus after 1808 that he met the conspirators of Querétaro, composed of wealthy and prestigious creoles in charge of the local police, militia, and businesses. Hidalgo and the conspirators finally chose October 1, 1810 as the date to initiate their uprising against the Viceregal Government of New Spain. The plot was discovered by the government and Hidalgo had no choice but to initiate the uprising on the night of September 15th-dawn of the 16th, 1810. With a grand total of ten men, Father Hidalgo set out from the parish church of Dolores to raise an army and initiate the uprising. Along the way he stopped to pray at another parish church and borrowed a standard of the Virgin of Guadalupe which he used as his rallying banner. Finally, he ordered inscribed on the banner the slogan (and reflection) of his intentions: “Long Live Our Lady of Guadalupe, Long Live America, Long Live Our Holy Faith, and Long Live Fernando VII.” His followers, mainly Indians unsophisticated in the ways of politics and intrigue added two slogans: “Down with Bad Government” and “Death to the Spaniards.”

Both the viceregal government and the Church acted quickly once they learned of the uprising. On September 24,
Bishop-elect Abad y Queipo of Michoacán excommunicated Fr. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. The ecclesiastical hierarchy was faced with quite a problem. A great number of parish priests had joined the Hidalgo uprising and their parishioners were following suit. The City of Guanajuato fell to the rebels on September 28th, and it proved that the uprising would be a merciless and bloody one. Both sides were surprised by the carnage, and particularly by the vengeful anger of the rebel Indians and mestizos whom Hidalgo and his creole officers could not control. It seemed as if the uprising was giving the Indians, mestizos, and castes the opportunity to avenge the almost three hundred years of oppression since Hernán Cortés. On October 8, the rebels left Guanajuato for Querétaro but changed directions and headed for Valladolid instead. They reached this city on October 15th, and four days later the army began to depart for Mexico City. Two weeks later, on October 30th, the rebels battled the Spanish royalist forces at Monte de las Cruces and totally defeated the royalists. The road to Mexico City was completely opened. For many reasons best known to Hidalgo and merely theorized by historians, Fr. Hidalgo decided not to attack the Viceregal capital. On November 2nd, the rebel forces began to retrace their steps and headed towards Querétaro. Along the way, the rebels were defeated at the battle at Aculco on November 7th. After this battle, Hidalgo headed towards Valladolid and then Guadalajara, which had recently declared itself in favor of the uprising. Hidalgo’s cohort, Don Ignacio Allende, occupied Guanajuato but was defeated there and forced to move on to Zacatecas. Being pursued by the effective Spanish Field Marshall Felix María Calleja del Rey, Allende had no choice but to also head towards Guadalajara. He reached it on December 12, 1810. Everywhere and everything behind him and Hidalgo had been reconquered by the Spanish Royalists.

On January 15, 1811, Hidalgo’s rebel army and the Spanish Army battled each other in the plains outside of Guadalajara known as Calderón. Once again the rebels were defeated and this time the insurgents began heading towards the northeastern frontier provinces and specifically, towards Saltillo, Monterrey, and possibly San Antonio, Texas.16

The said northeastern frontier provinces were already in the hands of pro-Hidalgo rebels. In November of 1810, Hidalgo had commissioned rebel Lieutenant General Mariano Jiménez to head the uprising in the Interior Provinces. On January 6, 1811,
the army of Jiménez had defeated a Spanish royalist force headed by Colonel Antonio Cordero near Saltillo, Coahuila. After this battle, the Governor of Nuevo León, Don Manuel Santa María declared in favor of the Hidalgo uprising. The Bishop of Nuevo León at Monterrey, however, chose to abandon his post and fled his diocese.17

Coincidental to these events, the leading creoles in San Antonio, Texas were also going about the business of joining the Hidalgo uprising. On January 22, 1811, Captain of militia, Juan Bautista de las Casas, arrested the Spanish Governor of Texas and his leading military and political aides. De las Casas then declared in favor of the Hidalgo uprising and communicated himself with General Mariano Jiménez. The insurgent general in charge of the Interior Provinces for Hidalgo, named de las Casas "Generalísimo and Governor of Texas." The abuses of power and the reported continuous defeat of Hidalgo by the royalists made the Texans reconsider their stand. The problem was further aggravated by the knowledge that Hidalgo was heading towards Texas and San Antonio and was being pursued by the Spanish army. Notwithstanding Hidalgo's apparent intention of passing through Texas on his way to the United States, it was feared that the rebel would bring the scorn of the royalists upon the Texans. On March 2, 1811, the leading creoles of San Antonio, headed by subdeacon Juan Manuel Zambrano of the parish church of San Fernando, arrested Juan Bautista de las Casas. They then established the "Counter-revolutionary Junta of Bexar."18

A special council of war was held at Saltillo, Coahuila, on March 16, 1811, at which, in time, two major decisions were made. The first was to remove Father Hidalgo as leader of the insurrection. Hereafter, he would still be known as "Generalísimo" but would have no power. The second decision was to go to the United States via Texas to seek assistance. Five days later, Hidalgo and the leaders of the uprising were all arrested at Norias de Baján, Coahuila, in a well-laid trap. Sub-deacon Juan Manuel Zambrano had convinced Colones Ignacio Elizondo to return to the royalist cause and had formulated the plans for the capture of Hidalgo, the rebel leaders, and the insurgent army. The execution of the ambush had been more successful than anticipated. The prisoners were taken to Monclova, Coahuila, and on March 26 were sent to Chihuahua (Nueva Vizcaya) to be tried. Eleven priests and Franciscan missionaries were sent to Durango to be tried separately and
ecclesiastically. Hidalgo and the leaders of the uprising had to stand a civil trial. In order to keep the balance of Church and State in line, the Bishop of Durango (Nueva Vizcaya) Don Francisco Gabriél de Olivares empowered Fr. Francisco Fernández Valentín to act in conjunction with the civil authorities. This special power was issued to the ecclesiastical judge on May 14. The court proceeded with the trial of Hidalgo and found him guilty of high treason. On July 27, Hidalgo was defrocked. Two days later he was executed by a firing squad. The corpse of Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla was then decapitated. His head was sent to the City of Guanajuato to be displayed in an iron cage along with the heads of Ignacio Allende, Juan Aldama, and Mariano Jiménez.¹⁹

Texas rebel Juan Bautista de las Casas did not fare any better. His courtmartial began in San Antonio but was changed to Monclova, Coahuila. There he was found guilty and executed by a firing squad. His corpse was also decapitated and his head was returned to San Antonio to be staked in the center of Military Plaza as a warning to other would-be rebels.²⁰

Sub-deacon Juan Manuel Zambrano of San Antonio, the traitor of Hidalgo, kept the reigns of the Texas Spanish government. He ruled Texas through the counter-revolutionary Junta of Bexar until mid-1812, when the Spanish governor finally arrived at the scene. In August of that year, one of Hidalgo’s former lieutenants returned to Texas. He was José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara. This time, however, he came as commander-in-chief of the Republican Army of the North. Gutiérrez de Lara had raised the army of Mexican, Indian, and United States volunteers with the assistance of the U.S. Government. Funds, munitions, arms, and men had been made available to him at New Orleans by U.S. secret agent William Shaler. The former hidalgüista thus returned to Texas, but neither to avenge Hidalgo nor to remain loyal to King Fernando VII.

After taking Nacodoches, the Republican Army headed for La Bahía del Espíritu Santo (later known as Goliad) which it took without incident in November of 1812. The Spanish Governor laid siege to the fortress at La Bahía almost immediately but was unable to dislodge the rebels. The royalists finally abandoned the field and returned to San Antonio. The insurgents left the fortress in March of 1813 and headed for San Antonio where on the outskirts of the city they were met for battle by the royalists. The action occurred on March 28, at the Rosillo Crossing of the Salado Creek. The rebels defeated the Spanish royalists who in
turn had no choice but to abandon the field and scurry back to the city. The Republican Army of the North did not pursue them. Instead, Gutiérrez de Lara asked the Spanish Governor and the City Council to surrender. On April 1, 1813, the royalists surrendered to the disciple of Hidalgo. Five days later Gutiérrez de Lara surprised everyone, and especially the United States, by issuing a formal written declaration of independence from "European Spain and all other foreign powers." U.S. secret agent William Shaler was completely taken aback by the document and immediately began to seek the removal of Gutiérrez de Lara.

By using double and triple secret agents, Shaler managed to get the soldiers of the Republican Army to elect their commander-in-chief. As per their instructions, they elected José Álvarez de Toledo, a supposed pro-U.S., Spanish born but pro-Mexican independence rebel. Gutiérrez de Lara was removed from command as the Republican Army prepared to do battle with a Spanish royalist force commanded by Brigadier General Joaquín de Arredondo, newly named Commandant General of the Interior Provinces of the East. The two armies met along the banks of the Medina River on the outskirts of San Antonio and the rebels were totally annihilated on August 18, 1813. Without taking prisoners and later executing those rebels who accidentally fell into his hands, Arredondo managed to reconquer Texas for the Spanish Crown. Among the officers whom he lauded for their bravery and participation during the Battle of the Medina were Cadet Lieutenant Antonio López de Santa Anna and sub-deacon Juan Manuel Zambrano of San Antonio. To further recognize the contributions of Zambrano, who had overthrown de las Casas, engineered the capture of Hidalgo and his top lieutenants, and governed Texas in 1811 and 1812, he was given the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel in the Spanish Royalist Army.  

Not all religious had turned on Hidalgo and his idea. One of his supposed best students, Father José María Morelos y Pavón was still carrying on the war in the southern part of New Spain. Following the lead of Gutiérrez de Lara, Morelos convened a congress of delegates from the provinces at Apatzingan in October and November of 1813. On November 6, he and his congress issued a declaration of independence from Spain. Morelos and the Congress also outlawed slavery as well as any religion other than the Roman Catholic Apostolic. Shortly thereafter the Congress was disbanded, Morelos was defeated and captured in battle. He was tried by both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities and executed.
Although many insurgents would harass the Spanish viceregal government in the next eight years after Morelos, it was an ex-seminary student who would truly turn the tide of events. He was a colonel by the name of Agustín de Iturbide. He had studied at the seminary at Valladolid (Morelia) and had joined the Spanish Army thereafter. Throughout the Hidalgo and Morelos uprisings (1811-1813) and thereafter, Iturbide had remained loyal to the Viceregal government and Fernando VII. In January of 1821, he wrote a die-hard rebel, Vicente Guerrero, offering to join forces to overthrow the Viceregal government. Guerrero agreed and on February 24, 1821, Iturbide and he signed the Plan de Iguala. The plan had twenty-four articles. The first proclaimed the Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion as the sole denomination of New Spain. The second article proclaimed New Spain totally independent of “the old Spain and all other foreign powers including those of this continent.” The third article proclaimed a monarchical government for the new nation. The fourth article invited Fernando VII, or a member of the Royal Spanish House, to assume the throne of the nation.

After dealing with political ideologies, the Plan, in article twelve, declared all inhabitants of New Spain as equal citizens of the new nation: The old caste distinctions and divisions were ordered dissolved. All personal property and belongings were assured as being recognized in article thirteen. Interestingly, the regular and secular clergy was assured in article fourteen that their rights and prerogatives were to be recognized. Article fifteen recognized the already existing governmental agencies which were not to be disbanded. The sixteenth article established the “three guarantees” of the Plan de Iguala and the army which defended it. The first guarantee was the reassurance that Roman Catholicism would be the sole denomination without toleration of any other. The second guarantee was the nation’s independence, and the third was the equality and unity of the people.

Iturbide called for a constitutional congress to meet in Mexico City, and the congress, seeing that Fernando VII and his relatives refused the throne of New Spain, gave way to Iturbide’s army which pressured it to name him emperor of Mexico. On May 18, 1822, Iturbide, by virtue of Congress, officially became Agustín I, Emperor of Mexico. The independence of Mexico had finally been assured.

Emperor Iturbide had difficulties governing the new Mexican nation and was forced to dissolve Congress and, in
many cases, order the arrest of his political opposition. It was at this time that the youngest Mexican General ever, Don Antonio López de Santa Anna, came to the fore. On December 2, 1822, he proclaimed the Plan de Casa Mata through which Santa Anna expounded the republican cause. The uprising gained support and on March 19, 1823, Emperor Agustín de Iturbide abdicated the throne. The Era of Santa Anna, so important for the northern frontier provinces, had begun.

Under Iturbide, the Mexican nation had been recognized by Constitutional Act of November 17, 1821, as being composed of the “Old Viceroyalty of New Spain,” as the Interior Provinces of the East, and the Interior Provinces of the West. Both Interior Provinces, therefore, were granted political identity as block entities. Under Santa Anna’s established military-political junta, the Constitutional Congress on August 22, 1823 temporarily recognized Iturbide’s arrangement until further notice. The first re-arrangement occurred on February 4, 1824, when the Congress identified the provinces to be represented in Congress and to be considered political entities of the new nation. They were Mexico, Guanajuato, Oaxaca, Michocán, Querétaro, San Luis Potosí, Tamaulipas, Tabasco, Tlaxcala, Veracruz, Jalisco, Yucatán, Zacatecas, the Interior State of the North (composed of the provinces, now districts, of Chihuahua, Durango and Nuevo México), the Interior State of the West (composed of the provinces, now districts, of Sinaloa and Sonora), the Interior State of the East (composed of the provinces, now districts of Coahuila, Nuevo Léon, and Texas), and the District of Colima and the Californias (Upper and Lower), which were declared territories of the nation.

The Constitutional Congress of 1823-1824 continued to debate the status of the various provinces and on May 7, 1824 did away with the Interior State of the East. On that day, Nuevo León was recognized as a separate State of the Republic. Coahuila and Texas, meanwhile, were annexed into one State which by congressional agreement was to exist until Texas had a large population warranting separate statehood. On July 6, 1824, the Interior State of the North was also done away with. Durango and Chihuahua became States and Nuevo México became a territory of the Republic. The Interior State of the West kept its identity until October 13, 1830. On that day both Sinaloa and Sonora were granted separate statehood. The old frontier Interior Provinces first established by the King of Spain in 1776 had finally ceased to exist. However, the frontier States, no longer united into regional political entities continued to be
united militarily. For the sake of protection against Indians and foreigners (namely the United States), the Republic of Mexico retained the military Commandant Generals for the Interior States of the East, West, and North.  

The Church, during this period of the establishment of the Republic of Mexico, was numerically and economically analyzed by the government. In the 1822 report of the status of the Church, it was learned that there were thirteen masculine Religious Orders in Mexico. They operated 149 convents, had 1,931 men as members, and were worth 3,050,578 pesos! There were an estimated 1,869 nuns, and their combined wealth was approximately 5,200,000 pesos!  

The situation on the frontier during the period of the establishment of the Republic of Mexico is nebulous. It is known that in 1820, Anglo American Roman Catholics had been granted permission to settle in Texas as colonists. Stephen F. Austin, taking over his father, Moses Austin’s dream, brought the Anglo Americans to Texas. Unfortunately, it was still a period of chaos and political-military-ecclesiastical confusion. There were not enough priests in Texas to minister to the spiritual needs of the citizens. Both Tejanos and Anglo American Catholics were sorely neglected and this led to a state of “relaxed Catholicism.” This situation was caused in part by the lack of a bishop for the Diocese of Nuevo León from 1821-1831. José María de Jesús Belaúzaran was named bishop of Nuevo León in February of 1831, and installed on July 17 of that year. He soon got into trouble with the government of the Republic and was forced to flee his post in 1834. Both the religious and their parishioners in Texas were once again left without spiritual guidance on the eve of the federalist-centralist struggles which would soon give way to the anti-Santa Anna uprisings.  

It was about this time that the Ministro de Justicia y Negocios Eclesiásticos issued its report on the Church for 1831. It noted that there were 1,194 parishes in the ten dioceses of Mexico. The Diocese of Nuevo León (Monterrey) composed of the States of Tamaulipas, Nuevo León, and Coahuila y Tejas, had fifty-seven parishes. The Diocese of Durango for the states of Chihuahua, Durango, and the territory of Nuevo México had sixty-four. The Diocese of Sonora for the states of Sinaloa, Sonora, and the territory of the Californias, had sixty-five parishes. These new statistics noted an increase in Mexico of 110 parishes since the end of Spanish rule in 1821. At the same time, there had been a decrease in the number of prelates from 4,229
in 1810, to 2,282 in 1831. Mexico had lost 1,947 priests during the war of independence! Two hundred priests were said to have been executed by the Spanish royalists during the course of the war. Another three hundred priests were Spanish-born prelates who chose to return to Spain. The balance (1,447) were said to have died of "various causes." Interestingly, the number of masculine convents in 1810 had been 208 with 3,112 members. This figure was decreased to 149 convents with 1,931 members in 1822. In 1831, following the expulsion of the Spaniards from Mexico in 1827, the convents numbered 155 (increase of six in nine years), but the number of men was reduced to 1,726 (decrease of 205 in the same nine years). 28

It was during this period of political confusion and ecclesiastical readjustment that Antonio López de Santa Anna was elected President of Mexico for the first time. He was elected on March 30, 1833, and assumed office on April first. Santa Anna chose the federalist Valentín Gómez Farías as his Vice-President. In typical santanista style, the President left the management of the office to his Vice-President while he retired to his hacienda, Mango de Clavo, to enjoy the benefits of his title. Valentín Gómez Farías was an effective federalist president who soon ran afoul of the centralists who favored a stronger dictatorial or monarchical government. Santa Anna came out of semi-retirement to remove his Vice-President in April of 1834, when he appointed General Miguel Barragán as his Vice-President. The centralist uprisings which had been occurring since federalist Santa Anna took office came to an end. The federalists then began to rebel. Among the first to do so was the State of Coahuila y Tejas, which on June 6, 1834 refused to recognize Santa Anna as President. The State for all practical purposes seceded from the union and urged its sister States to do likewise. Other federalist uprisings soon brought Santa Anna to the head of the Army of Operations, which dealt harshly with the rebels at Zacatecas. Thereafter, Santa Anna had temporary arrangements calling for an election in Coahuila y Tejas and the State was quieted for a while. The sending of government centralist troops to Texas in October of 1835 initiated a federalist civil war which soon became known as the Texas Revolution. Originally, the Tejanos and Anglo-American Texans were fighting for the return to the Federalist Constitution of 1824. Unofficial intervention by the United States in the form of men, arms, money, and munitions soon changed the rebellion from a Mexican Civil War to a war of secession. On March 2, 1836, Texas declared itself independent from Mexico. The defeat of Santa Anna on the
fields of San Jacinto in April of that year, and the signing of the Treaty of Velasco in August, officially established the Republic of Texas.  

While the Texans and Mexicans were debating the border question, the Church in Texas found itself in total disarray. Theoretically, the State, now Republic, belonged to the Diocese of Nuevo León. However, its Republic national status required a new ecclesiastical arrangement. In San Antonio, Father Refugio de la Garza was faced with economic, political, and ecclesiastical abandonment. The parish church of San Fernando under his charge had burned in 1828. The roof and dome had caved in. There were no funds to manage the Church and no directives from anyone to follow. He ceased keeping records of marriages, deaths, and baptisms, and must have merely tended to the daily needs of the parishioners.  

It was not until January of 1883 that Rome decided to act. The Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Cardinals de Propaganda Fide empowered the Bishop of New Orleans in the United States, Antonio Blanc, to send delegates to inspect Texas. Rector and President of St. Mary of the Barrens College, Father John Timon, was ordered on March 30 to go to Texas on a special ecclesiastical visitation. It was not until December 27 that Timon landed in Galveston Island. On January 2, 1839, Timon moved on to Houston, the then capital of Texas. The visiting delegate voiced a desire to visit San Antonio but was dissuaded from doing so by several congressmen and Senators who emphasized the dangers in doing so. On January 9, Timon started his return trip to New Orleans after having seen only two Texas municipalities. In his report, nonetheless, he stated that he had been told there were about six hundred Catholics in Nacogdoches, about twenty families at Goliad, some forty Irish Catholics at Refugio, some two hundred Catholics at Victoria (Irish and Mexican primarily), and approximately fifteen hundred Mexicans and fifty Anglo-American Catholics in San Antonio, Timon also lamented the condition of the parish church of San Fernando (which he had not seen) and which he stated was worth some $150,000 but was almost in ruins. He also learned from Juan N. Seguin and other San Antonians that there had not been any religious instruction in the city for years. Neither had there been any confirmations, confessions, or last rites given in San Antonio. The San Antonians also signed sworn affidavits concerning the laxity and religious neglect of Fathers Refugio de la Garza and José Antonio Valdez.
In his Memoirs written many years later, Timon was to say of the Tejano Catholics at that time that “the poor Mexicans were willing to die for their religion, yet, they hardly knew what their religion was about... The faith seemed rather a divine instinct that grew from their baptism than a faith of knowledge.”

On July 18, 1840, the Church designated the Republic of Texas a prefecture of the Diocese of New Orleans. Father John Timon was named Prefect Apostolic of Texas. The letter announcing the decision was given to Texas President Mirabeau Lamar in mid-December 1840. The President was reportedly quite pleased with the decision for it granted the Republic of Texas official recognition by the Vatican. It was in effect a document after the fact. United States Catholic priests and missionaries from the Diocese of New Orleans had been operating in Texas (with the exception of San Antonio) since Timon’s official visit in late 1838 and January of 1839 Timon and the Diocese of New Orleans were now empowered to act officially. For this reason, Timon was given all necessary power and authority to act as if he were a bishop. He then appointed Father John Mary Odin as his Vice-Prefect Apostolic.

Odin had arrived in Texas in mid-July 1840 and had made his way to San Antonio. There he finally met Fathers Refugio de la Garza and José Antonio Valdez of whom he had heard much criticism. Odin discovered the truth of all stories and decided to act. On August 3, 1840, he informed de la Garza of his power from Timon to remove any religious involved in a “public scandal.” Odin then removed de la Garza as pastor of San Fernando and withdrew his faculties as priest. In effect, Refugio de la Garza was defrocked. Four days later, Odin confronted Father Valdez and also defrocked him. Their removal ended the Spanish-American Catholic period of Texas. In their stead, Odin installed Fr. Miguel Calvo, a Spanish volunteer serving for a French Bishop from a United States Bishopric in the Prefecture Apostolic of the Republic of Texas!

Unknown to Timon and Odin, the latter had been appointed Co-adjutor Bishop of Detroit by the Vatican in December of 1840. Odin was notified on March 30, 1841, and immediately made plans for sailing to New Orleans to meet with the Bishop of that city. On April 16, Odin received the Papal Bull from Bishop Antonio Blanc and immediately asked for time to consider the appointment. Timon, in the meantime, argued against Odin’s appointment, arguing that he was sorely needed in Texas. Odin, meanwhile, returned the document of
appointment to the Bishop on May 9, and chose to return to Texas. He was back in Galveston by May 20. Odin then embarked on an official visitation of the Prefecture. The Vatican however, was not to be robbed on a capable administrator. On July 16, 1841, Pope Gregory XVI named John Odin bishop of the Vicariate Apostolic of Texas. The Papa Bulls arrived in New Orleans on Oct. 11, but Bishop Blanc did not inform Odin until January of 1842. Odin sailed for New Orleans from Galveston on February 17 and arrived two days later. Finally, on Sunday, March 6, 1842, John Odin was consecrated Bishop of Texas. All ties with Mexico and the Diocese of Nuevo León on Monterrey had finally been officially terminated.

While events in Texas and the dioceses of Nuevo León and New Orleans had been developing, the far northwestern regions of Mexico had also been receiving ecclesiastical attention. In 1832, the Franciscan College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas sent ten missionaries to California under the leadership of Fray Francisco del Refugio García Diego y Moreno. They arrived in Upper California on January 15, 1833, and spread out throughout the territory to inspect the missions. That same year, unfortunately, a pestilence struck California and many people, particularly mission Indians, succumbed to it. The missionary group verified the truth of the report and complaints by the missionaries in 1826 that the California missions were supporting the military and political forces in the territory. What little grain and goods they produced were taken by the soldiers for their sustenance.

The missions were described as economic communes presided over by the missionary. Everybody worked for the benefit of the commune, sharing the work and the benefits equally. Since the Indians were exempted from civil jurisdiction, the missionary was also the chief justice and defender of the neophytes. All in all, the missions were so successful that by 1830 the government owed the California missionaries some 400,000 pesos for goods delivered to the soldiers. At the same time, the missionaries by 1832 had succeeded in baptizing 87,739 Indians. Of this number 16,864 Indians were still in the missions. These Indians were proudly reported as being engaged in the process of being assimilated. They were shoemakers, weavers, carpenters, blacksmiths, cattlemen, and ordinary laborers. They were also the construction hands in the building of the churches, granaries, dams, acequias, orchards, and other improvements.

California by 1836 had eight Franciscans from the College of San Fernando de México and thirteen from the College of
Guadalupe de Zacatecas. In order to meet the demanding needs of the territory, it was decided to ask for the establishment of a diocese for California. Fray García Diego personally appealed to the Mexican Congress and the august body acted on September 19, 1836. The congressional edict actually called for a discussion on the merits of establishing a diocese and invited interested parties to present themselves to voice their opinion. Article two of the document called for asking the Holy See to establish such a diocese if there was a proven need for one. Nomination for the position of Bishop of California would be granted to the Archdiocese of Mexico with final approval by the national government.

Since there were no objections to the establishment of a diocese, Pope Gregory VII on April 27, 1840, issued the appropriate Papal Bull establishing the diocese of the Californias (Upper and Lower). The appointment as first bishop was granted to Fray Francisco del Refugio García Diego y Moreno. It was not until October 4, of the year that García Diego was consecrated at the College of Guadalupe de Zacatecas. The Bishop embarked for Upper California shortly thereafter and arrived on December 11. He chose to establish his seat at Monterey, Upper California. In January of 1842, the Bishop took residence at Mission Santa Barbara and officiated from there until his untimely death on April 30, 1846. García Diego's death at that particular time would be a calamity of sorts for the California Catholics and the Church in general. That same year, the United States invaded the Republic of Mexico and a costly war ensued. When it was over two years later with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexico had ceded to the United States its northern territories of Upper California, New Mexico, part of Sonora (the old Pimería Alta soon known as Arizona), and the northern unoccupied land to be generally known as the "U.S. Southwest."

For New Mexico, this new political event was a further complication of a ten-year situation which had worsened annually. It began in 1836 with the Republic of Texas ineffectively claiming the Rio Grande ("from its source") as its western boundary. This preposterous claim included New Mexico, and those portions east of the river governed since the colonial period by Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Tamaulipas! Texas was never able to enforce its claim and in the few instances when it sent commissioners and military or political representatives into the disputed territories of New Mexico and Coahuila, the Texans were either arrested or fired upon. The U.S.-Mexican
War and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo gave Texas one final chance at establishing its claim. The Texans arrived at Santa Fé in 1849 and the New Mexicans promptly and properly ignored them. Adding insult to injury, the New Mexicans established a legislature and appealed to the U.S. Congress for Statehood in 1850. The Texans, in turn, threatened to field an army against New Mexico to enforce their claim over the territory. The U.S. Government was forced to intervene and in the ensuing agreement, Texas received the El Paso area and what would later be known as the Panhandle. New Mexico received the area later known as Arizona as part of its territory.  

Unknown to the Texans, the New Mexicans, the United States Government, the Church was acting much faster in regard to New Mexico than in the case with Texas. Only July 19, 1850, Pope Pius IX issued a Papal Bull establishing the Diocese of New Mexico and named Joanne Lamy as its Vicar Apostolic. The newly appointed Bishop was thirty-five years of age, born a Frenchman but had long served with distinction in the United States. He had been previously nominated for the bishopric of California but received the one of New Mexico instead. On November 24, 1850, Joanne Baptiste Lamy was officially consecrated bishop of the newly established Diocese of New Mexico. Lamy left Cincinnati the following day, heading to Santa Fé by way of the Mississippi to New Orleans and thence by sea to Indianola, Texas and from there to San Antonio before heading north, northwest to El Paso and Santa Fe. It was not until August 9, 1851 that the Bishop reached his destination.

The citizens of Santa Fé gave the new bishop a pompous and warm reception and then informed him that they did not recognize his authority or title to the bishopric. The problem derived from the fact that the Vatican had previously informed its Mexican diocese to hold on to their post until further notice. That notice from the Pope had not reached the Bishop of Durango. As far as the Diocese of Durango and the clergy of New Mexico were concerned, Bishop Lamy had no verified authority to assume his post. The newly appointed Bishop decided to solve the problem by confronting it head on. Lamy went to meet with the Bishop of Durango, Fr. José Antonio Laureano López de Zubiría y Escalante.

The Mexican bishop insisted that he had never heard from the Vatican concerning the New Mexican Diocese. He first heard of it when Lamy wrote him from San Antonio. The Bishop thus insisted he could do nothing without official notification. Lamy
wisely produced a copy of his appointment accompanied by the proper Papal Bulls. Bishop López de Zubiria accepted this as proof of Lamy’s authority. Having accomplished what he had set out to do, Lamy returned to Santa Fé and reached it January 10, 1852. He then turned to mending the state of his diocese.36

Besides the economic ruin of the diocese, priests who had succumbed to earthly temptations, and a Spanish-Mexican clergy which was not too sure of him, Lamy still had to face the Third Order of Penitence. Already in 1833, Durango Bishop López de Zuribia had forbidden their rituals but they had continued with great support from some of the New Mexicans. Bishop Lamy’s problems would continue unabated for quite some time. He was destined to meet them one at a time until the Catholic Church of New Mexico would no longer be Spanish-Mexican but full-fledged U.S. American.

The last traces of the Spanish-Mexican Catholic Church in the U.S. Southwest occurred in 1850 when Archbishop Joseph Sadoc Alemany arrived in San Francisco to assume his new appointment.37 Odin in Texas, Lamy in New Mexico-Arizona, and Alemany in California represented a new Church and a new order of things. It was, however, built on centuries of dedication and sacrifice by hundreds of unsung missionaries and devoted Catholics who had brought, planted, and sowed and grains of Catholicism in the barren wilderness of the Spanish North American frontier. The newcomers would not always appreciate their predecessors, yet they could have not moved in the 1840’s and 1850’s into Texas and the Southwest if their predecessors had not paved the way with their blood, souls, tears, and labor.


7. Ibid., II, 65.

8. Ibid., II, 66-71.

9. Ibid., II, 78-79.

10. Ibid., II, 79.

11. Ibid., II, 117-120.

12. Ibid., II, 135-136.

13. Ibid., II, 143-146.


15. Ibid., II, 384-391.


18. "Proceso de Juan Bautista de las Casas for Infidencia" ms. 1811, *Texas State Archives; Austin.*


20. "Proceso de Juan Bautista de las Casas."


27. *Diccionario Porrúa*, I, 244-245.


NEW MEXICO

John Fitzmorris

New Mexico during the period 1810-1850 was controlled by three countries: Spain (from colonization until 1821), Mexico (1821-1848) and the U. S. Each of these time periods had its own characteristics. However, there were two characteristics which were common to all three periods: constant Indian raiding and isolation from the mainstream of the Spanish, Mexican, and American societies. The Indian raiding was extensive and constant. The best known of the raiding Indians were the Apaches and Utes. However, it was common for pacific Indians who felt maligned to dress themselves like hostile Indians and steal sheep or horses.\(^1\) The effectiveness of this raiding was heightened by the New Mexican isolation from civilization. This separation led to many of the problems experienced by New Mexicans. Lack of soldiers, caused by the low density of presidios, led to successful Indian raiding. Lack of legal advisors led the governor to send papers to Chihuahua for advice before he could review a legal case. This caused the populace, in many cases, to wait for a new governor, who would judge their case favorably, rather than ask for quick legal decisions and swift justice.

Each of the three periods, however, had different characteristics. The typical characteristics of the Spanish period were a barter economy, limited protection from the Indians, and hostile reception of United States expeditions. With the exception of Zebulon Pike’s contact with the New Mexicans in 1810, the U. S. attempts at trade were met with confiscation and imprisonment. McKnight’s expedition of 1812 spent 10 years in jail. The Chouteau-DeMun expedition of 1817 had their property confiscated. McLanahan and two others were accused of spying and spent two years in jail.\(^2\) The most favorably accepted, that of Merriwhether (who later became governor of New Mexico), was captured and then released east of Taos in the wilderness.\(^3\)

The Mexican period had one all-pervasive characteristic: the growing trade between the U. S. and New Mexico. The change in government altered the reception of Anglos in New Mexico. In 1821, the year Iturbide was crowned, Glenn became
the first explorer-trader from the U.S. who was not penalized for his mercantile instincts. Six years later the U.S. government saw fit to protect the commerce on the Santa Fé Trail. Fourteen years after that, the newly established government of Texas tried to annex New Mexico because of the trade. When Texas failed to annex New Mexico, the Texans tried unsuccessfully to divert the trade to obtain tribute. This also failed. Five years after the 1841 Texas-Santa Fé expedition’s attempt to annex New Mexico, the U.S. invaded Mexico and Kearny “captured” New Mexico.

U.S. control of New Mexico was characterized by hostility between Anglo and New Mexican cultures. In 1847 there was a revolt in which the governor was killed, and in 1851, when Bishop Lamy came to New Mexico, he replaced all the indigenous priests of the area.

New Mexico’s three main concerns during the Spanish period were (1) the Indians, (2) representation in the Spanish Cortes, and (3) the primitive environment. The importance of these concerns to New Mexico at this time can only be understood by examining more closely the situation of the province. The official population of New Mexico was divided into two groups: converted Indians, and Spaniards. But as both groups were Spanish-surnamed, they were indistinguishable in many instances. The converted Indian population at the time of the census was constant at 10,000 individuals. The Spanish population grew from 19,000 individuals in 1800 to approximately 30,000 in 1822.4 Hence, in 1800, there were two Spaniards for every converted Indian, and in 1822, three Spaniards for every converted Indian.

The increase in Spanish population was felt by all the Spanish villas except two: Albuquerque and Taos5 Since these two towns did not follow the pattern, they must have been subject to influences that restricted their growth. In the case of Taos, it may have been the “Anglo scare” of 1815 and 1817 during which the villa served as a center for reconnaissance. There were rumored to be 2,000 Anglos in a fort on the Río de las Animas.6 This was the Chouteau-DeMun trapping and trading expedition.7 In the case of Albuquerque the cause for the stunted growth of population might have been the exposed southern position of the villa and the intensive raiding of the area by the Apaches.8

Among the Pueblo Indian communities the notable exceptions to the average population of 766 people per pueblo, were the Laguna and Zuni 1950 and 1597 people respectively.9 It is not known, nor can it be hypothesized from the information
gathered in research, why these pueblos should have had larger populations. However, it is known what restricted pueblo populations of the time. First, the Pueblo Indians practiced effective birth control by drinking an herbal concoction, thus limiting the children in a family to four. Second, under Spanish laws the pueblos were granted a radius of land around a cross in the center of the pueblo. And third, the constant raiding by marauding Indians must have drained the matrilineal society of the pacific Indians in the defense of their pueblos. The main pueblos of this time were Taos, San Ildefonso, Cochiti, Santa Ana, Laguna, Isleta, Acoma, and Zuni.

The main villas or Spanish settlements at this time were: Santa Fé (the capital), Albuquerque, Santa Cruz de la Cañada, San Juan de los Caballeros, Abiquiu, Belén, Taos, and Santa Clara. But what did the Spanish villa of this time look like? A picture of a Spanish settlement is provided by the census of 1822. This census was taken when the Mexican government took over Spain's role in the Southwest. The city council of El Paso had under its jurisdiction 8,384 souls, of which 2,267 were male and 3,173 were female. Also, there were 161 married couples, 305 widowers, and 417 widows. Occupations ranged from 2,072 farmers to two treasury officials. Other occupations listed included 681 artisans, 269 laborers, and 6 manufacturers. Finally, there were 5 merchants, 3 students and 6 retired soldiers. Thus, a large city which stood at "the pass to the north" had approximately 40% more women than men, very few laborers, and a large number of farmers.

The society of the time in New Mexico was strongly agrarian. Unfortunately, the only way to gauge the production of the farmers of New Mexico is through the tithe, the tax for the support of the Church. The tithe was a tax levied by the government, collected by tax collectors or diezmeros for a percentage of the collection and distributed to the various priests for their support. In 1803 the total tithe collected for the year amounted to 3,000 fanegas of maize, 2,000 fanegas of wheat, 1,000 fanegas of vegetables, 1,000 arrobas of wool, 5,000 sheep, 500 goats, 200 calves, 400 arrobas of wine, and 40 arrobas of cotton. Hence, New Mexico had its greatest production in maize, wool, sheep, and wine. Also, there was a noticeably small production of cotton. The surplus production of wine and wool were the chief exports of New Mexico, while the lack of materials for the making of cloth caused it to be the leading import of New Mexico.
Imports and exports came chiefly from the south during the Spanish period by way of the Camino Real which went through the Jornada de Muerto to El Paso and Chihuahua City. One route used from New Mexico to California was "The Old Spanish Trail." It was, however, only partially used during the Spanish period. The portion of the Spanish trail used was the northwest route from Santa Fé to Colorado and the Great Basin. The "Old Spanish Trail" traffic was mainly in trade goods to the nomadic Indians whose territory was located in this area. The trade goods were an attempt to addict the nomadic Indians to the technological advantages of Spanish society. The goods were frequently traded for slaves captured in raids by the Indians. This trade on the Spanish Trail was first documented in 1813 when the Indians began killing the traders' horses if they would not buy the slaves. So, in order to save their horses, the Spanish started to trade in slaves along this route. This was not the first time the Spanish had traded in slaves.¹⁹

Any trade journey at this time was dangerous and long. The main predators to trade were the marauding Indians. Consequently, importing and exporting was done in groups of wagons called cordones or caravans. The vehicles of the 1800's were called carretas.²⁰ They were drawn by 8 mules and would carry as much as two tons of goods. The supplies for one caravan of medium proportions will give an indication of one such typical expedition in 1800. The supplies were 600 fanegas of wheat flour, 100 cattle, 150 fanegas of corn, beans, chickpeas, mutton, and water for the desert stretch to El Paso.²¹ A caravan between New Mexico and the south usually contained 32 wagons, each with a driver, muleteer or arriero, and was divided into four groups. Each group, called a train, was led by two wagon masters or mayordomos, who cared for four wagons each.²²

Southward, the wagons carried exports of wine, wool, and beaver pelts valued at around 60,000 pesos and on the northward journey carried cloth and livestock valued at 112,000 pesos.²³ One cordon brought these imports into New Mexico; 61,000 pesos worth of European cloth, 7,000 pesos of Asian cloth, and 1,000 pesos worth of horses and mules.²⁴ The tradings of the cordones, unfortunately, left a trade deficit of 52,000 pesos for the province of New Mexico.²⁵

However, the trade deficit did little harm to an economy which used money irregularly and whose only clock was the sundial at the governor's palace. Money, in New Mexico, was in limited circulation until the U.S. takeover in 1846.²⁶ The economy of New Mexico traded in goods. The amount of goods
to be traded was pre-determined by the ideal peso value of each of the goods and the price in pesos for the object. The kind of goods traded was indicated by the kind of peso which was set in the transaction. For example, a house of two windows and a door (since these things are hard to construct in adobe), could sell for 100 pesos de la tierra, but the medium of exchange would be 25 sheep at 2 pesos per sheep and 50 fangegas of wheat at 1 peso per fanega. Hence, the values of the goods traded were standardized, giving both parties in the transaction an idea of what had to be exchanged for a certain price. Other standard prices were: 1 real for a pint of wine, 1 peso de la tierra per fanega of wheat or corn, and 4 reales per pound of tobacco. Tobacco was a state monopoly, and was chiefly purchased by the rich and the presidial soldiers.27

Furthermore, there were different kinds of pesos which specified the kinds of goods that could be traded. For example, there was the peso de la tierra, which was used for objects of the land e.g. wheat, corn, or sheep, and was worth 2 reales. The peso de plata was worth 4 times the peso de la tierra, or 8 reales, and was made of silver. There was also the peso de proyecto, which means literally peso of design. The peso de proyecto was worth 6 reales. Finally, there were the pesos de antiguos, which literally were old pesos out of circulation and worth 4 reales. 28

To this point, New Mexico can be pictured as a chiefly agrarian economy carrying on trade with the Indians of the north in order to pacify them, and trade with the south for the items that could not be produced in New Mexico. The pueblo Indians, through conscious family planning, were a constant and integrated feature of an enlarging Spanish population. What about the government of this period?

The government of the Spanish period was a complex system of checks and balances. At the provincial level of the government, all power originated with the governor, who appointed priests, selected alcaldes, and was military head of the government. The governor’s official minions were the alcaldes.29

The position of the alcalde was roughly equivalent to a combination mayor, judge, militia leader, and policeman. There were officials for the smaller towns called alcalde tenientes who were under the control of an alcalde mayor who was under control of the governor. The most important function of the alcalde for the citizens was as Capitán de guerra or war chief. In an emergency, when a regular military officer was not present,
the alcalde could organize a foray against raiding Indians. Given the frequent and serious Indian problem of the times, this function must have been called on frequently. The alcalde mayor was under obligation to inform the governor of military expeditions that he formed.

The second function of the alcalde mayor was to act as juez de primera instancia or judge of the first instance. Cases of this sort were disputes involving the Justicia Ordinaria or Ordinary Justice and could be appealed through the alcalde to the governor and then to the audiencia (district court) in Guadalajara. The Justicia Ordinaria delivered justice in minor civil and criminal cases. Consequently, serious cases went to the governor or to their own special courts such as the ecclesiastical or military fueros (special rights and privileges). In these serious cases the alcalde submitted a summary or sumaria, which contained the expediente, or statements of witnesses, and the declaración indagatoria, or statement of the accused. When the alcalde was acting as juez, he carried his baton of office or bastón de justicia.

Thirdly, the alcalde mayor acted as a policeman. In this function the alcalde mayor was a revenue agent, responsible for the tobacco monopoly. The tobacco monopoly was a major source of revenue for the government from the rich and the military personnel. The military personnel and the rich were the only individuals who could pay the price of tobacco. All others in New Mexico were forced to use other home-grown smoking mixtures. The most common name for the smoking mixture was punche. Punche was legal, so long as it was used for barter or trade with the Indians.

As a policeman, the alcalde mayor was responsible for travel on the highways. The alcalde mayor was in this respect a form of a customs agent. The alcalde issued travel permits and apprehended illegal travelers who forfeited lands, money, and offices, when caught without the proper papers on the road. This was an attempt to force the Spaniards to live together for protection from the Indians. Finally, as a policeman, the alcalde protected the peace at the frequent trade fairs in which Spaniard, Pueblo Indian, and non-converted Indian participated. Usually, these trade fairs were held outside of the towns at areas which were easily watched inside and out and were relatively neutral.

The alcalde mayor also acted as land agent for the governor. The alcalde mayor administered grants issued by the governor.
First, he checked the land to see that no one lived there. Next, he surveyed the land and established what seemed to be fixed boundaries. Finally, he made sure the tenants were keeping the terms of their grants. There was a particularly interesting ceremony when the tenant came to take possession of the land. After surveying the perimeters of the grant, the alcalde went around these perimeters once more with the new owners and their witnesses. At points on the perimeters of the grant, the alcalde bent down and tore up a tuft of grass or lifted up a handful of dirt which he threw into the air. While the alcalde threw the grass or dirt into the air, the witnesses and new owner proclaimed: "long live the King." Thus, the new owner took possession of the granted lands.

The next most common arm of the government was the soldier. Although these men exercised limited political power, they did, however, exercise economic power as one of the few sources of hard cash for the economy of New Mexico during the Spanish Period. The highest stationed military officer in New Mexico was the governor. The governor's superior was the Commandant General of the Interior Provinces stationed in Chihuahua. Under the governor was one lieutenant, two second lieutenants, and 1,500 soldiers. The 1,500 soldiers were divided into 39 caballadas or cavalry units. There were also 12 soldiers guarding the jail at Santa Fé, and 7 soldiers at the presidio at Sevillity (or what is now La Joya).³¹

The duties of the soldiers were many. They ranged from herd guard to jail guard. In winter the main duty of the soldiers was guarding the presidio horse herds. The herds that the caballada guarded were sometimes as large as 300 head. This duty was particularly dangerous as one of the main measures of Nomadic Indian wealth was the size of an individual's horse herd. The Indians, then, to acquire prestige within the tribe, stole as many horses as possible from the Spaniards. In the early 1800's horse stealing grew so intense that many Indian raids were accomplished with relative ease, for the Spaniards could not chase the Indians because their horses were stolen.

The second function of the soldier was reconnaissance and patrol. The size of a patrol bore a positive relationship to the degree of danger that was expected in the expedition. For example, in 1817 Lt. Francisco Salazar and an expedition of 200 men went in search of an American fort said to have 2,000 men and cannon on the Rio de las Animas in present-day Colorado. Generally, it was not obligatory that a patrol be led by an officer,
although the title of a patrol leader was *comandante*. For example, a few months after Lt. Salazar’s reconnaissance mission, Sgt. Mariano Bernal led an expedition to capture the two explorers and traders, Julius DeMun and Auguste Chateau.\(^{32}\)

Sgt. Bernal was the *comandante* of the expedition. Lastly, the *comandante* of a patrol was responsible for keeping a day-to-day diary or *diario de novedades*, which served as an official record of the expedition. An example of this is the diary of Second Lt. Don José María de Arce in 1818 in his search for Anglos north of Taos.\(^{33}\) The remaining functions of soldiers were escort duty and mail carrying. The mail carriers were said to be open to graft for the purpose of looking into the contents of the carriers’ pouch, but not the letters themselves. However, it is hard to believe how this did much harm when many pieces of mail were packaged within one packet for the purpose of passing mail costs off on the commandant generals’ office.\(^ {34}\) Also, the soldier did duty as a caravan escort. A usual guard for a wagon train was 20 to 40 soldiers.

The third arm of the government was the Church. Priests were appointed by the governor through the vice patronage. The vice patronage was given the governor, by the Commandant General from the King. However, aside from appointing the priests, and collecting and distributing the tithes, the governor had little to do with the priests. The priests were under direct authority of the Diocese of Durango. But the Bishop from Durango had not visited New Mexico for 50 years when Pino made his report to the Cortes in 1812.\(^{35}\)

In addition to the Bishop of Durango’s considering New Mexico nonexistent, the priests who were in New Mexico did not always fulfill their function.\(^{36}\) The missionaries and priests only worked among those who were near enough to their quarters in the Spanish settlements or those who could pay enough for their services. In 1812 there were 26 Indian pueblos and 102 Spanish settlements, all of which were served by 22 missionaries and secular priests.\(^{37}\) Generally, a priest had to go from 8 to 10 leagues to serve his Indian flock.\(^ {38}\) This was a distance too long and too dangerous for the time. It is no wonder that the Pueblo Indians still maintain their religion much the same as it was before the Spaniards came. Perhaps the difficulty is most succinctly stated by Barreiro when he says: “How resentful must be the poor people who suffer such neglect! They realize that their harvests and their herds are paying for the maintenance of a priest who does not live among them and who does not provide
them with the comforts of religion even in that last hour, when they most need such comfort.”

Indeed, this condition led in 1810 to the “Natives” writing a petition to Protector General Andrade. In response Protector General Andrade appointed Felipe Sandoval to the post of protector partidario for New Mexico. Sandoval, after inspecting the province, reported that there was no religious instruction taking place. The Bishop of Durango, who had never visited New Mexico, reprimanded the clergy of New Mexico. The priests of New Mexico, led by Vice Custudio Father Sebastián Alvarez in 1818 made a defensive statement. In that statement they claimed that they were actually educating the natives and that Protector Partidario Sandoval was a thief. Nothing was ever resolved by this conflict. The religious life of the New Mexicans was neglected, except within their own specific form of religion, the Penitentes. The Penitentes, a religious sect descended from the flagellantal organization in Seville, originated around this time in New Mexican history.

The final arm of the New Mexican Government to be examined during this time in New Mexican history is the governor. The governor was the source for almost all governmenta power in New Mexico. The governor appointed priests under the vice patronage, the alcaldes did the governor’s bidding, and the governor was commander of military forces in New Mexico. The governor’s most important function, in regard to the settlers in New Mexico, was as military commander. As commander of forces in New Mexico he held under his command not only the Army, but also the civilian militia.

The militia was divided into three groups: Pueblo Indians, Spanish citizens, and Genizaros. Genizaros, or converted Indians from the plains, were distributed throughout the militia and a Trozo de Genizaros, a special guard, was stationed at Santa Fé. The main function of the Genizaros was as interpreters and guides, though they also served as warriors. The Pueblo Indians also served as warriors in the militia. Indeed, the Pueblo Indians in the last years of Spanish control were undifferentiated from the Spanish militia.

The Spanish militia was divided into three units. One of these units was directly under the governor’s control. These militia men were the urbanos or the elite class that took part in the militia. In 1808, the militia numbered one hundred eighty-three men or three companies of sixty-one men. In one company of the militia was approximately two squads or
escuadras. Each company had one captain, one lieutenant, two Alfereces or cadets, two sergeants, (one to an escuadra), four first corporals (two to an escuadra), four second corporals (two to an escuadra) and one drummer.44

The governor's second function was that of civil leader. The governor was primarily the leader of the alcaldes or Jefe de Alcaldes. The Jefe de Alcaldes listed to appeals and acted as juez de primera instancia for cases outside the jurisdiction of the alcaldes. The governor was also responsible for the inspection or visita of the province. In a visita the governor's emissaries visited all the principal villas and pueblos, read an official pronouncement, waited for complaints, and reported them to the governor.

Another function of the governor was the vice patronage. The vice patronage was granted to the governor by the Commandant General. The Commandant General, in granting the vice patronage, gave the privilege of selecting the clergy. The governor actually selected the priests and missionaries from a list supplied him by the provincial of the Franciscan order in Mexico City.

In summary, a panography of New Mexico during Spanish control would show an agrarian economy operating chiefly through barter, importing manufactured goods, exporting raw materials, and operating at a deficit. The panograph would also show a government that fulfilled many aspects of the citizens' needs. The chief among these needs was defense against marauding Indians.

The major historical event in the Spanish period during the nineteenth century was the election of an official to represent New Mexico at the Cortes in Spain. In February of 1810, a decree from the Junta Central de las Españas reached New Mexico. It ordered the people of New Mexico to select a representative for the Cortes.45 The Cortes was a conservative legislative body established to control the Spanish empire in the absences of its monarch. The membership of the Cortes was primarily of the upper socioeconomic and caste levels of society.46 The Cortes, therefore, was more liberal than the monarchy because it incorporated more of the creole elements of the Spanish society. Because its members were drawn from the top of the society, it did not wish to change the status quo. Hence, the representatives or diputados from the New World, met with a body of men who were not willing to listen to the problems of the New World.
The decree, which reached New Mexico in February of 1810, for the cabildo of Santa Fé to select a delegate to the Cortes. Since there was no town council for Santa Fé, the most important men from the largest cities helped select the delegate. The delegate they picked was Pedro Bautista Pino. Although the decree arrived in February of 1810, Pino was not picked until August of 1810 and he did not leave till October of 1811. New Mexico was represented, while Pino was preparing and traveling, by creoles, chosen in three drawings from the population of creoles living on the Iberian Peninsula.47

When Pino, the first creole from New Mexico to visit Spain48 arrived, he represented New Mexico and the interest of New Spain as best he could. The main points that Pino put to the Cortes were: the creation of five new presidios,49 the creation of civil and criminal audiencias in Chihuahua,50 the creation of a bishopric with a college,51 the reorganization of the military and paying the militia.52 The minor points that Pino was involved in were: liberalizing and developing trade,53 redistribution of land for New Mexico54 and Mexico, and the abolition of the tobacco monopoly.55

Pino in his Exposition, which is the best primary source on New Mexico at this time, described the condition of New Mexico and the arguments for his contentions at the Cortes. Pino’s contentions point to the main problems of New Mexico at the time. The establishment of five new presidios at El Paso, the Pecos River near Vado (or what is now San Miguel), Socorro, Taos, and Cristobal was prompted by the 33 nomadic Indian tribes56 which surrounded New Mexico. The creation of an audiencia, or judicial tribunal, in Chihuahua, was proposed because of the distances, time, and resources it took individuals to go to Guadalajara.57 The reorganization of the military was proposed because of the draft, waste in salaries, and the conviction by citizens that the Spanish government did not wish New Spain to flourish.58 Finally, Pino proposed to pay the militia because the services of the people of New Mexico were equal to that which the army provided and these services were done at great cost to the citizens.59 Pino also proposed the creation of a bishopric and a college because of the poor and estranged condition of the Church in New Mexico at the time.60

The minor points that Pino supported or championed at the Cortes were concerned with the welfare of Mexico as a whole. Pino in November 1812 introduced a resolution, for example, appealing for the resettlement of people of mixed blood (the
lesser castes, or the main participants in Hidalgo’s revolution) into pueblos where land could be given them for the good of all the inhabitants. Thus, according to Pino, the “reduced” people would not revolt because they would lose their land.

Pino’s only success was in the creation of a bishopric and seminary in 1813. However, this was a hollow administrative victory, for the bishopric and college were never established.

Pino, after returning to New Mexico, was re-elected in 1820 to the Provincial Deputation. As the donations were insufficient to cover the expenses of traveling and living in Spain, Pino would not go any further than Vera Cruz. Pedro Bautista Pino’s accomplishments were summed up in the children’s song: “Don Pedro Pino went; Don Pedro Pino came back.”

In 1821, news of Iturbide’s coronation in Mexico City reached New Mexico. Prior to 1821 nothing was known concerning the war for independence from Mexico. On December 26, 1821, the citizens of Santa Fé gathered at the post office to hear news of the “dulce voz de libertad” or “sweet voice of liberty.” Persons receiving mail read the letters aloud to the people outside the post office. On January 6, 1822 there was a baile or dance to celebrate independence from Spain.
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THE CHURCH IN TEXAS
Carmen Tafolla

The period 1848 to 1904 was complex and difficult for Mexicotejanos (Texans of Mexican origin). Set against the economic and political difficulties of a highly anti-Catholic, anti-Mexican postwar Texas, the situation was complicated even more by the linguistic and cultural barriers encountered by a predominantly non-Spanish-speaking clergy new to the area, its language, and its customs. This cultural distance often led to mutual misunderstandings between the clergy and Mexicotejanos. The financial difficulties encountered by the clergy and the extreme poverty of the people made the survival of the church a question of immediate physical reality.

In 1848 the newly created Diocese of Galveston was in a state of confusion and change. Bishop Odin, formerly Bishop of the Vicariate Apostolic of Galveston, was chosen on May 21, 1847 as ordinary of the new diocese with jurisdiction over the state of Texas. But he had many problems determining the exact boundaries of the former Mexican province of Texas.

Bishop Joan Marie Odin, explaining later his reasons for neglecting certain areas, described his dilemma to Cardinal Barnabo, secretary of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The province of Texas and the area between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande had formerly been under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Monterrey, Mexico, while the province of New Mexico had been under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Durango. When the Texans gained their independence from Mexico, they set their western and southern boundaries as the Rio Grande from its mouth to its source. This would now include on the north most of New Mexico and on the south the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. Bishop Odin added that this latter area “had never been part of Texas properly speaking.” Mexico had ceded to the United States, by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, all the territory claimed by Texas east of the Rio Grande as well as the rest of the
Southwest, thereby leaving the question of the boundaries of Texas to an internal settlement between the United States and Texas. Bishop Odin refrained from visiting either the lower Rio Grande Valley or the New Mexico territory claimed by Texas until the dispute was settled between the United States and Texas.

In the spring of 1849, Bishop Odin was informed that he should exercise jurisdiction over the disputed areas. Realizing the vastness of this territory and the great task it would impose upon him to minister effectively to it, Odin appealed to the Seventh Provincial Council in Baltimore to recommend to Rome that a vicar apostolic take charge of New Mexico. On July 29, 1850 the Holy Father appointed Jean Baptiste Lamy bishop-vicear of New Mexico. The lower Rio Grande Valley was now part of the Diocese of Galveston, and the bishop quickly arranged to visit the new area.

Despite danger from raiding Comanches, Bishop Odin left San Antonio in April 1850 for Eagle Pass. From there he passed to Presidio del Rio Grande, Laredo, and Brownsville. Odin repeatedly commented on the great faith of the Mexican and Mexicotejano people. This religious faithfulness was especially surprising if we take into account the fact that in 1849 there were only twelve priests in the entire state of Texas to minister to twenty thousand Catholics; the devotion of the Mexicotejano people was sustained by and large without the help of clergy.

Since the Rio Grande Valley contained more than ten thousand Catholics, the greatest concentration in the state, with San Antonio reporting the second largest number of Catholics at only six thousand, it is curious that Odin should have shown no interest in the area until specifically instructed to exercise jurisdiction over it. Although the very great majority of Catholics were Mexicotejanos, no attempt was made to recruit Spanish-speaking clergy. On the contrary, the only two Mexican priests in the valley had been removed from their positions by Odin in 1840. Furthermore, an earlier report to Odin from Father John Timon, a visitor sent by the bishop of New Orleans, had rejoiced at the mass emigration of Mexicotejanos out of Texas and south to Mexico. This, he reported, would be of benefit to the church, which instead of having to deal with the existent Catholicism of the past, could begin with a clean slate to build a newer and stronger Catholicism in the present. The obvious reference here seems to be to a preference for establishing a mission among non-Mexicotejano residents of Texas.
It must be remembered that at this time the United States had recently emerged as victor from a war with Mexico; not all the anti-Mexican war sentiments were forgotten, nor would they be forgotten in the years immediately ahead. Socially the Catholic church was in a very precarious position in the United States. A definite minority, the church saw clearly that the political and economic control of the state was in the hands of the Anglo-Americans. Realizing that the strong anti-Catholic prejudice would be most feasibly overcome by an emphatic affirmation of the "Americanism" of the church and by a close affiliation with Anglo-American power groups, the Catholic hierarchy struggling for survival adopted pro-Anglo policies.

The recent anti-Mexicanist views of the Texas Catholic hierarchy, as seen in the report of Father Telmon to Bishop Odin (1839-1841), by the attitude toward the Mexican clergy, and by the bishop's neglect of the predominantly Mexican-populated area until he was specifically instructed to the contrary, make the bishop's interest in Brownsville's Mexicotejanos in 1849 curious.

There are two major influences that can be linked to Bishop Odin's sudden interest in Brownsville. The first was the activity of Protestant groups among the Spanish-speaking of Brownsville. The second, and perhaps the more influential, was a special request for Catholic missionaries from the Anglo-Americans of Brownsville. Odin responded by asking the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, a newly formed French order, to answer this need. Eager to carry out their motto of service to the poor, the Oblates reached Texas in December 1849. But the priests who arrived found that the many tender letters of request were based on religious motives. The Mexicotejanos refused to deal with the local Anglo-Americans, whom they held in great mistrust. Seeing that this would harm their financial concerns, the Anglo-Americans had approached the church. A rich Lutheran businessman offered his store as a place to gather for Mass and a house next to the chapel for a lodging for priests. A two hundred francs a month for the Catholic clergy. All this appeared to the Mexicotejanos to be an apparent collaboration between the French priests, who at first communicated only in English, and the Anglo-American businessmen. It only added to the suspicion on the part of Mexicotejanos.

THE RANCHERISTAS

South Texas in the 1850s and 1860s was a rough territory plagued with bandits escaping justice from both sides of the
border. Father Soulerin describes the area as one “without any civil or judicial organization” where lynch law ruled. He adds, “We have seen hangings without any form of trial. The Mexicans, a devoutly Catholic people and of great number in this town, distrust us, for in addition to being French, we come from the U.S., of which they have heard us speak the languages.”

Emmanuel Domenech, describing his missionary adventures in Texas, emphasizes the force used by Easterners and Kentucky immigrants to take away lands from native Texans, and the discrimination, even within the legal system, used against newly arrived Germans and Irish and especially against resident Mexicotejanos. Intimidation was often quite direct, including the use of pistols, rifles, and knives against the rights of the majority for the material benefit of English-speakers.

The Mexicotejanos of the ranchos were an extremely poor people who, despite an almost total lack of contact with priests, had maintained and developed their own religious life. At a small rural mission stop, one priest was informed that there were such large crowds for Mass that it was sometimes necessary to offer the holy mysteries under a tree in the open air. According to the Metropolitan Catholic Almanac, there were in 1860 only forty-two and forty-four churches and chapels in the entire state of Texas, a great number of these being in urban areas. In some rural areas, there were only four priests, all traveling constantly and separately, dividing among themselves the care of eighty thousand souls. The extreme poverty of the people of the ranchos made it impossible for two priests to travel together, for they were well aware that the people could barely feed one priest for more than a day. The average rural settlement consisted of small dwellings huddled together. The dwelling, (jacal), was typically built of poles fixed into the ground, interlaced with branches, and covered with mud. The floor was usually of dirt.

The rancherista missionaries who tended to the needs of the people of the ranchos were quite sensitive to the situation of this poverty-ridden but devout people. Suffering numerous hardships, rancheristas covered great expanses of territory on horseback to visit countless rural settlements, stopping only long enough to hear confession, to say Mass, and to perform what sacraments were requested, and perhaps to spend the night on some floor or table. Father Jose Ma. Clos usually rode three hundred miles on horseback in a week. Father Piat was said to have ridden some 175,000 miles in his thirty-one years of service to the ranchos.
The brush country through which the missionaries traveled was filled with poisonous snakes, cactus thickets, and river crossings menaced by alligators and quicksand beds. Several missionaries reported encounters with pumas; a few described days of being lost in the brush country and surviving on mesquite beans and prickly pears; and one, suffering from poor health and failing eyesight, disappeared into the wild ranch country and was not heard of again until his remains were discovered in a thicket ten years later.

Although the rancheristas were continually traveling to visit all the settlements in their area, these were so numerous that visits of priests to the same rancho were often separated by long periods of time. When news arrived of a missionary’s visit, the entire settlement gathered to make the necessary preparations. Mass was usually held in one of the jacals or in a makeshift tent. Father Clos described these one-room huts as “worse than the stable of Bethlehem.” A small table decorated with wild flowers and santitos served as an altar. The santitos, small carved figures of saints, were often passed from one generation, and treasured highly. The neighbors contributed their santitos and other decorations for the Mass, four candles were placed in cups of corn, and Mass was held in this humble setting.

The priorities of the rancheristas were definitely with the Mexicotejanos, but many other Oblates, most notably certain key administrators, felt that the English-speaking population should receive the brunt of their efforts, despite the fact that these represented less than one tenth of the population. Although the rancheristas’ zeal was great and their efforts intense, their numbers were quite limited. Father Olivier, in describing his people, says “few priests take any interest in them”.

ANTI—MEXICOTEJANO FEELINGS

In February 1861, Odin was appointed archbishop of New Orleans, and Father Claude Marie Dubuis was named the new bishop of Galveston. By the 1860s the Oblates had divided into two factions. The governing group wished to withdraw from the South Texas Valley, for they felt the people were too poor. The rancherista faction, however, wished to stay and work among the rural Mexicotejanos. The General Council of the Oblates in 1863 considered the situation in South Texas and decided that, although the work of the Oblates in Brownsville was
commendable, the future lay in Mexico, and the arduous task of ministering to the scattered rural settlements was too discouraging. They refused to consider any new projects in the area, and allowed only two lay brothers to work in Brownsville. To the rancheristas this decision was very disheartening. They also complained that their superior, Father Gaudet, placed too much emphasis on external ritual, and that his concern with ritual was taking from them the valuable time needed to administer to the poor. Father Gaudet, speaking no Spanish and little English, was in no way subtle in his negative feelings toward Mexicans and Mexicotejanos. Writing to Superior General Fabre, Gaudet stated, “I don’t know when we shall be able to return to Mexico, but actually I do not even wish to return. Our situation there will be intolerable as long as there is not a Mexican government strong enough to sustain itself without the Mexicans themselves.”

He was not alone in his sentiments. Another priest wrote, “To progress here, we should put all the Mexican clergy and Bishops in a monastery and replace them with foreigners. The root of all the evil is the clergy.”

Another point on which the rancheristas differed from policies of their community was the case of St. Joseph’s College in Brownsville. According to the rancheristas, this college, begun in 1865 by Fathers Parisot and Gaudet, only illustrated and emphasized the church’s pronounced catering to English-speakers at the expense of the mexicotejano majority. While the pro-Mexicotejano clergy opposed this, the pro-Anglo clergy felt that it was an important step in “doing something for the governing class.”

Stated Father Florent Vandenberghe, “Miserable as it may seem, this little college is the only Catholic establishment of the kind in the whole region. To close it means to hand over to the Protestants all the children of the white race, that is, all the families who have some influence.”

In March 1874 Father Vandenberghe was made superior of the Oblates in Brownsville. Speaking little English and no Spanish, he found the Vallery extremely unattractive and promptly began to seek a way to withdraw from the mission. He wished to accept a mission among “civilized people” in Louisiana or North Texas. He tried repeatedly to persuade the Jesuits to take charge of the area, but their involvement in other projects kept them from accepting the offer. Vandenberghe, alienated of his own will from the Mexicotejano population, stated, “The Spanish people and the Spanish language are destined to disappear.” He believed that the Oblates should not
conduct free schools or accept children from poor families. After Vandenbergh died of yellow fever, Father Aimé Martinet, assistant general in Vancouver, came to visit the area. He recommended that the valley not be abandoned, but that Father James McGrath, an Irish American, be named superior because of his potentially closer rapport with his English-speaking compatriots.

In September of 1874 the area between the Nueces and the Rio Grande rivers became the Vicariate Apostolic of Brownsville, and the Most Reverend Dominic Manucy was appointed its vicar. Manucy was not pleased:

“I received your letter this morning. I thank you for the courtesy of having sent it to me. But I should tell you that it has thrown me into a fever. I consider this appointment as Vicar Apostolic of Brownsville the worst sentence that could have been given me for any crime! ... The Brownsville district is a country without resources. The Catholic population is composed almost exclusively of Mexican greasers — cattle drovers and thieves. No money can be got out of these people, not even to bury their fathers! A Father in Brownsville recently tried to build a school and had to appeal to the charity of the faithful abroad in order to pay for it. Worst of all is that the only Fathers in the area are the O.M.I. — Oblates of Mary Immaculate. They most likely own what little property is in the place and in consequence will be masters over the bishop. All a bishop will be useful for then will be to ride the circuit like a Methodist minister, administer confirmation, and be the laughing stock of the religious men ... If there were some hope of doing good for the glory of God, I would gladly make the sacrifice, but I don’t see the possible means of doing it. All those with whom I’ve spoken who have visited that region speak of the most discouraging manner of that people. Surely if that district of country presented any advantages, one of the Oblates would have been appointed Bishop.”

Openly anti-Mexican, Manucy assumed his new position in South Texas.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

The Diocese of Galveston was by these times almost uncontrollably large. Pope Pius IX on August 27, 1874, separated from the sprawling Diocese of Galveston the territory between the Colorado River on the east and the Nueces River on the west, thereby creating the new Diocese of San Antonio, which
covered an estimated 90,909 square miles and had as its episcopal see the city of San Antonio. According to the 1870 census, San Antonio had twelve thousand inhabitants and was predominantly Spanish-speaking. Bishop Anthony Pelliccer was assigned to the new diocese. Unfortunately, suffering from ill health and overwork, he succumbed to diabetes in April 1880. In his short six-year term of administration, Bishop Pelliccer reported the addition of fifteen churches, seven chapels, twenty-five parochial schools, a college for boys, and the expansion and construction of a new building for Santa Rosa Hospital (which a report from January 13, 1870 described as having accommodations for a hundred patients.) The Catholic population of the diocese had increased 20 percent to forty-eight thousand.16

In 1881 Bishop Dubuis of Galveston resigned and was replaced the following year by Bishop Nicholas Gallagher. Gallagher found the diocese too large to be adequately attended and growing rapidly in population and financial potential. Following Gallagher’s recommendation to the bishops of the province of New Orleans in 1889, Pope Leo XIII declared in 1890 the formation of a new diocese in North Texas. Appointed as Bishop of the new Diocese of Dallas was the Most Reverend Thomas Brennan. Through his intelligence, enthusiasm, fluency, and wit, he soon won the hearts of his people. In response to the faith of the small Mexicotejano congregation of Tascosa, he sent a native Spanish-speaking priest to preach a mission to them, beginning on December 12, the anniversary of the apparition of Our Lady of Guadalupe, patroness of Mexico. Soon after Brennan returned to the parish to preach a sermon in Spanish. Unfortunately, the energetic young bishop occupied this position for only two years and then he was transferred out of state.17

THE SISTERS OF CHARITY

Meanwhile, in the Rio Grande Valley Manucy was still complaining about his appointment and loudly stating his preference for an English-speaking diocese. Even Vandenberghe, who was in no way noted for pro-Mexicotejano sentiments, stated: “He manifests an evident repugnance for the Mexicans. He turns away from them. And when he talks to the Americans, he stresses the fact that he is one of them, a native.”18 Manucy stated that Vandenberghe should be replaced by “an Irish subject ... because we must do more for the English-speaking population.”19
In the spring of 1875 a group of twenty-two Sisters of Charity, accompanied by three priests, arrived in Brownsville. Exiled from Mexico by the government of Sebastian Lerdo de Tejeda, the sisters were all Spanish-speaking and quickly endeared themselves to the people. Without informing either the bishop or the Oblates, the people made arrangements for the sisters to stay among them. Already, the sisters had begun to make visits to homes and to tend the sick. Within four days a delegation of Mexicotejanos presented themselves to the bishop, asked that the sisters be allowed to stay for six months or a year, and committed themselves to funding the sisters. Manucy refused this permission, citing various reasons, among them the fact that since he was very recently appointed, it would be inappropriate for him to assume such responsibility. He also added that the sisters would interfere with the work of the Oblates and that of the cloistered Sisters of the Incarnate Word, and that there was a lack of funds. The Mexicotejanos saw a much more likely reason for the bishop’s refusal: the certainty that the Spanish-speaking sisters would become actively involved in the Mexicotejano community and work for the betterment of their socio-economic situation. Not only would the Mexicotejanos then have an advocate against the injustices of which they complained but they also would soon be much more supportive of the Sisters of Charity than of the Oblates, the Sisters of the Incarnate Word, or of the bishop himself.

Desperate for a clergy that understood their language and their culture, the people tried every route possible to keep the Sisters of Charity there. On the day the sisters were to leave Brownsville, the Mexicotejanos began to gather at the train station at four in the morning, five hours before the train was to leave. Such was their strength of purpose that when the sisters arrived, three hundred people pulled the railroad car off its track and away from the rails. They were determined that the sisters should not leave and began to make emotional speeches. The sisters could only say that they could not stay without the consent of the bishop. Then people began to shout, “Out with the bishop” and “May the bishop go away.” The mayor called in police to disperse the crowd, but this was impossible as the crowd had grown to three hundred persons. Finally the mayor asked the bishop to intercede. The bishop refused on the grounds that it would not be prudent for someone of his position to expose himself to the insults of such people, but he advised the mayor to promise the crowd that the bishop would invite the sisters back as soon as it was convenient. With this promise the
crowd allowed the car to be returned to the track and let the sisters leave. The people then gathered in front of the bishop’s residence. Police were assigned to guard the residence all that day and night, but many people stayed on. The next day the bishop left on a tour of nearby ranch areas. The sisters were never invited back. Six months later the bishop announced that he would be changing his residence to Corpus Christi, giving as his principal reason the almost complete control of the area by the Oblates. He added that Corpus Christi was a more central location that had a large enough English-speaking population to support him. When Manucy left, only three parishioners came to bid him off.20

Manucy’s complaints grew into direct indictments of the Mexicotejanos for being so inconsiderate and inhospitable as to be poor. In 1877 he described them as a people “who possess nothing, or so little that in any case they cannot help us and many time are a burden and an obstacle. The Mexicans cause many problems, great expenses and (give) few services.”21 Although he admitted that “most of my clergy are, to a certain point, incapacitated because they do not know the Spanish language” and that “unless a priest knows Spanish or can learn it promptly, he is completely useless outside Corpus Christi and Brownsville,” he still seemed to expect support from the neglected people and complained that “one cannot get even one dollar directly out of a Mexican, be he rich or poor.”22 Manucy realized that his more than forty thousand Mexicotejano Catholics were “all poor, without permanent residences, employed for a very small salary by the Protestant Americans.” But his comments progressed from a description of the Mexicotejano as “mainly very poor and from the lowest class, and those that have the means are not generous” to a sharp categorization of them in 1882 as “the stingiest, the most demanding, and the most unfair” people in the world.23

Manucy’s reference to the people’s outstanding greed seems strange in the light of the people’s generous donations to Pope Pius IX in the 1860s and the repeated affirmation by the priests that these people barely survived from hand to mouth. In 1884 Manucy was finally granted a transfer to an English-speaking diocese. Within the year, he turned his new diocese in Mobile, Alabama, into a financial disaster and resigned the position.24 Manucy was replaced in Texas by Father Claude Jallet, who followed Manucy’s pattern of complaints, claiming that one of the main problems with these people was that they
had once been part of the Mexican state of Tamaulipas, the worst of the Mexican states in regard to morality, politics, and religion, according to him.\textsuperscript{25} Jailett’s successor, Pedro Verdaguer of Spain, reported in 1899 that of the sixty-three thousand Catholics, fifty thousand were “poor Mexicans, worse than civilized Indians” for whom everything had to be done free.\textsuperscript{26}

In contrast to these anti-Mexicotejano attitudes were the comments of Bishop J. Claude Neraz of San Antonio. In 1881 Neraz reported his constant search for Spanish-speaking priests, since his Mexicotejano population of more than twenty thousand had only six priests to serve them. In a letter written in 1884, Neraz attributed the great poverty of his people to exploitation by the Anglo-Texans, asserting that much that had formerly belonged to the Mexicotejanos had been taken away. He praised the people’s great uncomplaining faith in the face of such problems. In 1888 he reported that he had built a school for the Spanish-speaking because of exclusionist policies of the “American” schools, stating that the poverty of the people made this “the duty of the diocese.” In the same year San Fernando Cathedral School for Boys was built, with its first pupils mostly Mexicotejanos.\textsuperscript{27}

There were others who were also concerned with the church’s seeming neglect of the Mexicotejanos. In 1902 Joseph Lefebvre, writing from Eagle Pass, stressed the need for priests to learn both languages well and lamented:

“Ever since I have been put in charge of this Province, I have been struck and preoccupied by the fact: in our mission of Texas, our ministry touches but one part of the flock entrusted to us! I earnestly hope for the day when we will be able to visit and care for the different centers in the neighborhoods of Eagle Pass and Uvalde.”\textsuperscript{28}

By 1904 the state of Texas contained three dioceses as well as part of an area under the jurisdiction of a fourth. The problems had been many, the discrimination intense, and the progress slow, but for the Spanish-speaking Catholics of Texas the frustrating struggle had left them only with a deeper determination to claim their rightful place in the life of the church.
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THE CHURCH IN NEW MEXICO
Luciano Hendren

INVASION

The ink was hardly dry on the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, between Mexico and the United States, when its mutual agreements and guarantees were being violated unilaterally and systematically by the New Americano form of government, which now occupied an "alien people and land."

The same violations occurred with the 1846 Treaty which established a Military Government in the New Mexico Territory, when General Stephen M. Kearney invaded and conquered the aforementioned territory on August 18 of that same year. The Kearney invasion was superficially prompted by the boundary dispute over the Texas Territory, which claimed the lands between the Texas Sabine River, west to the head waters of the Rio Grande, down to the Gulf of Mexico. The "boundary dispute" was the excuse for the invasion, while the real cause was the "political brain child," known as Manifest Destiny, born in 1845, of the Washington leaders. It was to that end that war was declared on Mexico, by President James K. Polk on May 13, 1846.

The question has been raised, whether or not, and if so, to what degree, the Church was influenced by the Manifest Destiny Doctrine. It is a known factor that the Church has and does assume some of the general attitudes of society. Could this be the case in the Southwest? Was it convenient to "use the Church" in America's western march across the continent? After all, "are not the majority of the natives out there Catholic?"

There were several guarantees in both the 1846 and the 1848 Treaties. Among these were respect and protection for the land owners, including the land grants; non-interference and preservation of the Spanish language, customs, and culture, especially as they were related to the Spanish Catholic religious experience and forms of worship. Yet, within a relatively short period of time, the gradual and unilateral erosion of all these guarantees was becoming evident.
PROPHECY

Antonio José Martínez played an important role in New Mexico's history. He was born in Abiquiu, New Mexico, in 1793, widowed in 1813 after one year of marriage. His only daughter died in 1814. As a widower, Martínez went to Durango, Mexico, to study for the priesthood in 1817. After a brilliant scholastic career, he was ordained to the priesthood in 1822 at the age of 29. He worked in Mexico for one year, and then returned to his native New Mexico where he served a long and illustrious pastorate. Padre Martínez was a natural-born leader and pastor, who always sought the best for his people.

After he was assigned to the parish in Taos, New Mexico, he began schools for the children in the area. He published books as well as a newspaper with the printing press he brought in. The printing press was the first one west of the Mississippi. He realized that in educating the people, he could help liberate them.

Herein lies Padre Martínez' prophecy. The title of his newspaper was *El Crepúsculo de la Libertad*. Unfortunately, up to this point, there has yet to be found a historian or historical novelist who has properly translated the title. They have, every one, given the meaning of the title as "The Dawn of Liberty." The correct meaning of the publication is "The Twilight of Liberty." Crepúsculo means the end of the day, or the end of the light, and as used in the title, actually means the "End of the People's Freedom."

Could the good Padre be re-echoing the words of the New Mexico lawyer, Don Antonio Barreiro, who wrote the *Adiciones* in 1839, to the *Noticias Históricas* written by Don Pedro Bautista Pino in 1812? The words of Barreiro are strongly stated: "How long will we continue to be strangers in our land?" Perhaps Barreiro saw the great influx of extranjeros coming in through the Santa Fe Trail trade route as taking advantage of the local people? With this in mind, Padre Martínez perhaps foresaw "the end of liberty."

Is it possible that the good priest was strongly influenced by the liberation movement begun in Mexico by the good Padres Hidalgo and Morelos? Remember that he studied in Durango, Mexico, shortly after the *Grito de Dolores* and just before Mexico gained her independence from Spain.

Padre Martínez' life spanned four different forms of government: the Spanish colonial period; the Mexican era; the
United States military rule, and the United States territorial government. He, as well as the other Padres and laity, was well able to judge leadership and administration.

A FORMAL CHURCH

The most evident and hardest interference for the people of New Mexico to accept was the encroachment into their faith expression by los estranjeros. This is true of any people, not just the nativos of the New Mexico Territory. This encroachment was accomplished with the “official establishment” of the Church in the territory, which included present-day Arizona and southern Colorado. Arizona was separated from New Mexico in 1863, while southern Colorado was separated in 1865.

The official Church was formally established on July 19, 1850, when the Holy See favorably answered the request from the VII Council of Baltimore, and named the area as a Vicariate, with a Frenchman, Jean-Baptiste Lamy, as Vicar Apostolic in partibus infidelium, or “in the region of the infidels,” not knowing that the Catholic faith had been firmly planted in that “region” since 1598, some 252 years earlier. Or did Rome forget that Fray Alonso de Benavidez, the Franciscan Superior in New Mexico, had requested from Rome and the King of Spain that Santa Fé be named an Episcopal See in 1630?2 The same request had been repeated in 1780, as well in 1812,3 the latter time, by a layman, Don Pedro Bautista Pino, who, as delegate to the King’s Court, had received the noble name of “Abraham of New Mexico,” because of his strong faith.

MISSIONARIES

Jean-Baptiste Lamy was born in Lempdes, Puy-da-Dome, France, on October 11, 1814, and ordained a priest in December 1838. His fellow-countryman and Vicar General for the new Vicariate in New Mexico, Joseph P. Machebeuf, was born on August 11, 1812, in Riom and ordained a priest in December 1836. Both Lempdes and Riom are in the French province of the Auvergne. Within eighteen years of their arrival, both “missionaries” could write “back home” and claim that they had established a “little Auvergne” in the western, uncivilized lands of the Untied States. This could be stated proudly, since the Metropolitan, Lamy, and his two Suffragans: Jean Baptiste Salpointe, Bishop of Tucson (1868), and Machebeuf, Bishop of Denver (1868), and three-fourths of the priests were “natives of the Auvergne.”4
Both Lamy and Machebeuf came to the United States from their "beloved France" in 1838, to work in the Ohio River Valley area. The former worked with Jean Baptiste Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati, while the latter worked with Bishop Flaget of Bardstown, Ohio. Both of these latter-named bishops were also Auvergnites. From the time of their arrival in the "new world" neither Lamy nor Machebeuf ever really left, much less forgot, their native homeland. They were sincerely proud Frenchmen and Auvergnites to the core.

In reading their letters to family and friends back in "La Belle France," one wonders if France, or they, had ever in fact renounced the heresy of Gallicanism, which on paper had been recanted years before, by pressure from the Holy See? They were very nationalistic, so much so that their superiority was most shown when among the people. Yet, they did not want the New Mexico people to be proud of being Mexicano. They had to be "Americanized."

Neither Lamy nor Machebeuf ever mastered the English language, yet they classified English as patois. The same lack of understanding as well as lack of adaptation to the place wherein they found themselves was evident in subsequent Auvergnites brought over by Lamy and the next four French bishops who were to govern New Mexico from 1850 to 1918.

While working in the more industrialized Ohio River Valley area, it is noted that there was need for German, Irish, and French priests to work with their respective people. Yet, this ideal is all but contradicted upon the arrival of these two French missionaries into New Mexico. Lamy stated: "I pray that these Mexican clerics would leave soon, and the sooner the better." Little did Bishop Lamy realize that these Mexican clerics, were, for the most part, native-born New Mexicans. Yet, many did leave for old Mexico, rather than to have to work under such trying conditions. Lamy and the next four French bishops did little to foster native vocations, being content to go to their motherland and bring "the good priests" over to work in the area. For all practical purposes, there was in a relatively short time an elimination of what native clergy existed in New Mexico.

**FINANCES**

Could it be true, as Padre Juan Felipe Ortíz claimed in 1855, that all the gold and silver-plated altar ornaments and chalices were taken to Europe and sold? By Lamy? By Machebeuf? No one seems to know! But that they were missing, everyone, including the laity, knew as fact.
Machebeuf appears much stronger, temperamentally and in character, than Lamy, and undoubtedly had a strong influence on the latter. Machebeuf, it appears, was in constant financial trouble. Lamy also faced financial problems. He received a letter from the J. and W. R. Bernard Company of Westport, Missouri, which carried just one of several of Lamy's outstanding accounts. The company complained that it was facing a losing proposition with the present debt, and the company could not afford to carry such a debt.

On one occasion, Lamy sent Machebeuf "back east" to try and obtain some Sisters to come to New Mexico to staff a school, and also to pay on a loan that Lamy owed Bishop Purcell. The latter comments that: "He (Machebeuf) did not make the payment." 8

One of several complaints by the French missionaries against the native clergy (and this was a continual and gradually evolving point of contention) was that the native clergy were charging for everything they did. This was a scandal to the people. Lamy wrote to Purcell, asking: "What do you think of a priest who charges $18.00 per year to preach?" 9 Yet, Lamy's own record is far worse, as will be shown in the following pages.

Lamy's famous pastoral letter of 1854, on rules and regulations for tithing as a condition for the reception of the sacraments, with a penalty clause of a three-fold increase in tithing for those who refuse to comply with the fifth commandment of the Church, was the breaking point beyond which the native clergy and laity could not go. This tithing program was nothing other than the means used by Lamy to raise the finances necessary to build his French Gothic Cathedral in the midst of these Mexican people, as Padre Martínez charged.

**COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS**

Early in Lamy's pastorate in the New Mexico Territory, he ran into serious conflicts, not only with the clergy, but with some of the laity as well. Could it have been that the stronger Machebeuf was badly influencing Lamy through wrong counsel? That there were hard feelings toward the Americans is undeniable. After all, they had invaded and conquered los nuevos Mexicanos, first, militarily, then religiously.

The nativos had not been informed that they were no longer under the jurisdiction of Bishop Zubiria of Durango, until the last possible moment. Padre Ortíz, the Vicar, had informed the clergy and people. The reception was cordial for the new
prelate. But, as was only natural, and in keeping with Canon Law, the new prelate was expected to present his papers as proof of his appointment. Lamy thought that the native clergy were insolent and proud because of this request. His reaction to the request was twisted. The clergy were correct in requesting proof. They had already been taken advantage of through the extranjeros who came prior, and they were not going to let it happen again. So Lamy was forced to go to Durango to present the Papal Bulls to Zubiria, who approved them. While Lamy was gone, he left Machebeuf in charge: a problem in itself!

Lamy and Machebeuf had already insulted the people, their patois and their customs, as well as their “mud huts and churches.” Lamy was critical of the “morals of the native priests, which were worse yet.” Lamy also spoke out against the fact that the families of the priests are always around. They are clannish. Yet, within a relatively short period of time, Machebeuf was to bring his relatives over to design and build the Cathedral, as well as the Chapel of Our Lady of the Light. Lamy was to have his niece become the mother superior in the Loretto Community of Santa Fé, and a couple of his cousins and a nephew were to be priests in the Santa Fé Diocese.

The bishop publicly complained that the native clergy were living in concubinage. On the issue of “concubinage of the native clergy,” Lamy was not too quick to reveal that one of his own Frenchmen, the priest in Isleta Pueblo, “was living with a woman of ill fame and was causing a scandal and should be removed.” It seems that Lamy wrote to Purcell saying that the Father was too ill to take the rigors of missionary life and was returning to France for reasons of health, not wanting to admit that one of his own “was worse yet.”

How quick one is to forget what is inconvenient! It was not only the fault of the clergy that the “huts and churches were of mud.” That was the style. That they were in bad shape is not their fault. Little did Lamy realize that the upkeep of the churches was not the duty of the clergy. New Mexico, after all, came from a Church-State form of government, and it was the duty of the State to maintain the churches. The situation was similar to that of Lamy’s “beloved France” when Napoleon confiscated all church property but let the churches deteriorate. Lamy also forgot the villages in his “la belle France” with mud and dirt streets, and shacks serving as homes, after the French Revolution, a revolution which took a heavy toll on the French, and from which they suffered a long time. Or could the
Napoleonic invasion of Spain in 1808 and the replacement of Ferdinand VII with Joseph Bonaparte as King of Spain have been fresh in the memories of both the nativos and the French missionaries in New Mexico? With Joseph came French Masonry into Spain and through Spain, into Mexico through the person of Maximilian.

AUTHORITY AND FEAR

Lamy’s initial reaction to the clergy was equally as strong as Machebeuf’s. The reaction of the former was “to keep them under fear. Perhaps that will change them, but I doubt it.” Yet, both Frenchmen criticized the local clergy as being oppressive to the people. The question was: who was being oppressed? Lamy wrote to Purcell and said, “I must be patient and catch them (the native clergy) doing wrong.” Lamy continued in the same letter: “I suspended one of the senior clerics ... perhaps that will serve as an example for the others.”

The fire was being ignited! There were charges and countercharges. The harder the native clergy tried to help Lamy understand the local scene, the more adamant the prelate became. After all, it was necessary that he let everyone know that he was the bishop.

Hence, we see the bishop battling some sixteen priests, seven of whom were quite elderly and sickly. The nuclei of the clergy who dared to speak up for the people were: Juan Felipe Ortíz, vicar; Antonio José Martínez, pastor of Taos; José Manuel Gallegos, pastor of San Felipe in Albuquerque; Pastor Lucero of Arroyo Seco, as well as Fathers Luján and Salazar. These priests knew their rights, and the rights of the people. They wanted to insure that those rights were not violated. These priests were loved and respected by the laity. Yet, the prelate worked hard to discredit the clergy, and drive a wedge between them and the laity. It did not work. The people, as though in a persecution, went into the “catacombs” known as their moradas. The moradas were the private chapels of the Penitentes. An underground church was forming. It was not a heretical or schismatic church as many are quick to state. The people were trying to protect and safeguard what was dearest to them: their faith. The people were unfamiliar with any Jansenistic concepts.

POOR JUDGMENT

On January 14, 1854, Bishop Lamy sent out a pastoral letter setting the new rules for tithing, and the giving of the first fruits. The fifth norm stated: “The faculty is removed from the priests to
administer the sacraments or give ecclesiastical burial to the heads of families who refuse to pay the tithe.”  

The price list for the sacraments had been printed by the bishop’s office earlier (1852) as: marriages $8.00; burials $6.00; burial of a child under seven years of age $2.00; and baptism $1.00. The pastoral letter did condescendingly state that “those of meager resources will only have to pay one-half of the aforementioned rates.”  

It can be concluded, safely, that even the laity were not cooperating with the new prelate, and that they had to be threatened with the denial of the sacraments if they did not comply with the prelate’s directives.

By virtue of the pastoral, “the fees would increase by approximately two-thirds the diocesan revenues, bringing in from $100,000.00 to $150,000.00, or over and above the fees generated by parish fiestas and other arbitrary collections,” according to Padre Martínez. The Padre continued: “since the prelate’s arrival here, he has manifested more interest in temporal gain, even in detriment of the spiritual ones.”

Padre Martínez raised the question of simony, and pondered if the bishop was guilty of such. Martínez sent the prelate a two-volume set of canon law, having previously cited the proper texts on canonical simony. The Padre also cited several passages from scripture on simony. This all was done by Martínez “to enlighten my good prelate on the church’s regulations concerning simony, and the related censures.” “Especially,” as Padre Martínez stated, “since it has been brought to my attention that a seven-year-old child near Picuries was disinterred and kept above ground for two days until the head of the family paid the tithes in triple amounts.” The group of native padres also reported that “the prelate has a team of tax collectors going around the diocese exacting the tithes from the people.”

Martínez tried to reason with the bishop from an historical perspective: “In 1833, October 27, with the Law of San Felipe, Mexico abrogated tithing; and since New Mexico at that time belonged to the country of Mexico, the custom of the people now is ‘to give a suitable offering, spontaneously and according to their means.’ The people are not used to having to pay.”

Padre Martínez logically concluded that he “is not bound by the censure imposed by the bishop” because the prelate himself “has violated the Law of the Church and has incurred the censure himself.” Yet, the good Padre tried once again to have a
reconciliation by stating: "I offer myself to Your Excellency recognizing you as my superior, in the Canon Law only now in force." The people always accepted Padre Antonio José as their priest, advocate and protector, even after he was "excommunicated." His memory is still alive today. To his dying day he "lived and died a faithful Roman Catholic."20

Other native clergy and laity were treated equally as bad. Padre Ortíz was removed from his pastorate in Santa Fé, where he had been Vicar since 1932. Padre Gallegos was removed from the "excellent parish of San Felipe in Albuquerque," and replaced by Machebeuf. Gallegos' removal was prompted by "scandalous gambling and cavorting with the people." The real reason was that San Felipe was a growing and wealthy parish and Machebeuf wanted it.

Gallegos went on to serve his people, after his suspension, as the elected delegate of the territory of New Mexico to Washington, D.C. "Since he could not serve his people in the Church, he would serve them by representing their cause." Bishop Lamy could "not understand why the people would elect and re-elect Gallegos to Congress." Little did Lamy realize that the people wanted someone they could trust.

It is most interesting to note that while Padre Gallegos was serving as Territorial Delegate in Washington, he wrote to Bishop Zubiria stating: "The Cabinet here keeps looking at ways to start a war with Spain in order to obtain Cuba."21 This was forty-four years before the Spanish American War of 1898, when Cuba was taken from Spain. Prophetic? Or is it a continuation of the Manifest Destiny Doctrine?

The French influence in New Mexico is still felt today. After all, there were five French bishops in a row, from 1850 to 1918. It is also interesting to note that just as the "Mexican clergy rejected the Frenchmen," and "created problems," so, too, when Bishop Jean Baptiste Pitaval died, and the French line was broken with the appointment in 1919 of a German, Bishop Albert Thomas Daeger, the French clergy "refused to accept him." It has been said that the French priests would gather together and decide when they wanted to transfer parishes. They would transfer themselves, without going through the bishop's office.

It is true that from 1850 to 1904 there were several schools and churches built. But the "community of the people" was not built up; it was replaced by "another community" brought in from Europe and other parts of the United States. The children
were taught, “not only English,” but can you guess, yes, “French.”

In defense of Padre Martínez, and all the priests of New Mexico, it might be well to quote an editorial appearing in the Santa Fé Weekly Gazette entitled “The Pastor of Taos,” a tribute to him upon his retirement:

“The ministerial and priestly profession is noble and its holy obligations ought to be doubly noble, after having spent the greater part of one’s life in the fulfillment of his obligations, he is now fortified, not only by his own conscience, but also the affection, love and universal confidence of his parishioners. We have heard it said that it is better to be useful than popular, and this is how it is; but not too often does one find one who is at the same time useful and popular. This seems to be the case with Padre Martínez. He is one of the few native priests of the land who has dedicated himself to the betterment of the condition of his parishioners. We have been informed that there are several young people in the Valley of Taos who are completely indebted to their pastor for their excellent education. He might have his faults, but who doesn’t? Hence, we speak softly about them, and about all who err, because life is too short to cast aspersions.”

Padre Martínez’ knowledge of canon law was extraordinary, and that not only surprised Lamy, but was most threatening to the latter because he could not “act arbitrarily as he was so often to do” as Padre Martínez charged, and with reason.

More important than the good Padre’s knowledge of law, were his sound and logical theological insights. In several of his tracts Padre Martínez had defined God “as Presence,” which was a great source of inner strength to him during the harsh treatment. The theological concept undoubtedly was also a source of strength for the people, who also suffered.

Martínez’ astuteness is also shown when Lamy apparently wanted to prevent him from publishing articles about the outrageous tithes the bishop had imposed on the people. Martínez’ answer was that he was permitted to write in what was considered a less liberal form of government, namely that of Mexico. How then, could he be denied the same privilege in what is now considered a more liberal and liberating form of government as claimed by the United States? Martínez continued not only to write but to speak out against abuses, rightfully claiming his “freedom of speech.”

The “grotesque art” of the santeros, that is, the bultos and retablos “found in the chapels in the hills” was replaced by the
Frenchmen with plaster-of-paris statues. By the end of the nineteenth century the mastery of the only indigenous art in America, other than the strictly native Indian, disappeared. The only remembrance of this art is to be found today in museums and among the private collections of the americanos.

La Hermandad de los Penitentes or the Brotherhood of Jesus, the Catholic lay society of the people, now had to turn in their rules and regulations for "living in charity and helping each other in every facet of daily life" to the bishop for his approval. Naturally, the bishops changed and watered down the rules to try and neutralize the effectiveness of the people. The Penitentes were forced to go "underground" in order to survive. They still exist today, but more as a modified secret society. Because of French clerical harassment they were forced to "go underground."

As the santero ceased to exist, and the Penitente was forced into isolation, a strong effort was made through these means to change the people, to drive them into submission in order to better "Americanize" them. In order to accomplish this, the Church hit hardest at its strongest "foe," namely the native clergy. Once the native clergy ceased to be (there was an occasional and rare native ordained who "qualified") the people could be handled with ease, and the American dream of "achievement" could be realized in the wilds of the West.

The process of Americanization was almost complete now in New Mexico. All that remained was statehood, which had been promised in 1848 but not granted until 1912. The designed delay was due to the fact that "we cannot accept an alien people who are largely illiterate." Or again: "It would not be appropriate to accept them now, because they are too numerous and we (the anglo) would be outnumbered."

We see, then, in summary, two converging elements meeting in New Mexico. On the one hand, we see a less highly institutionalized and more personalized church developing in New Mexico, being confronted by a more highly institutionalized, structured and impersonalized church from the mid-West and East (and France) meeting. We also see a church in isolation that is much more creative and perhaps not stained by the "Protestant ethic" or French nationalism, which developed into Irish nationalism, meeting a church from a much more highly industrialized sector of the country. We see a church that did not have time to be creative because it was also
fighting for survival, and so it was content to be much too imitative of the European church.

We also see a European-born and trained eastern seaboard clergy being transplanted here, a necessity at first. After a period of time, the clergy were American-born, but European-trained, thus perpetuating Europeanism in America. Later American seminaries were founded, but the faculty once again was European trained. The pattern of non-creativity was now established. In contrast, the Church in Mexico had long since ceased bringing clergy from Spanish seminaries to serve in New Mexico. There was a native clergy, native trained to serve the needs of the native people. The Church had existed much longer in the Southwest than in the eastern United States.

We analyze the problems presented in this fashion. A cultural shock occurred both for the native people in New Mexico as well as for the French missionaries. This cultural shock was the basis for the various problems presented. The pastoral problems arise from the divergent emphasis of respective values, the main one being economics within the Church. The end result of the convergence of the economic factors as occurred in New Mexico was largely the basis of said problems.

Hence, we see the following steps occurring: (1) there was a cultural shock which led (2) to pastoral problems through the variance of values which led (3) to the economic factor of building community versus building buildings, and this (4) exploded into a doctrinal issue, namely simony.

The end result of this four-step process was the oppression of a living church, a living people. That which was "accidental," namely their language and culture, were taken from them in order to "Americanize" them. But worse yet, that which was "essential," namely their faith, was also "transposed" and "superimposed" by another form of faith expression, namely French.

*El Crepúsculo de la Libertad* or the "End of a People's Freedom" was prophetically fulfilled.
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THE CHURCH IN CALIFORNIA

Moises Sandoval and Salvador E. Alzarez

Between 1848 and 1904 the church in California endured one convulsive transition after another. Had it just been the traumatic change from a Mexican province to a territory of the United States the church might have been better able to cope. But the American conquest was only one of a series of major upheavals that the church had to undergo in the nineteenth century. The first was the change from a dependent and almost forgotten colony of Spain to an even more forgotten colony of Mexico, a new nation striving to consolidate its domain. But hardly had the church of California had an opportunity to accustom itself to Mexican jurisdiction than the Yankees swept through the territory and imposed a new way of life characterized by a form of oppression that continued for more than a century. In addition to political shifts, the Church had to adjust to another far-reaching change — secularization.

These transitions were especially difficult for the fledgling church because it had not been long in existence. Fray Junípero Serra, the Franciscan pioneer missionary, first reached San Diego in 1769. There simply has not been enough time to establish a strong secular structure when the mission system was dismantled. The church lacked institutions beyond its chain of twenty-one missions stretching the length of Alta California. These existed only as tenuous footholds along the coast, and the interior was virtually unexplored. Furthermore, the population was so sparse that the Hispanic people numbered only about ten thousand at the time of the American conquest of 1846. The faith of the Indian converts was maintained more by the discipline and routine of the missions than by personal conviction among the Indians. When the missions were secularized, the indigenous Christians tended to scatter.

In its brief history the church in California failed to develop a home-grown clergy. Nevertheless, for a brief time between 1840 and 1846, the seeds of a mestizo clergy were sown. Unfortunately, the climate after the American conquest did not encourage the flowering of that pioneer effort.
THE MEXICAN PERIOD

From the Hispanic point of view, the brightest moment in the first half of the nineteenth century occurred in 1836 when the Mexican government insisted that a diocese be created in California and that the Spanish padres be replaced by Mexican priests. The Vatican acceded to the request, and on October 4, 1840 Bishop Francisco Diego y Moreno, a Franciscan, was consecrated as first bishop of the new diocese of the Californias. The Mexican-born prelate, the first mestizo bishop is what is now the United States, reached Santa Barbara in 1842.

The task facing the new bishop was enormous. The only church presence in the Californias was the mission system then in the process of being dismantled through secularization. There were only seventeen Franciscans in Alta California and four in Baja. The new prelate spent months trying to recruit clergy in Mexico, but he was not successful. He did bring a few seminarians with him to Santa Barbara, the seat of his new diocese.

Bishop Diego y Moreno was making important progress when he died in 1846. He had the joy of seeing six of the students he had brought from Mexico ordained to the priesthood during his brief administration. As one of his top priorities, the bishop opened the seminary of Our Lady of Guadalupe near Santa Inés Mission on May 4, 1844. By the end of 1845 there were thirty-three students, although only a few of them, according to one historian were really candidates for the priesthood. Still it was evident that California was fertile ground for cultivating vocations.

Unfortunately, death robbed Bishop Diego y Moreno of the satisfaction of seeing a mestizo church take firm root in California. Already 55 years old when he was consecrated, he died only four years after arriving in Alta California. His cherished seminary was soon destined to fade into oblivion.

The seminary admitted as many poor students as its resources would permit, giving preference to children of poor but respectable families. The prelates who came after Diego y Moreno were unable or unwilling to support the seminary, which served its intended role only seventeen years, although for two more decades it continued as a school. Almost a century passed before the church again had a seminary in this area — St. John's at Camarillo, which opened in 1939.

The death of Bishop Diego y Moreno, the conquest by the United States, and the eclipse of Hispanic culture by a massive
Anglo immigration effectively discouraged further development of a Mexican-American clergy. Of six Mexican priests listed by Francis J. Weber among the pioneer clergy of California, only one remained after 1856. He was Francisco Sánchez, who served until his death in 1884. Here is what happened to the rest of them:

"José de Los Santos Avila died in 1847, a mere eighty-four days after he was ordained. Miguel Gómez ministered to Californians until 1856, when he died during a visit home to Guadalahar. Antonio Jiménez del Recio died in 1853. José María Rosales y Pacheco and José Prudencio Santillán returned to Mexico in 1853 and 1851 respectively."6

With the death of Bishop Diego y Moreno also went the only chance of the Spanish-speaking for a church structure led by their own people. More than 125 years passed before another mestizo was named. Finally, in 1974 Bishop Gilberto Chávez became an auxiliary in the Diocese of San Diego.

After 1846 the task of administering the church in California fell to Father José Gonzáles Rubio, another Mexican. Appointed vicar general by the ailing bishop just before his death, Father Rubio, also a Franciscan, was elected vicar and governor of the sacred miter of California in October 7, 1847 by the Catholic hierarchy in Mexico City.7 He served in that post until 1850, but was never consecrated bishop.

The flood of immigrants precipitated by the Gold Rush of 1849 quickly created a problem for Father Rubio. Many of the newcomers were Catholics, but the diocese was hardly able to serve their needs. Since the need was immediate and since Mexico could not be counted on to send missionaries because it had its own shortage of clergy, Father Rubio turned to Europe. On August 11, 1849 he wrote Archbishop J. D. Benamie, head of the Picpus Congregation in Paris, asking for missioners.8 Members of Picpus began to arrive in 1850, and two of them were assigned to the seminary at Santa Inez, replacing two Franciscans.

Father Rubio also wrote Archbishop Nortbert Blanchet of Oregon, asking if he could also send priests to California. The archbishop said yes and by the end of 1850, twenty-two priests had been recruited in Europe and Oregon. With the thirteen who remained from the pre-conquest period, California had thirty-five priests to greet the first bishop who arrived to serve the diocese after the United States took over California.9

RETURN OF THE SPANIARD
The new prelate was a Spaniard named Joseph Sadoc
Alemany, a Dominican missioner who had served in Ohio, Tennessee, and Kentucky prior to his appointment by the Holy See on June 30, 1850. The new bishop had the recommendation of the American hierarchy. As a delegate to the Seventh Council of Baltimore, he had met and impressed many of the American bishops. Born in Vich near Barcelona on July 13, 1814, he was described as a well-traveled priest with practical experience in both Europe and North America.

In a novel gesture not often indulged in by members of the American hierarchy, Bishop John Hughes of New York had written José de la Guerra, a leading Catholic layman in California, and asked him for a report on the church in California. José de la Guerra strongly urged the appointment of a Hispanic bishop:

"I judge that to be fitting, because Catholics of this country are almost all Spanish-Americans, with whom the Spaniards are in sympathy; however, if this might not be accomplished, I think at least that it is indispensable that the bishop or bishops who are appointed should be proficient in Spanish." 11

Pope Pius IX initially appointed Father Charles Pius Montgomery, a Dominican priest and a native of Kentucky, to head the Diocese of Monterey, as the California see was to be called. But, Father Montgomery refused the appointment, pleading poor health.

Enroute to his new assignment from Rome, where he had been attending a general chapter of his order when named bishop of Monterey, Alemany journeyed through France, England, and Ireland seeking financial support and personnel for California.

Bishop Alemany seemed favorably disposed toward the Spanish-speaking among his flock. Immediately upon his arrival in California in December, 1850, he named Father Gonzáles Rubio as his vicar general. Finding only five Mexican Franciscans in California, on February 1, 1852 Bishop Alemany applied for permission from Rome to establish a novitiate where more priests could be trained. His diocese urgently needed them. the minister general of the Franciscans granted the permission and, in January 1853:

"there gathered at Santa Barbara the four resident Franciscans, Bishop Alemany, and Father Jesus Orruño, the guardian of the San Fernando College in Mexico City...It was resolved that the new institution should be provisionally established as a friary..." 12
On April 18, 1853, Bishop Alemany officially confirmed the friary at Santa Barbara as an apostolic college with facilities to train priests. Thus the Franciscans were able to build a center of Mexican Catholicism outside the diocesan structure - the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows. Unfortunately, Bishop Alemany’s tenure as spiritual shepherd of Monterey was short; in 1853 he was promoted to be the first archbishop of the newly created Archdiocese of San Francisco, at that time heavily Anglo.

In October 1854, a conference of priests in the archdiocese, issued eighteen decrees, one of which proclaimed:

“Recognizing the reality of cultural pluralism among the Anglo-American and Spanish-speaking Catholics, the conference decreed that couples coming from the same cultural background have the right to choose the nationality of the officiating priest.”

Michael Neri, a Catholic historian, contends that such a decree reflected Alemany’s concern for California’s Spanish-speaking Catholics. He attributes Alemany’s sensitivity to the “soliticio administration” of Gonzáles Rubio, whom Alemany initially appointed vicar general of the southern part of the diocese, and in April 1852, vicar general and administrator of the entire diocese. From his position Rubio was able to influence the affairs of the church in California past his time as chief administrator.

Alemany’s successor was not, as one might have expected, the veteran vicar general, Father Rubio, but another Spaniard: Bishop Thaddeus Amat, who was less sympathetic than Alemany to the Spanish-speaking Californians. The new prelate criticized the Mexican Catholics in Santa Barbara for not conforming to what he considered correct Catholic behavior. Neri describes Amat’s position:

“(Amat)...was dismayed at the apparent inability of religious principles to modify and ameliorate the public and private behavior of the town’s Catholic population, which was composed almost totally of the Spanish-speaking segment of the population.”

Neri speculates that Amat’s views of the mestizo Catholics coincided with those of Charles E. Hugh. A Protestant and Harvard-educated lawyer of the time, Hugh thought that the “Catholics of Hispanic background were very correct in the observance of external worship and ceremonies and regular in attending church, but he found little in them to commend in the
exercise of good works and in genuine practice of Christianity."16

In September 1856 Bishop Amat issued a pastoral letter strongly critical of Mexican Catholicism. Thus he succeeded in alienating the Spanish-speaking laity of Santa Barbara, who chose to ignore the ministrations of Bishop Amat and allied themselves with the Mexican Franciscans of the apostolic college, who shared the same adversity in which the Mexican laity lived.17

Amat’s next action struck resentment among the Mexican laity and, more important, among the Franciscans of Santa Barbara. He requested that the priests leave the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows and go to Mission San Luis Rey to proselytize among the Indians. The priests refused because their departure would have meant the end of the apostolic college, which had been in operation only one year.18 Although Amat insisted that the Franciscans honor his request, the priests again resisted the move.

Amat then opposed the Mexican Franciscans’ presence in Santa Barbara because their loyal followers among Santa Barbara Spanish-speaking Catholics prevented the formation of a parish. The community could not support both. The dispute between the bishop and the Mexican Catholics began with Amat’s critical letter and hardened into hostility to his order that the Franciscans leave Santa Barbara. This loyalty to the Franciscans was intolerable to Bishop Amat.19

In October 1856, Amat wrote the prefect of Propaganda Fide and the Franciscan minister general in Rome, accusing the Mexican priests of unspecified wrongdoings. He claimed that he and the priests loyal to him were branded as “innovators and heretics by the Santa Barbara Catholics.”20 The disagreement amounted to a schism, he said, and the only solution was to banish the Mexican padres to an area where they could not be such a disruptive influence.

During August 1857, Amat reinforced his claims with two letters to the pope in which he expressed his belief that the controversy had reached new levels that only drastic action could rectify. But the Franciscans found support for their cause. On March 19, 1858, Archbishop Alemany wrote the prefect of the Propaganda Fide, Cardinal Barnabo, praising the Franciscans for the alacrity with which they performed their priestly functions. Secular support came from at least one illustrious layman, Pablo de la Guerra, a California state senator and president of the Santa
Barbara City Council. He acknowledged the importance of the apostolic college and mentioned the good standing it enjoyed in Santa Barbara.

Amat was not deterred from his purpose. He extended his campaign against the priests until 1858, when he sent an emissary, Father Cajenti Serrenti, to Rome to testify against the Franciscans. The Franciscan minister general, Bernardino de Montefranco, wrote the Franciscans, advising them of the charges lodged against them. On May 2, 1858 they replied with a blanket denial of all charges.

Though the Mexican Franciscans were found innocent on all counts, their exoneration came too late. By the time news of their exoneration reached California (on September 30, 1858), Amat had removed Gonzáles Rubio as vicar general because, the bishop claimed, the interest and power of that office directly conflicted with Rubio’s new position as president of the apostolic college. After removing Rubio as vicar general, Amat successfully destroyed the Mexicans’ claim to high office in the Catholic church of California. In the same year, 1858, Amat revoked the diocesan faculties of all three Franciscans at Santa Barbara. Their faculties were not restored until several years later. Rubio spent his remaining years, until his death in 1875, fighting for the survival of the apostolic college.

Though the struggle was long, there was perhaps a Pyrrhic victory: The Franciscans had salvaged a base for themselves and Mexican Catholics in the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows until it closed in 1900.

With respect to the Amat-Franciscan controversy two Catholic historians have offered differing interpretations. Neri writes that the issue:

"...in essence was a cultural, ethnic, and economic one. The bishop and his clergy were bent on cultivating a Catholicism in the Diocese of Monterey-Los Angeles which was free from cultural and ethnic characteristics of Mexican Catholicism. Amat felt that the public processions and private devotionalism of Mexican Catholicism would precipitate anti-Catholic feelings among the new American Protestant inhabitants of Santa Barbara. In addition, the prelate thought that this type of religion was only external in nature and therefore, he blamed the immorality of certain Hispanic inhabitants of Santa Barbara on its lack of substance."^21

Though Neri’s interpretation appears moderately pro-
Mexican, Francis Weber, a historian of the Los Angeles Archdiocese, offers another view:

“...The Franciscan-Amat controversies certainly do not form one of the brighter chapters in the history of the Catholic Church in California. They seemed to owe their origin to a genuine misunderstanding on the part of Bishop Amat which the passage of time seemed only to increase. Individual actions were misinterpreted and exaggerated out of perspective by both parties, and it would be unfair to place the blame wholly on either side for these unhappy events. In fairness to Amat, however, it must be said that the existing documents on these cases sustain his contentions, especially in regard to the earlier charges made by the bishop, for no evidence has been discovered that the friars attempted any more than a blanket denial of the accusations.”

The fact remains, however, that there was discernible conflict between the Mexican Catholics of Santa Barbara and Bishop Amat. The bishop mounted his attacks against the Mexican laity of Santa Barbara and the Franciscan clergy at the Apostolic College of Our Lady of Sorrows in an effort to suppress their particular expression of Catholicism. The conflict also placed the Spanish archbishop of California and the Spanish bishop of Monterey in opposition to each other. This conflict only weakened the already outnumbered Spanish-speaking people in the church of California at a time when Anglo immigration was significant enough to bring about a transition to an Anglo hierarchy before the turn of the century. Bishop Amat died in 1878 and was succeeded by another Spaniard, Bishop Francis Mora, who served until 1896. Archbishop Alemany served in San Francisco until the 1880s, retiring to his native Spain. From then on, Irish bishops headed California dioceses.

THE IRISH HIERARCHY

The transition to an Irish hierarchy began at mid-century with the immigration of Anglo settlers into California, who soon became the majority in the San Francisco Archdiocese. Irish priests came with the Irish laity and soon held many posts in the archdiocese, then the center of California Catholicism. The San Francisco Archdiocesan Directory shows that of the 231 priests who served in the Archdiocese from 1848 to 1904, a total of 146, or 63.2 percent, were trained in Ireland. During this same period, only 4 priests, or less than 2 percent, were from Spain. None were trained in Mexico. A review of the 19 religious orders serving the archdiocese during the latter half of the century reveals similar findings.
While the Irish also suffered from the anti-Catholic sentiment prevalent at the time, bias was much stronger in the Los Angeles area, the area with the heaviest population of Spanish-speaking Catholics. In addition, the Mexicans had few defenders while the Irish always had their clergy to represent their cause.

The Irish immigration to California soon established a need for a third diocese. In 1870 the Diocese of Grass Valley was formed and later renamed the Diocese of Sacramento. Father Eugene O’Connel, an Irishman, was appointed its first bishop. The Irish Archbishop Patrick W. Riordan succeeded Alemany. In 1896 Bishop O’Connel of Sacramento was succeeded by another Irishman, Bishop Patrick Monogue. That same year the Irish Bishop George Montgomery succeeded Mora. Thus the transition from a Spanish to an Irish hierarchy was complete by 1900.

During this transitional period the number of native Spanish-speaking and Mexican-born priests steadily dwindled. The Mexican Franciscans died out and were replaced by German Franciscans. Eventually, the Spanish-speaking were left without religious leaders.

With the arrival of the Anglos, the peaceful, well-ordered Christian society of the Spanish-speaking in California began to fall apart. Crimes of violence were almost unknown prior to the conquest. “Personal security of the person prevailed in California,” wrote Don José Arnaz, a South American, in narrating his stay in the province between 1840 and 1843. Visitors praised the characteristic hospitality (especially to travelers) of California colonial society. Family structure was strong and protective of the welfare of parents and children as well as of grandchildren, in-laws, relatives, and adopted orphans.

But the conquest brought into confrontation two societies with antagonistic or at least disparate values. The bitter legacy of animosity between England and Spain found a new environment in which to poison human relations. Anglo-Calvinistic mentality did not count the Hispanics among the elect. The racist views of the conquerors condemned the mestizo culture of California. The engine of conquest had been fueled with a “lust for seizure,” writes Kevin Starr, tracing it back to the “perennial Protestant contempt for the Latin way of life.” Starr asserts, “The more intense grew the Americans’ ambition, the more violent and racist grew their abuse of Mexicans, a process which culminated in the orgy of invective during the pre-conquest years.”
The result was a perspective on Hispanic life that saw absolutely no value in it. The extreme bias expressed by Rufus Sage, a trapper, about New Mexicans was equally prevalent in California. Sage wrote, “There is no people on the continent of America, whether civilized or uncivilized, with one or two exceptions, more miserable or despicable than the mongrel race inhabiting New Mexico.”

The outcome of such ill will on the part of the conquerors was predictable. No one was spared. Even the successful, affluent, and powerful among the Spanish-speaking were persecuted. Leonard Pitt, an American historian, writes that of the forty-five Californians representing the twenty-five families whom Thomas Oliver Larking had enumerated in 1846 as the “principal men” of the old regime, the vast majority went to their graves embittered.

The discovery of gold in 1848 brought eighty thousand Anglos to California by the end of the year. Overnight the Hispanic people of California became a tiny minority. The new majority immediately set out to isolate the despised Mexicans. Just as the Indians were set apart on bleak reservations, the Hispanics were isolated in colonies. The historian Fred W. Ross describes their situation: It was never intended that the colonias were to be a part of the wider community...Rather, it was meant that they were to be apart from it in every way; colonia residents were to live apart, work apart, play apart, worship apart and, in some cases, trade apart.

California was willing to have free nonwhites (a category in which the Spanish-speaking were included), but only if they had few or no human rights and could be considered without argument to be born inferiors. The benefits of true equality that might lead to the acquisition of power were denied to Hispanics as well as to Indians.

Don Pablo de la Guerra, a leading Californian legislator, graphically describes the sad state of his people in a speech to the California Senate in 1856:

“It is the conquered who are humbled before the conqueror asking for his protection, while enjoying what little their misfortune has left them. It is those who have been sold like sheep—it is those who were abandoned by Mexico. They do not understand the prevalent language of their native soil. They are foreigners in their native land. I have seen seventy and sixty year olds cry like children because they have been uprooted from the lands of
their fathers. They have been humiliated and insulted. They have been refused the privilege of taking water from their own wells. They have been denied the privilege of cutting their own firewood."

Though land titles were guaranteed by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, the paper guarantees of the American government turned out to be worthless. The best lands were soon lost to Anglo land speculators. The change was swift, often marred by strife and violence, as the Anglos began to assert their power over the Spanish-speaking inhabitants. Led by the Irish and Germans, Anglos quickly gained dominion over northern California, their power centered around San Francisco.

In southern California, where the largest mestizo population lived, a climate of hostility prevailed. In 1854, an average of one homicide a day was reported in Los Angeles, most of the victims being either Mexicans or Indians.

"...the native Spanish inhabitants have undoubtedly suffered a certain check in their remarkable fecundity from their anomalous position. They possessed a mixture of Indian blood, for which Americans entertained an undisguised and irritating contempt that was inconsiderately extended to almost any sunburned complexion. Add to this, the feeling engendered by the war of conquest and the intrusion, usurpation, and other injustices to which they were subjected by unscrupulous newcomers who enviously beheld the broad possessions acquired by long colonization."

The land speculators inherited the land grants intact, and by 1860 the immense acreage had come into the control of a relatively small number of individuals. The control narrowed until in 1881 the combined holdings of 516 men totaled more than 8.5 million acres. In Fresno County alone, forty-eight men owned more than 79,000 acres each. The railroad, whose holdings by 1870 amounted to 20 million acres throughout the state, was part of this new landed class.

A $20 monthly tax, which Anglos did not have to pay, was levied upon Spanish-speaking gold miners. Others were simply driven off their claims or killed. No jury would indict or convict an Anglo for killing or raping a Mexican. The testimony of Mexicans or Indians had no standing in courts. The civil safeguards of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, like the property guarantees, were quickly forgotten.
Immigrants of Latin extraction numbered only 4302 between 1851 and 1860, a time when immigrants from the rest of the world were flooding into the United States. Latin immigration reached a peak of slightly more than 6000 in the 1870s and declined to less than 2000 in the final decade of the century. Latin immigrants comprised less than 1 percent of total immigration from 1851 to 1900. As a result of contact with white civilization and with diminishing immigration, mestizo population withered to half its strength by mid-century.

Hispanics became so insignificant in the social, economic, and political life of California that in 1859 a Major Emery wrote that the white race was “exterminating or crushing out the inferior race,” and an American soldier wrote that “the Mexican, like the poor Indian, is doomed to retire before the more enterprising Anglo-American.”

By the 1880s few signs of Spanish culture remained in California. Most of the Spanish names of streets had been Anglicized; thirty years of oppression and violence had discouraged the influx of new immigrants from Mexico; the Hispanic people had lost everything of significance. It was generally assumed, writes Historian McWilliams, that the Spanish influence had been thoroughly exorcised.

Yet at no time was Hispanic culture completely uprooted. Though many Mexican American fled south of the border to escape oppression, enough people remained to keep the language and traditions alive throughout the Southwest. Still the cost was huge in spiritual, psychological, and economic terms. What remained was a spiritually defeated and isolated people.
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PART THREE

Beginnings of the Mexican and Puerto Rican Migration
(1899-1945)
EXPANSION OF THE CHURCH IN TEXAS

Carmen Tafolla

The years 1904 to 1945 recorded not only a great change in the makeup of the Mexicotejano population of Texas but also the beginning of a change in attitudes within the structure of the church. Every facet of society felt the far reaching effects of the Mexican Revolution. As political upsets, disturbances, and animosities increased in frequency from 1900 to 1910, the movement of Mexican citizens into Texas began to have a visible social effect. With the outbreak of open rebellion in 1911, Mexico set upon the path of one of the bloodiest and most chaotic periods of its history. The rapid succession of revolutionary governments, each deposing by force, soon created a huge number of political personalities whose only hope of survival lay in refuge outside Mexico. Even those whose involvement in the political controversies had been passive were often, because of a professional, religious, or social affiliation, forced to flee their native land. Many from among the defeated forces, seeing their cause, their dreams, and their homes destroyed, turned away from the scarred battlefields and moved north, seeking a new life.

The Mexican immigrants to Texas represented a broad range of economic, social, educational, and professional backgrounds. Not only were a few refugee Mexican priests and nuns beginning to settle in Texas but the mexicotejano congregations also reflected many economic levels in their lay membership. Mexican immigrants to Texas included many individuals from the wealthiest and most prestigious elements of Mexican society, individuals who came to their new home fully
armed with education, professional training, political experience, and wealth. At the same time priests familiar with the language and culture of their parishioners began to work for the betterment of their people. The seed of great changes in the educational and social opportunities for Spanish-speaking Texans was planted at this time.

In addition, the economic situation of South Texas improved greatly the establishment in 1904 of 160 miles of railroad between Corpus Christi and Brownsville, and other lines leading north from Corpus Christi. The agricultural development area was enhanced by the cultivation of rice and cane — more important, a sugar factory was established. This factor became a source of permanent employment for a community that formerly had to depend totally on migrant agricultural work. The railroads also greatly facilitated the travel of missionaries.

Throughout the whole state, projects for the social and educational betterment of the Mexicotejano community began to appear. In 1905 Spohn Hospital was built in Corpus Christi, and the Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word of San Antonio accepted an invitation to assume control of it. In the same years Sister Ursula became superior of Seton Hospital, opened in Austin in 1901, and immediately expanded the hospital operation to include a special project among the long neglected Spanish-speaking citizens of the community. Sister Julia, a native Spanish-speaker, arrived to care for the special needs of Spanish-speaking patients. She did not confine her work to the hospital but soon began an active involvement in the concerns of Mexicotejanos in the whole city and its surroundings. Her concern was shared by Father P. J. O'Reilly, a fluent Spanish-speaker, who at one time underwent treatment at Seton Hospital. Upon his recovery O'Reilly dedicated himself to work among the Mexicotejanos. He received permission to organize Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish for the Mexicotejano community.

In 1907 the Servants of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Poor, founded in Mexico in 1885 for the purpose of helping poor children, came to Texas and founded Sacred Heart Orphans' Home in Laredo. In 1919 this religious group agreed to take control of the Guadalupano Day Nursery in El Paso. In February 1920 they founded the Sacred Heart Orphanage in El Paso.

In 1910 the first sisters of the Society of Saint Teresa of Jesus came to San Antonio, followed during the next years by five more sisters sent from Mexico to take charge of the new parish
school of Our Lady of Guadalupe. Within two months over two hundred children were enrolled. Soon after, the sisters opened San Felipe's School in San Antonio, and in 1913 Saint Teresa's School in Uvalde.

In 1912 the School Sisters of Notre Dame took charge of Saint Gerard's Parish in San Antonio, expanded the parochial school, and began to work extensively among the Spanish-speaking. In 1915 Our Lady of Guadalupe School for Mexican Children was established in Austin by the Dominican Sisters.

Between 1911 and 1913 there was a visible revitalizing of the apostolate to the ranchos. There was also an expansion of projects to build "Mexican churches" though the motives for these undertakings did not always seem to be purely religious. A Del Rio newspaper article reporting the building of Our Lady of Guadalupe church, for example, concluded that "the new church will do much to keep more and a better class of Mexican laborers in our city." Another reason for the new churches was cited by Father Serodes, who described the "American" Catholics as "not willing to mix, even in church, with the Mexicans" because "the temperaments of the two races do not harmonize." In 1902 work began on a church for the Mexicotejanos of Corpus Christi. In July 1903, at the church's dedication, the people requested it be named Our Lady of Guadalupe, but despite their desire, it was called Corpus Christi church. Renamed Blessed Sacrament church in 1915, it was rechristened in 1923 Holy Cross church. Between 1911 and 1918 eighty-two new churches were erected in the Diocese of San Antonio, most of them in Mexicotejano communities. In the ranchos near Dimmit, Father J. M. Wilson dreamed of a permanent church building for the rancheros. Reading of an offer by the Knights of Columbus of New York to give $500 to the neediest church, he sent a picture of their small chapel with an urgent letter of request, and won the donation.

In 1913 the town of Batesville, which had been described in 1900 as having "seven Mexican families and the Erskines," saw an influx of immigrants from Mexico. Among them Ofelia Fuentes, a young woman who began to teach catechism to the children of the community in a private building. In 1916 the people of Batesville built a one-room schoolhouse on church property, and by 1917 Fuentes had about thirty children in her school.

In 1907, with the opening of a school in Peñitas, the Sisters of Mercy began a period of expansion throughout the Rio Grande
Valley. During the next two decades they opened schools at Roma, McAllen, Mercedes, Mission, Port Isabel, Harlingen, Edinburg, and Rio Grande City. In the years 1913-1920 efforts were made everywhere to build and support schools. In a 1917 report on Mexican schools, Fathers Bergnard, Hermann, and Rose reported that in all the schools in the Eagle Pass-Uvalde-Del Rio area, teaching was done in Spanish in the first two grades; in the other grades, a half-hour was conducted in Spanish and the rest of the day was in English. It must be noted that this was done in the same year that the state of Texas outlawed the speaking of any foreign language on school grounds.7

THE DIOCESE OF CORPUS CHRISTI

Bishop Pedro Verdaguer, vicar apostolic of Brownsville since 1891 and no great admirer of the Mexican people, whom he described as "poor, not very industrious, and perhaps superstitious,"8 was a native of Cataluña, Spain. Despite the low regard in which he seemed to hold the Mexicotejanos, he was a native Spanish-speaker and he began to increase the number of Spanish-speaking clergy. Although he expressed the opinion that the church would benefit and the area be much improved if South Texas were settled by German, Irish, Italian, and Austrian immigrants, and complained frequently about the poverty of his vicariate, he improved and expanded the church. In October 1911 Verdaguer died, leaving a local church that had grown from 42,500 Catholics to more than 82,000, an increase of from twenty priests to thirty-two, a growth of from twenty-seven churches to seventy-five, and a growth of from seven to nine parochial schools and five academies. Two hospitals, a college, and an orphanage had been established.9 The bishop's emphasis on the increase of Spanish-speaking priests had reaped visible benefits; the church had grown tremendously.

In view of the growth of the church in this area, a recommendation that the vicariate apostolic be raised to a diocese was sent to the Holy See. Early in 1912 the Diocese of Corpus Christi was created and the Most Reverend Paul J. Nussbaum, C.P., was appointed bishop in April 1913. The Diocese of Corpus Christi, covering some 88,000 square miles, counted 83,000 Catholics under its jurisdiction, more than 70,000 of whom were mexicotejanos. Nussbaum immediately set forth on a visitation of the many small communities in his diocese.

Nussbaum's fervor was evident, he was especially concerned about the shortage of priests for the many scattered
rural communities. In his seven years with the diocese, the number of parochial schools and students attending them doubled. When he resigned because of poor health in March 1920, there were eighteen parochial schools serving more than 2600 students.10

THE DIOCESE OF EL PASO

In 1914 El Paso, under the jurisdiction of distant Tucson, Arizona, had only three churches for its more than ten thousand Catholics. Concerned for the needs of the faithful in El Paso, Bishop Granjon of Tucson requested that the Diocese of Tucson be limited to the state of Arizona. The provincial council pondered what should be done with the detached portion of southern New Mexico, which was at that time part of the Diocese of Tucson. It was too small to form a separate diocese but too large to be added to any existing diocese. The council proposed the inclusion of sections of the dioceses of Dallas and San Antonio with the area under concern to form a new diocese. The proposal was referred to the Holy See, and a bull was issued in March 1914 forming the new Diocese of El Paso. In June 1915 the Reverend A.J. Schuler, S.J., was named bishop of El Paso. By 1942, at Schuler’s retirement, the diocese had seen the addition of almost eighty thousand new Catholics, seventy-seven priests, thirty-nine missions, thirty parishes, six orphanages, two large Catholic Action centers, two academies, three parochial schools, three day nurseries, a maternity clinic, and a hospital. Schuler had also been involved in convincing the Jesuits in Las Vegas, New Mexico, to bring Revista Catolica to El Paso. The offices of this magazine were moved to El Paso, and, a large audience in and beyond the Diocese of El Paso. Schuler was also one of the founders of Associated Charities.11

Fleeing from persecution in Mexico, five sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd arrived in El Paso in 1927 with only two suitcases and $100. With the consent of Bishop Schuler, they opened a convent. Joined in 1928 by eighteen more sisters seeking refuge from the dangers of the Mexican Revolution and the violent anti-Catholicism of Mexican President Plutarco Calles, they founded a home for delinquent girls, which by 1936 was helping forty-two girls. Other sisters of the congregation of Our Lady of Charity, also refugees from Mexico, passed through El Paso in 1929, hoping to return to Mexico. Unable to go back to Mexico, they requested permission to remain in El Paso. Teaching and ministering to poor children, they worked
untiringly for the improvement of social services to the Spanish-speaking. They established Our Lady of Refuge Home as well as an orphanage for homeless children.

In addition, the congregations in El Paso had a long history of lay involvement in social-betterment activities. In May 1908 the first distribution of flour to the poor was made, and this practice continued on a monthly basis at San Ignacio de Loyola Parish. In November of that year, the first benefit supper was held on behalf of the poor. That year tickets to the enchilada supper at 25 cents a person brought $81. The event became an annual affair. In 1918 a free day nursery established by the parish ladies was named Asilo Guadalupano. In January 1923, an immigration branch of the Conferencia Nacional de Bienestar Católico was established in El Paso to help families migrating from Mexico and to protect the residence rights of those already in El Paso. From 1933 to 1935 it served 76,306 persons. The different parishes also received the services of exiled Mexican priests. In 1926 Cleofas Calleros, a parish member of San Ignacio, started citizenship classes in the church hall. The clergy and laity of El Paso were enthusiastically involved in social and cultural activities.

STRUCTURAL CHANGES

In northern Texas new projects were established to meet the concerns of the long-oppressed Mexicotejanos. In 1915 the parish of Saint Joseph for the Spanish-speaking was founded in Fort Worth. It was directed by Father Atanáz, C.M., and Father Constantín, C.M., until it was transferred to the control of the Claretine Fathers in 1925. In 1920 Saint Paul’s Hospital of Dallas, established in 1898 and expanded to include a free clinic in 1908, began special work among the Spanish-speaking. Nurses and staff from the hospital established an additional free clinic in the “Mexican” section of the city.

Because of the vastness of the northern territories and the great growth of the church in Texas, Pope Pius XI decided to create a separate diocese. Counties were separated off from the dioceses of San Antonio, Dallas, and El Paso to create the new Diocese of Amarillo. Father R. A. Gerken was appointed first bishop in April 1927.

On August 3, 1926 Pope Pius XI also raised San Antonio to the status of an archdiocese. Bishop Arthur J. Drossaerts was named archbishop, and San Fernando Cathedral, the place of
worship of the first permanent European settlers of Texas, was made a metropolitan church.

THE CONTINUATION OF TRADITIONAL FOLK RELIGION

The alienation of Mexicotejanos from the formal structure of the church did not indicate a neglect of personal religion but rather a strengthening of private forms of worship. There was a visible continuation of devotional customs, such as personal relationships with favorite saints, the activities of lay religious societies and the age-old folk religion, which the people clung to despite neglect and disdain on the part of the clergy. In short, the religion of the people survived, in spite of the formal institutions of the church.

An interesting example of this kind of religious life outside the official church can be seen in the devout respect accorded to the small privately owned chapel of el Señor de los Milagros in San Antonio. Built in the form of a private home, except for the cross above it inscribed 1813, the chapel houses a battered image of El Señor de los Milagros as well as hundreds of candles, flowers, pictures, and personal notes left by devotees. People come from both great distances and nearby neighborhoods to pray, ask help, and leave symbols of their gratitude. The walls are covered with photographs, scribbled notes of thanks, and rude paintings, often on boards, illustrating sufferings endured or miracle performed. The image had been rescued from a fire by the man who built the chapel to house it. The chapel passed to the man’s granddaughter, who cared for it and gathered alms as her source of sustenance. Although the chapel was viewed with great reverence by the people, no official religious rites took place there, for it was private property and the clergy discouraged the expressions of worship there. Manuel Gamio, writing in 1930, stated, “the priests of San Antonio, as is well known, frown upon the cult and have attempted to have the image of El Señor de los Milagros conveyed to the Cathedral or to some other Catholic church within that jurisdiction.” But the attitude of the clergy did not sway the people, who have continued to request miracles of the image.

THE PHENOMENON OF MEDIATION

The mediation of saints was important in the folk religion of Mexicotejanos. The state was spotted with small grottoes, shrines, private chapels, and other points of pilgrimage
dedicated to the Virgin or to various saints. The most numerous of these were dedicated to the Virgin of Guadalupe, protectress of the Mexican people. But the great attraction of the saints for many people was their very humanness. Personalism within the culture emphasized the formation of strong bonds with persons instead of institutions. Friendships, conversations, and confrontation with favorite saints point to the humanness of the relationship. A parish priest explained: “One of my parishioners is very devoted to Saint Anthony. She brings him small gifts, pleads the necessity of her request, shares excitedly the results, or scolds him when he fails to fulfill the request. Her personal relationship with him is sincere and direct, as it would be with any family member. She would feel strange raising her voice at Jesus, but she treats Saint Anthony as openly and naturally as she would one of her children.”

The phenomenon of mediation was not restricted to saints. It was believed that certain people can mediate or transmit certain powers—to heal, to avert evil, or to bring peace and tranquility to the mind or spirit. Certain children were especially thought to have these powers. It was a common practice to ask for the prayers or blessings of these people or to touch these children. The traditional belief that different people are given different gifts—healing, prophecy, or calming—was very much a part of the experience of the apostolic period. An interesting parallel to the period of the Acts of the Apostles can be drawn when we consider that the early church was made up of very poor people with numerous and extended family bonds, similar to those of people living in Mexicotejano barrios.

Concepts of this kind came into direct conflict with the institutional church, which at that time did not recognize the existence of special gifts in lay people and only reluctantly in certain priests. It was another point of divergence between the people’s private religion and the formal church institution.

SOCIEDADES AND CELEBRATIONS

The sociedades (church-based lay societies), formed an important part of the religious activites of Mexicotejanos. These sociedades were founded to reflect and to pass on traditions, and also to fill the need for people to pray together and to be of mutual assistance. The sociedades can be categorized by their activities and central goals into the cofradía or treasury of prayer and the apostolado or missionary group. Although most sociedades were started and nurtured by priests, lay people
dominated the activities. Many priests attempted to amalgamate the numerous societies into one for men and one for women, or simply one for both, but they were met by a definite and united resistance. These amalgamation attempts misinterpreted one of the main purposes of the sociedades. In granting lay people the status of officers or members of the boards of directors, the sociedades were serving to give recognition to individuals in the community and to encourage leadership roles in which individuals were viewed as integral and vital elements of the church. The people's resistance to amalgamation attempts was based on the realization that these would lessen the number of leadership positions available and thereby cut into the power system of the community. There were other built-in protections in the traditional procedures of sociedades. A formal and informal rule existed within communities prohibiting the holding of two presidencies in different sociedades by the same individual. There was also a strong informal procedural format to be followed in the selection of presidents of sociedades. The selection involved a communal decision based on informal conversation among the members to single out persons who (1) had an understanding of the traditions of the sociedad, (2) had been faithful workers even as nonofficers, (3) got along well with the other members, and (4) had time to devote to the office. This was usually quite a lengthy process; when a satisfactory decision was reached unanimously by the members, the priest would usually ratify the decision without question. This process also spread to other barrio organizations, although in such cases the selection of officers was usually formalized through a vote.

One of the most well-known of these sociedades is the Guadalupanas or the Association of Our Lady of Guadalupe. Founded in San Antonio on August 13, 1911 by Father Juan Maiztegui, C.M., Archbishop of Panama. It was reorganized on October 12, 1932 by Reverend Carmelo Tranchesse under the name of Sociedad Guadalupana de Altar. Its primary goals are to cultivate a special devotion to Our Lady of Guadalupe, to develop the spiritual growth of its members, and to take special care of the altar and its adornments. Among traditional ceremonies observed by the Guadalupanas are Guadalupana Sundays and the Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe. On the second Sunday of every month, the day designated in commemoration of the Guadalupanas, the sociedad gathers its members behind the standard of Our Lady of Guadalupe and enters the church in procession in front of the priest. December 12, the feast day of Our Lady of Guadalupe, is perhaps one of the most highly
celebrated events, frequently lasting more than twenty-four
hours. In many communities festivities begin at noon on the
previous day with an extremely long procession of members of
different sociedades, parishes, schools, and other devotees.\textsuperscript{17}
The main focus of the procession is a young woman dressed as
the Virgin of Guadalupe. Flanked by two angels and Juan Diego,
she is carried on a cart, surrounded by young people dressed in
traditional Mexican Indian costume and bearing little cages of
chicks. The procession often begins in the barrio, proceeds to
the main plaza of the town or neighborhood, and returns to the
church, where all enter and receive the blessing of the priest.
The rest of the evening is usually spent at festivities on the church
grounds, including bingo, food, and a small carnival. These
activities usually continue until four in the morning when \textit{Las
Mañanitas} is sung in serenade by several groups of mariachis,
after which the church is opened and all the people enter to join
in the singing. A special Mass is held for the Virgin of Guadalupe,
for whom the altar is covered with roses. After Mass the
festivities come to a close with a large breakfast for all the
participants.

The importance of this type of procession, when the church
is the center of social life among mexicotejanos lies in the
dynamics of a visible, public manifestation of faith. These
festivities also reflect the history of the people and their rural
culture, for the special religious celebrations follow the cyclical
pattern of the agricultural seasons. The feasts of the harvest, the
quiet of winter, the celebration of the growth of spring are all
reflected in the importance accorded to the feasts of gratitude to
Guadalupe, the penance and hard work of the Lenten season,
and the celebration of rain on the day of San Juan. This seems a
natural result of the rural setting in which a sense of rhythm and
closeness to the land pervades all facets of life, including
religious life. In the city of El Paso, the feast days of Guadalupe
and of San Lorenzo were always accompanied by special
ceremonial dances. Dancing on the church school patio to the
sound of tambourines and a violin or flute, the mactachines
would carry banners, medallions, flowers, bells, and rattles.
From dawn until late in the night they would dance in honor of
the Virgin and the saints.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{THE LIGAS}

Some sociedades were quite significant in that they
represented community self-help leagues organized for the
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mutual benefit of members. Several of these were quite aggressive in their demands for social justice and seem to have been catalysts in organizing civil-rights activities. One of these, the Liga de Protección Mexicano, was founded in Del Rio, on May 1, 1908. Father Serodes of Del Rio enthusiastically described its beginnings:

"Fourteen of our best and influential Mexicans came...and out of the meeting sprang up some kind of mustard plant, which, now being watered by God's grace and fertilized by good men's united wills, shall grow, some day, shade and fruits.... A league of Catholic men, all good and sound... a Protection League on both religious and temporal standpoints ... A Mexican Protection League organized among Mexicans and for Mexicans' sake."19

Eight months after its creation, the Liga had fifty members in Del Rio. When Serodes preached a mission at Eagle Pass in the spring of 1912, he started the league there with thirty-four charter members.20 Bishop John W. Shaw was at first not too enthusiastic about the Liga, but by 1912 its beneficial activities and its praise by Serodes convinced the bishop of the constructive religious role it played. Among the activities mentioned in the Liga's 1912 rule book are special funds for a library, for public assistance, for funeral expenses, and for health, medical and daily expenses were allotted for the ill.21

When the Del Rio rectory burned down in February 1917 and the church hall in May, many people suspected arson because of the recent activities of the church. The Liga, together with the parish priest, lodged a written protest with the sheriff, who then posted a $1000 reward for the capture of the arsonist.22

THE CLERGY DEFEND THE RIGHTS OF THE POOR

During the latter part of this period there was a growing concern on the part of the clergy for the rights of Mexicotejanos. From Alamo in 1928 Father Labouré reported: "Our English-speaking Catholics, especially those coming from the north of the U.S., consider the Mexicans as a lower race practically on the same level as Negroes, and do not wish to have anything to do with them outside of the manual labor which the Mexicans furnish in the fields or in the house. Father Smith has taken the stand and rightly so, that our Mexicans born here in Texas are as much Americans as people of Irish, Dutch, German, French, or any other descent born in other parts of the U.S. He is trying to make our Mexican children vindicate their right to be treated in church on the same footing as any other Americans...
Unfortunately, racial prejudices are so bitter that it will probably take many years and much untiring effort to do away with this antagonistic feeling entertained by our American people against our Mexicans."

But this changing attitudes of the clergy were not limited to passive commentary. On November 7, 1930, at the call of Father Charles Taylor, over 450 Mexicotejano farm workers, not counting women and children, gathered to discuss unjust labor conditions. The group — all resident citizens of Crystal City — drew up in union fashion a set of common agreements to be presented to the owners. They demanded that henceforth no outside laborers should be brought in without special reason; that payments for field work should be based on the need for workers to secure the necessities of life and not according to the principle of maximizing the profits of the owners; that $2 a day or $45 a month be set as the minimum wage; that wages be openly posted at the fields; that child labor under the age of twelve be prohibited; and that work could be approved or rejected in the fields. This group, representing the four thousand farm laborers of Crystal City, received a public reply from the owners, which, although not conceding many of the requests, did result in a public recognition of the workers’ problems and needs. It should be noted that attendance at Mexican schools increased with the beginning of spinach harvest that year, instead of decreasing as was customary.

This brief account by no means exhausts the account of the struggles of priests to help the poor, but it serves as an indication of a new and growing respect for the Mexicotejanos. Father Giles Marchand, in his visitation to Saint Anthony’s Seminary in 1942, called the six Mexicotejano students among the eighty-four seminarians the “future of the province.” Throughout the whole state an awareness of the importance of the language, culture, and faith of Mexicotejanos was developed within the church.
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7. PAC II, Doc. 46, Bergnard to Antoine, 26 July 1917.
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24. Oblate Archives, Crystal City N & D, Doc. 3; Doc. 5.
EXPANSION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CHURCH

Prior to 1905 the church hierarchy and the religious orders in California embarked on an ambitious building program of churches, schools, universities, and hospitals. Of course, World War I temporarily curtailed most construction operations. The three California bishops in office at the turn of the century died within a few years of each other. Archbishop Patrick Riordan of San Francisco in 1914, Bishop Thomas J. Conaty of Monterey in Los Angeles in 1915, and Bishop Grace of Sacramento in 1921. Their replacements were Archbishop Edward Hanna in San Francisco, Bishop John Cantwell, in Monterey-Los Angeles, and Bishop Joseph Keane in Sacramento. Catholic historian Francis Weber makes the following comment:

"Bishop Cantwell was an organizer and a builder. Farsighted and possessing boundless energy, he had the gift...to carry out his expansion programs."

Bishop Keane lived only a few years after his appointment, in 1928 Robert Armstrong replaced him. Armstrong guided the diocese for a quarter century of spectacular growth. Weber describes the general growth throughout the state:

"Statistically, by 1920 the Catholic Church in California was coming of age. The population of the state had risen to 3,426,861. Los Angeles replaced San Francisco as the principal Metropolis. The Archdiocese of San Francisco had 447 priests, 147 parish churches, and seventy-one missions. Its seminaries enrolled 216 students from the dioceses of California. There were seven colleges, five orphanages, two industrial schools, two homes for boys, and three homes for the aged. Fifty-three parish schools and a score of academies and other schools served Bay City with the total number of pupils fixed at 26,442. The Catholic population of the Archdiocese, based upon analysis of parish figures, was placed at 364,826. The Diocese of Monterey-Los Angeles had 285 priests and counted 126 parish churches and 116 missions. There were two colleges, four high schools, sixteen
academies, and sixty-three parish schools, numbering a collective enrollment of 14,313. Eight orphanages, an infant asylum, an Indian school, and three homes for the aged... the Catholic population of the diocese was placed at 214,000... the Diocese of Sacramento within the limits of California had sixty-seven priests, eleven parish schools, and seven academies... pupils ... 2,611. Catholic population ... 48,000. A special work in all three jurisdictions was that of hospitals... These institutions were thoroughly abreast of the times.”

By 1922 the Diocese of Monterey-Los Angeles had to be divided. A new Diocese of Monterey-Fresno was established with John MacGinley its bishop. The Diocese of Los Angeles-San Diego was established with Bishop Cantwell pushing forward expansion to “meet the need for new churches, schools, hospitals, and other institutions,” as the population increase in California in this decade was largely centered in the southern part of the state, particularly in the Los Angeles area.

The rapid growth of Los Angeles led to great expansion of its church institutions. By 1930 this institutional growth was quite evident:

“San Francisco had 539 priests... 168 parish churches and fifty missions...two seminaries...four colleges...seventy-two parish schools...enrollment...30,754...Catholic population...350,000...Los Angeles-San Diego...509 priests...217 parish churches...diocesan seminary...three colleges...eleven other high schools...eighty-two parish schools...three industrial schools... pupils ... 35,000 ... Catholic population ... 301,840 ... Diocese of Monterey-Fresno...ninety-four priests...seventeen parish schools...3,000 pupils...Diocese of Sacramento...ninety-one priests...twelve parish schools...”

After 1930 population growth slowed, but industrial development of the state continued. During this decade the Diocese of Nevada was established; formerly this area had been included in the Sacramento Diocese. Los Angeles became an archdiocese in 1936, and Bishop Cantwell became its archbishop. The Diocese of San Diego was formed with Charles Buddy as its new bishop. Archbishop Hanna of San Francisco resigned in 1935, and was succeeded by Coadjutor Archbishop John J. Mitty.

By 1940 the state population had grown to 6,907,387. The San Francisco Archdiocese had a Catholic population of 443,000; Los Angeles of 327,952; Sacramento, of 127,703; Monterey-Fresno of 82,166; and San Diego of 141,689. The total Catholic population
of California in 1941 was 1,222,510. Parishes numbered 549, served by 1797 priests. A major seminary at Camarillo was built for the Los Angeles Archdiocese. St. Patrick’s Seminary in the Archdiocese of San Francisco experienced notable growth. In 1941 the five jurisdictions of the archdiocese contained parish schools, forty-six other elementary schools, eleven colleges and universities, nine normal schools, fourteen seminaries, twenty-two novitiates of sisters, 104 high schools, eighteen orphanages and homes for children, ten summer camps, eight homes for the aged, sixteen hospitals, eight schools for nurses, and forty centers of Catholic social work agencies.

World War II brought more newcomers to work for California’s war industries and farms. The Catholic church saw a need for additional churches, schools, hospitals, and welfare centers. Weber reports that in 1950:

“The Archdiocese of San Francisco numbered 873 priests. 200 parishes and forty mission stations... eleven seminaries... seven universities and colleges, thirty-five high schools, 110 parochial and private elementary schools and four orphanages served a Catholic population of 725,000.”

The Hispanic people of California played almost no role in this phenomenal material growth of the institutional church. As a people they had no voice in the administrative decisions. They were too poor and exploited to be able to make significant financial contributions. As beneficiaries of the church, they were far down the list of priorities set by the church officials. The schools, hospitals, universities, and charitable institutions were built to serve mainstream Catholics, especially those who made substantial donations for their construction. Only as objects of charity did the Hispanic people fit into the scheme the church had set as its model, but even there they were considered a liability and therefore unwelcome.

The attitude was expressed forcefully by Archbishop Hanna in a letter to the California congressional delegation opposing unrestricted immigration from Mexico. He set forth the following reasons why the immigration of Mexicans should not be encouraged:

1. They drain our charities.
2. They and their children became a large portion of the jail population.
3. They affect the health of the community.
4. They create a problem in labor camps.
5. They require special attention in our schools and are of low mentality.
6. They diminish the percentage of our white population.
7. They remain foreign.

The archbishop further claimed that an extraordinarily large percentage of Mexicans benefitted from Catholic charitable organizations:

"In Los Angeles, where 7% of the population is Mexican, he said that 28% of all charity cases were Mexicans. "The Bureau of Catholic charities in Los Angeles," he continued, "devotes more than 50% of its benefits to Mexican cases. One-fourth of the general hospital budget in Los Angeles is devoted to Mexican cases. The City Maternity Hospital devotes 73% of its budget to Mexican cases.""

**A PEOPLE WITHOUT CLERGY**

Perhaps at no other period in history have the Hispanic people of California had so little representation among the clergy. Between 1900 and 1945 they had neither bishops nor priests — not even Spaniards with their own cultural gap to bridge in order to serve the Hispanic people of California. The Spanish Franciscans had died off or left, they had been replaced by Germans. The new Franciscan seminaries of the twentieth century required their students to know and to take six years of German, but apparently no Spanish.

Between 1905 and 1945 no Hispanic priests were ordained by the Archdiocese of San Francisco. During that forty year period, 462 priests served the archdiocese. Though 169 of them had trained in fifteen different countries, only one was educated in Spain and none was ordained in Mexico (See Table 1).
Table 1
Countries of Training for Priests of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, 1905-45.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Total Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There was a major shift in the countries of training for priests of the Archdiocese of San Francisco between 1848-1904 and 1905-45. Between 1848 and 1904 the majority of priests were trained in Ireland; between 1905 and 1945 the majority were trained in the United States. However, Ireland continued to be the major source of priests.

Data indicate an absence of Hispanic seminarians in the Archdiocese of San Francisco between 1848 and 1945. During this period 48 percent of the priests were trained in the United States, and 52 percent in Europe. The Archdiocese did not have a single priest trained in Mexico for ninety-seven years! Among the religious orders a single Jesuit priest came from Spain: Padre José Peña. There were no other Spanish-surnamed priests on the rosters of religious orders in the archdiocese for this period. Table 2 indicates the country, total numbers, and percentages of diocesan priests trained for the Archdiocese of San Francisco between 1848 and 1945.
Table 2

Countries of Training for Priests of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, 1848-1945.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Total Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The above tables list no priests trained in Mexico. A review of the lists of priests who served the archdiocese reveals an absence of Spanish-surnamed priests in general. It is true, however, that the Archdiocese of Los Angeles did ordain a few mestizo priests, the exact number has not been determined.

IMMIGRATION OF CATHOLIC LAY PEOPLE TO CALIFORNIA

Even as Hispanics were disappearing from among the clergy of the institutional church, the Hispanic laity — mainly from Mexico — was beginning to increase. Complementary legislative acts and economic developments in the United States left Hispanic people the dubious heirs of stoop-labor jobs. The first legislative act was a law excluding Chinese immigration in the 1890s. The Chinese were considered a threat to American labor and the American way of life. The second development was the Gentlemen’s Agreement of the early 1900s restricting
Japanese immigration for the same reasons. By then only eastern Europeans competed with blacks and Mexicans for cheap labor. But legislation in the 1920s cut off the flow of eastern Europeans.

Meanwhile, irrigation brought millions of acres under cultivation. The new farmlands were planted with labor-intensive crops, creating a need for an army of cheap labor. After the flow of Chinese, Japanese, and eastern Europeans was cut off, Mexicans and other Latins from the Caribbean and Central America were in demand.

At the same time the bloodiest war in the history of the Western Hemisphere (more than 1 million dead) broke out in Mexico. The Revolution of 1910-20 caused hundreds of thousands of Mexicans to flee their country. Another decade of unstable government and religious persecution maintained the push, sending a vast stream of humanity northward. In addition, the trend in immigration reflected the industrial expansion in both the United States in general and California in particular.

The following figures indicate, by decade, the influx of Mexican immigrants legally admitted to the United States, as compared with the influx of people from European countries. Between 1901 and 1910 immigration figures included 2,146,266 Hungarians, 341,498 Germans, 388,017 English, 339 Irish, 2,045,877 Italians, 249,534 Swedes, 1,597,306 Russians, 49,642 Mexicans, and 8192 South Americans.11

Between 1911 and 1920, 442,693 Hungarians, 143,945 Germans, 249,944 English, 1,109,525 Italians, 146,181 Irish, 921,201 Russians, 742,185 Canadians, 219,004 Mexicans, and 41,899 South Americans were admitted.12

Between 1921 and 1930, 412,202 Germans, 157,420 English, 220,591 Irish, 455,315 Italians, 227,734 Polish, 924,515 Canadians, 459,287 Mexicans, and 42,215 South Americans were admitted.13

Between 1930 and 1940, 114,058 Germans, 108,527 Canadians, 22,319 Mexicans, and 7803 South Americans were admitted.14

Between 1940 and 1950, 226,578 Germans, 112,252 English, 171,718 Canadians, 60,589 Mexicans, and 21,831 South Americans were admitted.15

Thus immigration reached a peak of 8,795,386 between 1901 and 1910, dropping to 1,035,039 between 1941 to 1950. Mexican immigration peaked between 1910 to 1930, and then dropped drastically between 1931 and 1940. Table 3 indicates Mexican immigration totals as compared with those of other countries.
between 1901 and 1950. As indicated, only 6.7 percent of all immigrants came from Mexico and South America during this fifty-year period, while 64 percent of all immigrants came from nine European countries (Hungary 13 percent, France 1.2 percent, Germany 6.1 percent, Great Britain 7.4 percent, Ireland 4.8 percent, Italy 18.5 percent, U.S.S.R. 12.7 percent, Canada 10.5 percent, and Spain .7 percent).\textsuperscript{16}

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Countries</td>
<td>70,201,876</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2,629,969</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>236,318</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,238,281</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>1,502,651</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>966,562</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3,736,405</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>2,564,153</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>131,660</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>2,126,171</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>810,841</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>54,456</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 indicates the total immigration figures from 1851 to 1950 for each major cultural group.\textsuperscript{17}

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Countries</td>
<td>36,861,281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3,657,164</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>502,102</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5,653,720</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>4,666,611</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3,797,127</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>4,772,322</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>3,324,978</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>824,156</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>61,584</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we deduct the Mexican immigration figure for the period 1901-1950 (Table 3) we see that only 13,315 legal immigrants came to the United States from Mexico prior to 1905. Furthermore, of the 824,156 Mexican immigrants admitted to the United States over the hundred-year period 1851 to 1950, 678,291 were admitted between 1910 and 1930, that is 82 percent during a twenty-year period. Thus the major periods of limited entrance of Mexicans into the United States in the hundred years were from 1850 to 1910 and again from 1930 to 1950. After 1940, Mexican labor could be obtained without legal entry or by temporary legal entry through the bracero program.

MESTIZO CATHOLIC WORKERS IN THE FIELD

As has been pointed out, Mexican immigrants were encouraged to migrate to the United States to do farm labor. Efforts to organize these workers existed. Contrary to the popular belief that Mexicans were docile prior to the 1960s, the roots of organized mestizo protest in farm labor can be traced back to the nineteenth century. Carey McWilliams writes:

"When several hundred cowboys had gone on strike in the Pan Handle in 1883 — the first attempt to form a union of agricultural workers in the United States — the strike call was signed by one Juan Gomez. As early as 1903, over a thousand Mexican and Japanese sugar-beet workers went on strike at Ventura, California... 1910 was initiated by a strike of Mexican workers on the local street railway. In 1922, Mexican field workers had sought to establish a union of grape pickers at Fresno..."

"The first stable organization of Mexican workers was established in Southern California in 1927, when the Confederacion de Uniones Obreras Mexicanas ... organized ... the first strike called by the union, in Imperial Valley in 1928, was broken ... Two years later five thousand Mexican field workers struck in Imperial Valley."18

In 1930 Governor C. C. Young published Mexicans in California: Report of Governor C. C. Young's Mexican Fact-Finding Committee. This report documents the way Mexican immigrants formed Mutualista labor unions to deal with exploitation and oppression by California agribusinesses. It states:

"That the Mexican immigrants are beginning to orientate themselves in California is evidenced by the fact that they have
begun to organize into unions for the purpose of improving living and working conditions in the land of their adoption. The effort to organize the Mexican workers into unions seems to have begun in Los Angeles in November, 1927. On the tenth day of that month, a committee of the Federation of Mexican Societies in Los Angeles met and adopted a resolution calling upon the mutual and benefit societies affiliated with the Federation to lend their moral and financial support to the cause of organizing trade unions of Mexican workers.

"This resolution recited the "deplorable condition of abandonment and isolation" in which the Mexicans lived in the United States, "deprived of food, cooperation and mutual help." The resolution stated, "that the present conditions of the Mexican worker compel him to work on a minimum salary basis to his own detriment and the harmful effect to the workingmen of this region and those of American nationality who naturally feel that the competition is detrimental," and called attention to the fact that much discussion had taken place at the convention of the American Federation of Labor held in Los Angeles in 1927, regarding the harmful effects of Mexican competition with American workers."^{19}

This quotation indicated that the American Federation of Labor viewed Mexican labor as harmful because of its competition with "American workers." Thus it appeared that the labor movement had no commitment to help mestizo farm workers organize. The resolution was sent out to the Federated Mexican Societies. Local unions were organized in Los Angeles and other places in California into the Confederation of Mexican Labor Unions, Confederación de Uniones Obreras Mexicanas. On March 23, 1928 the following principles were written into its constitution:

1. That the exploited class, the greater part of which is made up of manual labor, is right in establishing a class struggle in order to effect an economic and moral betterment of its conditions, and at last its complete freedom from capitalistic tyranny.

2. That in order to be able to oppose the organization, each day more complete and intelligent, of the exploiters, the exploited class must organize as such, the base of its organization being the union of resistance, in accord with the rights which the laws of this country concede to native and foreign workers.

3. That the corporations, possessors of the natural and social wealth, being integral parts of the international association of
industry, commerce and banking, the disinherited class must also integrate by means of its federations and confederation into a single union of all the labor of the world.\textsuperscript{20}

The concepts utilized were socialistic and commonly used by the Wobblies between 1900 and 1920. On January 9, 1928 the Confederación issued a manifesto setting forth principles and invited all Mexican societies to attend the first convention.

Twenty locals were present at the first convention from the following areas: Los Angeles, El Modena, Garden Grove, Palos Verdes (Los Angeles), Orange, Attwood, Stanton, Santa Ana, Tatbert (Santa Ana), San Fernando, Modena, Anaheim, Glorietta, Santa Monica, Placentia, Buena Park, Moor Park, La Jolla, Corona, Fullerton, San Bernardino, and Colton.\textsuperscript{21} In addition, there were delegates from Mexican mutual aid societies but no delegates from the American Federation of Labor or from any other American labor union or churches. This is distinct from the contemporary conventions of the United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO, led by Cesar Chávez, in which representatives of labor and of the churches are present in large numbers. The following resolutions of the 1928 convention indicate concerns regarding immigration, schools, and labor support:

1. That in view of the fact that thousands of Mexican laborers in the United States were already suffering want and deprivations, because of lack of work, the Mexican government and the CROM be urged to obstruct and discourage all further immigration of Mexicans into the United States.

2. That each member of the Confederation of Mexican Labor Unions in the United States write at once to his relatives and friends in Mexico urging them not the come to the United States, because of the desperate position in which the Mexican laborers in the United States find themselves.

3. That the Confederation of Mexican Labor Unions observe the first day of May, as a labor holiday, instead of Labor Day in September.

4. That schools be established by each local labor union for the children of Mexicans.

5. That a pact of solidarity with the American Federation of Labor be negotiated, and

6. That an intensive campaign of organization be instituted.
Other resolutions introduced at the convention condemned several California industrial companies for the manner in which they treated their Mexican laborers.

The convention elected a central committee to carry on the work of the confederation and to suggest changes to the constitution for consideration by the next convention.\textsuperscript{22}

Major strikes occurred in southern California between 1928 and 1940. The best documented account of these strikes led by the confederation and the Cannery and Agricultural Workers Industrial Union was prepared in 1945 by Stuart Jamieson. Its title is \textit{Labor Unionism in American Agriculture}.\textsuperscript{23} Jamieson writes: "There is some fragmentary evidence that attempts were made as early as 1922 to organize Mexican farmworkers in California as a distinct group.... The first stable organization including Mexican farm laborers was begun in 1927.... the Confederation of Mexican Labor Unions or C.U.O.M..... Its principles reflected in part the influence of American leftist organizations, such as the I.W.W. and the Communist Party.... Total membership in May 1928, was estimated at 2,000 to 3,000 in some 20 locals in Southern California communities."\textsuperscript{24}

Jamieson documents the vast amount of organizing activity and strikes led by Mexican farm laborers between 1920 and 1930. Farm labor organization during the 1940s is best documented by Ernesto Galarza in \textit{Spiders in the House, Workers in the Fields}.\textsuperscript{25} Other organizing efforts between 1905 and 1945 included the founding of the following organizations in California.\textsuperscript{26}

1914 International Institute of Los Angeles
1915 Agricultural Workers Organization, I.W.C.U.
1928 \textit{Sociedad Guadalupana}
1933 \textit{Club Latino Americano de Long Beach y Signal Hall}
1937 Sinarquista Movement
1940 Unity League

Thus the mestizo Catholic population was active in seeking social justice against discrimination and economic exploitation. In addition, there was a struggle against forced segregation in Mexican schools, which is the next topic of discussion.

\textbf{SEGREGATION OF MEXICAN SCHOOL CHILDREN}

The roots of forced segregation in California existed between 1848 and 1904. The existence of so-called Indian school
was a common practice between 1848 and 1904. Mestizos were not allowed into schools, except in very small numbers, prior to the twentieth century. Between 1905 and 1945, when there was a large increase in mestizo immigrants, both public and private school systems established segregated Mexican schools throughout the Southwest, particularly in Texas and California. Héctor García, founder of the American G.I. Forum and a former ambassador to the United Nations, in 1970 testified before Congress regarding the segregation of Mexican schoolchildren. In the Southwest, he stated, “Texas set up a segregated educational system... which later extended to all the Southwest and became prevalent against Mexican Americans.”

He exhibited photographs of Mexican schools and commented: I will ask Carlos to help me in a survey that I did. I will show you briefly the "Mexican School."

Another picture of the same "Mexican School."

"You see, Senator, all of such schools were designated as Mexican. What set it apart? It was a creek, a ditch, a highway, a crack, a road. Every community in the Southwest thusly and in Texas, had a 'little Mexico,' and these schools that were set aside were called 'Mexican Schools.' This is recorded in the minutes of many school board meetings they had at that time, prior to 1950. Mathis was a 'Mexican School.'

"Here you have a brick, wonderful, magnificent castle, which is the American School...."

"Here are the Mexican Schools — these pictures are horrible. Here is the American School — a beautiful job, a brick job."

In California and throughout the Southwest, there was resistance to forced segregation. By 1945 the protest against segregated public schools manifested itself in the courts, as reflected in the Westminster, v., Mendez case.

On March 2, 1945, Gonzales Mendez, William Guzman, Frank Palomino, Thomas Estrada and Lorenzo Ramirez, as citizens of the United States and on behalf of their minor children and on behalf of "some 5000" persons similarly affected, all of Mexican or Latin descent, filed a class suit against Westminster Garden Grove and El Modeno School Districts and Santa Ana City Schools and their respective trustees and superintendents. All the School Districts and the system were of Orange County, California. The complaint alleged a concerted policy and design of class discrimination against "persons of Mexican
or Latin extraction" of elementary school age. This alleged class discrimination resulted in the denial of equal protection to the children of the complainants and "some 500" other children in the schools involved.

The complaint states that the school system and school districts involved did, by common plan, design and purpose create regulations, customs and usage which excluded children of Mexican or Latin descent from "attending, using, enjoying, and receiving benefits of the education, health and recreation facilities of certain schools...." Allegedly the children of Mexican or Latin descent were segregated and required to attend and use certain schools in said Districts and System reserved for and attended exclusively and solely by them. Children purportedly known as White or Anglo-Saxon attended schools maintained for their exclusive use.\textsuperscript{30}

The petitioners claimed this segregation was unconstitutional. An injunction was issued:

"We conclude by holding that the allegations of the complaint (petition) have been established sufficiently to justify injunctive relief against all defendants restraining further discriminatory practices against the pupils of Mexican descent in the public school of defendant school districts."\textsuperscript{31}

The final ruling stated: "By enforcing the segregation of school children of Mexican descent against their will and contrary to the laws of California, the respondents have violated the federal law as provided in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, by depriving them of liberty and property without due process of law and by denying them equal protection of law."\textsuperscript{32} This case was used in 1954 as a point of authority for the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in \textit{Brown v. Kansas Board of Education} in which segregation of black students was ruled unconstitutional.

School segregation was due to forced housing segregation of the \textit{mestizo} population in both rural and urban areas of California. This segregated forced housing was rooted in cultural racism and economic and political exploitation. Furthermore, within the determination of school segregation there was continuous violation of freedom of speech as a result of the forced use of "English only" in classrooms and school yards. The California Education Code required that English be the sole language of the schools.
THE MYTH OF DOCILITY

There is a great deal of literature that contends that mestizos, commonly referred to as Mexican Americans, were a docile group prior to recognition of the social movement of La Causa in the 1960s. That decade is depicted as a period of "awakening." This stereotype seeks to associate the motivation for Chicano organizational activity with the black civil rights movement and government poverty programs. But La Causa has pointed out that mestizo Catholics were busy organizing and had not been docile. As early as 1930 the myth of docility was refuted:

"The fact that the Mexican laborers are beginning to organize into unions is significant from the standpoint of those employers who look upon Mexican laborers as tractable and docile persons. It appears probably that, if these labor unions will be able to retain and enlarge their membership, they will make attempts to secure better wages and working conditions to justify the existence of their organizations."33

In summary, the growing Latin population of California between 1910 and 1930 was, for the most part, a rural Catholic work force exploited by agribusinesses, living in deprived and segregated conditions, and trying to improve its living conditions. These Catholic workers lacked support from the institutional church.
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MEXICAN MIGRATION TO THE MIDWEST AND EAST

Moises Sandoval

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, the Mexican-American population of the United States had largely remained in the states acquired by conquest more than fifty years earlier—Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and the fringes of states bordering these four. But in the early 1900s forces and events building up for a long time coalesced to scatter Mexicans throughout the Midwest, East, and even parts of southeastern Texas. In little more than two decades sizeable colonies could be found in all major cities of the Midwest and Northeast, and a large stream of migrants flowed every spring into many agricultural areas of the Midwest. "Mexicans," said a California grower in 1927, "scatter like the clouds; they are all over America."1

The forces and events that led to this exodus were many. One was the Chinese Exclusion Act passed by the U.S. Congress in 1882, which created a labor shortage. Another immigration measure that created a need for additional labor was the 1907 Gentleman's Agreement with Japan limiting immigration from that country. At the same time agricultural acreage in the West had tripled, principally because of the advent of irrigation. Land under irrigation increased during that period from 60,000 to 1,466,000 acres. Along with that, a new labor-intensive agricultural industry—sugar beet growing—developed as a result of the passage of the Dingley Tariff in 1887. Cheap labor was needed to make the new industry competitive.

In Mexico a revolution that would take a million lives was about to ignite. Marauding armies would soon drive many of the survivors northward. By the time the conflict broke out in 1910, fifteen thousand miles of railroad leading the United States were complete, facilitating the exodus. Five railroads built with American capital for the export of minerals, linked Chihuahua, Sonora, Nuevo León, Zacatecas, Durango, and San Luis Potosí with the United States border. Roads had also been improved.2 The Mexican workers who helped build the railroads went across the border after their completion and worked on American railroads. Likewise, the Mexican mining industry, also developed with American capital, provided miners for the border states.
The upshot of all these events was a massive migration whose impact was felt by the entire nation. The population of Kansas went from 71 Mexicans in 1900 to 8429 in 1910 and 13,770 in 1920; Michigan's increased from fewer than 100 in 1900 to more than 8000 Mexicans in Detroit alone by the end of World War I; Illinois had an increase in its Mexican population from 156 in 1900 to 4032 in 1920; Missouri had only 162 Mexicans in 1900 while in 1920 it had 3411; in Nebraska Mexicans went from 27 in 1910 to 3611 in 1920. Even New York registered an increase from 353 in 1900 to 2999 in 1920. Louisiana's Mexican residents increased from 488 in 1900 to 2487 in 1920.

Just as the Santa Fe trail was the route traveled by American traders and trappers who first penetrated the Southwest in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Mexican immigrants followed the same trail when they pushed into the industrial heartland of the United States a century later. The lure was railroad employment. By 1908, the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific railroads were hiring an average of 1000 Mexican workers a month. That is why Kansas, with its huge rail yards in Kansas City, had the largest Mexican population of any midwestern state both in 1910 and 1920, although the Mexicans were used more as section hands than as rail yard workers.

World War I created labor shortages in many industrial cities as production increased and many Americans entered the armed services. Mexicans were recruited for industrial jobs in St. Louis, Omaha, Chicago, Gary, Indiana, and Detroit, as well as Kansas City. Counteracting the pull of the war shortage was the Selective Service Act, which made any Mexican male who declared his intention to become a citizen eligible to serve in the armed services. Many indeed fought in the war, where their record of voluntary enlistment was proportionately greater than any other ethnic group's. Another brake to immigration came with the passage of the General Immigration Act of 1917, which imposed an $8 head tax and set literacy qualifications for all immigrants. But such was the demand for Mexican residents that exemptions were approved the same year. By the end of 1920 there were seventy thousand Mexicans living east of the Mississippi. So scattered were the Mexicans across the United States that between 1926 and 1927, money orders were sent to Mexico from forty-four of the forty-eight states.

As early as 1907, Mexicans began to appear as track laborers in Illinois. By 1910, 21 percent of the maintenance forces of the
Santa Fe, Rock Island, and Galesburg and Aurora divisions of the Burlington Railroad were Mexican—a total of 1121 men. That percentage increased steadily to a peak of 75 percent for the Santa Fe in 1927, 80 percent for the Burlington in 1928, and 72 percent for the Rock Island. As industrial activity increased during and after World War I, Mexicans left railroad employment for more remunerative jobs in steel and other industries. In 1928 Mexicans made up 12 percent of the work force in eight large plants of basic industries in Chicago and Calumet, Illinois, a total of 5999 workers. Packing houses, tanneries, and cement plants were among those employing Mexicans.

In 1923 the Bethlehem Steel Company transported from Texas at its own expense 912 men, twenty-nine women, and seven children to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Others were brought to the company’s Lackawanna and other plants. The company signed an agreement with the Mexican consul general guaranteeing wages and other benefits to the workers, including quarters and board and transportation back home for those who worked at least a year. The colony dispersed after a few years.

Interestingly enough, immigrants who settled in the industrial centers of the Midwest and East did not first live in border areas, before or after coming to the United States. They leapfrogged from the central plateau in Mexico’s interior to the industrial heartland of the United States. They came from such places as Jalisco, Michoacán, Guanajuato. This was as true for those who came to Chicago as for those who were brought to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Perhaps the major cause for the leap from one interior to the other was the Mexican Revolution. The ebb and flow of war displaced large segments of the civilian population, and unsettled conditions prevailed for years after over hostilities ended. Another reason no doubt was the type of immigrants: those from Mexico’s interior seem to have been less agrarian. Many of them came to the United States with the know-how and skills that would enable them to adapt and prosper in an urban industrial society. The presence of American capitalists in Mexico also played a role. By 1910 American investments in Mexico exceeded $2 billion, more than all the capital in the hands of Mexicans. The president of a malleable steel company in Chicago brought “several batches” of Mexicans from Chihuahua because he owned land there and knew people.

Such was the growth of the Mexican population in Chicago that in the 1930 census it was five times what the figure for the
entire state of Illinois had been in 1920: 19,362 Mexicans residing in six distinct colonies. Across the Indiana state border there were another 9000 Mexicans. Puerto Rico migration had not yet become a factor. In 1928 only six workers from Puerto Rico were on the payroll of eight large basic industries in Chicago.

Track laborers received the lowest wage, between 35 and 39 cents an hour in the late 1920s. Steel workers earned the most, between 45 and 50 cents an hour, and the work was steadier. Rail work was largely seasonal. In between, employment could be found in packing houses and other industries. Thus from the railroads, which were the conduits for many of the immigrants, the workers went to other industries as soon as they could find openings. The Mexicans were sometimes paid less than the going rate, but generally that seemed to be the exception. Skilled workers sometimes had to begin in unskilled jobs.

In general, these urban immigrants fared much better in every way than their countrymen in agriculture. Though the first wave of newcomers consisted mainly of single men in their twenties and thirties, families came later. Job discrimination was not as big a factor as in agriculture. The Mexicans were able to start their own businesses—groceries, rooming houses, pool halls, barber shops, and the like.

The heavy recruiting by industry was a phenomenon lasting only a few years, but once the colonies were established, other Mexicans came on their own. Some worked only for a time and then returned, but their communities endured and grew. Agricultural interests did not look kindly on the competition from industry. Beet growers and Texas farmers feared losing their cheap labor. Consequently, in 1929 Texas enacted an emigrant agency law seeking to hamper mass shipment of laborers out of state.13

**Beginnings of the Migrant Stream**

Beet-growing may be the industry that drew more Mexican migrant labor to the Midwest than any other. At least it was the employment for which large numbers of Mexicans were first recruited in such states as Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado. Beet work was tailor-made for cheap labor. The first successful sugar factory was not established in California until 1870, and not until 1897 was the industry made viable through a stiff tariff on sugar imports. Without cheap labor it could not compete with the cane-sugar industry. Fortunately for the beet trust, the willing
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Mexicans were waiting to be recruited in border states. At first, Mexicans were not the only ethnic group in the beet fields. In Michigan, in particular, the earliest beet workers were Poles, Belgians, and Hungarians. But when the Europeans began organizing an agricultural workers union in 1935, they were driven off the fields and replaced with Mexican migrants.\textsuperscript{14}

Beet work involves three cheap-labor operations. The first begins about April 15 and consists of blocking and thinning the rows of beets. The next is hoeing after the plants are bigger. Then there is a long wait for harvest beginning in October and ending in December. In all, the beet worker spends only seventy-eight to eighty days on beets. The rest of the time the migrants work in other labor -- intensive jobs such as picking beans, cucumbers for pickles, cherries, and tomatoes. Thus these other industries developed apace with beet growing.

There is probably no sadder story than that of the migrants' annual odyssey to the Midwest. Historian Carey McWilliams characterizes the journey north as a nightmare: "\textquote{10,000 workers and their women and children scurrying northward in early spring, fleeing like fugitives.}''\textsuperscript{15} Along the route the migrants were harassed by law-enforcement officers, snubbed and denied service in public places, at times not even finding places to go to the bathroom. The workers and their families were packed like cattle in the back of trucks. The drivers who contracted to take them to the Midwest often made the entire trip of more than a thousand miles without stopping. Families had to carry buckets for their bodily wastes because there were no stops, except for gasoline.

In beet-growing areas, the migrants lived in shacks, barns, or one-room houses built on wagons so they could be moved around from place to place. Most of the housing had no modern conveniences -- no water, electricity, or sewer service. McWilliams visited the Scioto March in Ohio in 1940, where he found twenty-three persons living in a three-room shack.\textsuperscript{16}

Sophisticated and intensive recruiting was necessary, especially since the steel and rail industries were also competing for Mexican workers. Sugar companies sent agents south in February to hold public meetings and to go from house to house. Booklets were printed and circulated. Newspaper ads were published. Posters were displayed in public places, and handbills and calendars were passed out in Southwest labor markets. In the beginning workers were transported by train, and the sugar companies paid full or half fares.\textsuperscript{17}
The myth persists to this day that the migrants went from place to place because they enjoyed doing so. "It's in the nature of these people to move from place to place," philosophized Jack Pandol, a California grower. "Most of these Mexicans like the arrangement of not working steady." But facts put the lie to that belief. Migrants were welcome in the North only while there was work to be done. McWilliams described how in one country the sheriff rounded up any stragglers at season's end and "encouraged" them to get going. "There is a tacit agreement among all groups in the community that the migrants must be out of the area by October," wrote McWilliams. They were supposed to arrive with the blossoms and disappear when the fruit was picked. The host counties wanted no welfare problems created by unemployment during the winter months.

Despite their labors, the Mexican agricultural workers often barely made enough to live during the summer. Sometimes families did not even have enough money saved to pay their way back home. McWilliams reports that they were overcharged for groceries and often were worse off when they returned home. The average annual earnings of farm laborers in 1935-1936 in ten counties in eight states were $125 to $347, between half to 70 percent of the average factory wage. McWilliams said that many farms were nothing but sweatshops. Here is how a newspaper described the plight of Mexican workers in the early 1940s:

"Want, poverty, misery and terror stalk the beet fields like four gibbering ghosts, haunting the days and nights of articulate Mexican laborers who have been brought so far from their homes to the strange northern land to work in strange fields."

Prejudice and discrimination were virulent in the small towns and the villages where Mexican farm workers went to shop. There were no Mexican clerks or business people to serve them. "No Mexicans Allowed" said common signs in restaurants and places of entertainment. It was difficult to find even a friendly barber. In one small town in Colorado there was no place for Mexicans to eat. Police harassment was common. Attitudes and actions generally reflected the view expressed by a beet grower in the South Platte Valley of Colorado in the 1920s: "The Mexicans are an inferior race."

Only after colonies of ex-migrants started developing little by little in agricultural towns of the Midwest could migrant workers hope to find barrios where they could shop, eat, and use recreational facilities without fear of discrimination. But to this
day one continues to read of incidents of police brutality and discrimination against migrants.

**Religion and the Immigrants**

Very little has been written about the dealings of the church with Mexican immigrants to the Midwest and East between 1904 and 1945. The few tidbits one finds deal almost exclusively with Mexicans who settled in urban areas. There is almost nothing about how local churches served the migrant workers. One thing is certain: No churchmen made the long trek with the migrants to Michigan. If the local parishes discovered their presence and made efforts to serve them, such events were not recorded.

No other ethnic group entered the United States as orphaned of religious leadership as the Mexicans who came to the Midwest and east. At least those who entered the Southwest could hope to find churches whose congregations were Spanish-speaking even if the priests were not. The Irish, Italians, Germans, Czechs, and Poles had brought their own priests when they immigrated to the United States. Such clergy shared the struggles of their people. Thus these ethnic groups were very close to their church. This was not the case with the Mexican immigrants of this period. The church in Mexico had been an ally of the establishment, amassing wealth and acquiring title to large tracts of land. One goal of the revolution was to break up these large holdings and distribute land to the peasants. Manuel Gambio wrote that the Mexican church was more concerned with riches and power than with evangelical duties.23 Gamio claimed that because the Mexican clergy had been an obstacle to progress, it had been necessary to restrict religious liberties. Without trying to assess the merits of that position, it is necessary to say that the experience of Mexicans with their church has been different than that of other immigrants. Jorge Lara-Braud pointed out that “the traditions of anticlericalism and noninstitutional Catholicism were deeply imbedded in Mexicans before they came to the United States.”24

Noninstitutional religion is the response of a religious people not adequately served by the institutional church. It is simply do-it-yourself religion. Priests and churches were thinly spread over vast territories. But the people did not forget to practice their beliefs simply because priests were not around. They developed their own home liturgies and church events, giving honor and glory to God according to their own lights. For
many, the institution played such a small role that it was almost superfluous.

Gamio wrote that even fanatical Catholics became less intensely Catholic when they immigrated to the United States. The Mexicans no longer had to pay tithes, first-fruit taxes, or any other of the small contributions exacted by the church in Mexico. Failure to pay did not bring reproaches from the community, as would have been the case south of the border. Then Protestant propaganda brought to the attention of the migrants weak points about the Catholic church. Further, American Catholicism seemed to Mexicans “almost colorless and standardized, awakening no emotional response.” The end result of all this, claimed Gamio, was that the immigrant became less fanatic and indifferent, unbelievers or Protestants. However, Paul S. Taylor’s study of Mexicans in the Chicago-Calumet region revealed that “despite the religious indifference complained of by the Catholic priests and the numerous Protestant groups active among the Mexican colonists, the number of active Roman Catholic communicants very greatly exceeded the number of active Protestants.”

Another factor to be considered in studying the relationship between the church and new Mexican immigrants is the prevalence in that era of national churches or parishes. The pastors of these parishes felt a keen responsibility for their own people and devoted themselves to them. But they did not feel the same kind of regard for the Mexicans orphaned of institutional religious care who settled in the midst of these national parishes. Taylor wrote that the Mexicans “do not generally go readily to the numerous Catholic churches in their neighborhoods which are attended predominantly by particular European nationalities.” Of course, the hierarchy did erect Our Lady of Guadalupe church in South Chicago in 1928. That church and St. Francis on Roosevelt Road were the ones most frequented by Mexican immigrants to the Chicago area.

As far as is known, only one group of migrants came with their own priests. That was the showcase importation of industrial workers to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. But the management very frankly stated this was a special case:

“We took more pains with the Mexicans than with most labor. We wanted a good name in the labor market of the south should we ever go again. We encouraged families to come but not all family men. One or two priests also came. We wanted
Mexicans to feel they had a good community. We wanted them to be happy and feel we were interested in them as human beings as a matter of good business and good morale."

However, the vast majority of Mexican immigrants -- in the absence, as always, of interest and concern from the institutional church -- continued the practice of their religión casera (home or do-it-yourself religion). More accurately, it was a community religiosity of mutual help organizations and devotional groups growing out of the home-nurtured faith of the people. In 1928 there were approximately thirty-five societies in the Chicago-Gary area. The principal type was the mutualista, which provided sick, death, and other benefits for its members. Some of these mutualistas were sponsored by religious organizations, usually Catholic churches, wrote Taylor.

However, there were instances where misunderstandings developed and an organization was "disowned" by the church. As far as church-connected organizations are concerned, the Sociedad de Esfuerzo Cristiano "San Marcos" began in the Chicago area in 1925; the Friendly Club of St. Mark's Church in 1926; Sociedad Caballeros de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe in 1927 or earlier; Sociedad Santo Nombre in 1927; Sociedad Recreativa Feminil Guadalupana in 1928 or earlier; Liga Mexicana de Jóvenes Cristianos in 1928; Círculo de Obreros Católicos San José in 1924; Caballeros de Guadalupe in 1928, and Hijas de María in 1928 or earlier.

The prejudice experienced by Mexicans in Catholic churches no doubt was similar to that suffered in Protestant churches, for history shows little qualitative difference. A Protestant pastor in Chicago said:

"Some Mexicans came into the American services before they had a church of their own. That wasn't at all satisfactory, however, because I could see that the Americans did not like it. The Mexicans were strange people, they were dark and they seemed to be sneaking and furtive. I suppose that was because they were new and unaccustomed to our way. For instance, sometimes they would knock on the door before coming in. I have always insisted that they go to the Spanish services although there are a few who are white as the ordinary American whom it is rather hard to know what to do with."

Some priests found the Mexicans too superstitious, and objected to the fact that they attached too much significance to small devotions. A priest from Mexico complained that the
immigrants were not as polite with the American clergy as they were with those in Mexico. Another priest thought that the immigrants were not the Catholics in the United States that they were back home. "They think that Catholicism here is not the same as in Mexico," he declared.31

In smaller towns the struggle of the Spanish-speaking was even more difficult. A proclamation issued in 1975 by State Senator Robert W. Mitchler marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of Mt. Carmel Chapel in Joliet, Illinois, stated that Illinois Spanish-speaking families living in the region began as early as 1900 to organize their own places of free worship. But it was not until the spring of 1948 that they succeeded in constructing their own chapel.

American priests found the Mexicans’ desire to continue their own religious traditions objectionable. The Gary, Indiana, Post-Tribune reported on 28 January 1928, that Father John B. de Ville told Gary Rotarians:

"We have shut out European immigrants and have accepted the uncivilized Mexican in his place.

"There are 560 organized communists in Gary and they consist almost wholly of Mexicans and Russians.

"You can Americanize the man from southeastern and southern Europe but you can’t Americanize a Mexican."32

A Mexican by the name of José Gallardo replied to Father de Ville, who was then superintendent of the Gary-Alerding Settlement House:

"Rev. Mr. de Ville, you also judge us to be criminals. Criminals exist in all kind of races, not only among the Mexicans. No matter how great a nation or how small it is, all have their criminals, from those who crucified Jesus Christ to the persons who insult a race.

"As in reference to the Americanization, we do not have to become Americans because we are Americans bone and flesh. America is our country and we could not be otherwise. You should not contemplate the cactus by its thorns but by its blossoms. Furthermore, you should remember that you have quite a number of Mexicans in your Sociedad de Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe who are liable to get offended. They should be treated equally to the Italian colony."33

Despite such tensions, "a considerable number" of Mexican immigrants received aid from the church in time of need or
sickness, wrote Manuel Gamio. Protestants competed with Catholics in dispensing charity. But contrary to the claim sometimes made that the immigrants were a drain on charities, Mexican immigrants in Chicago were not considered a serious charity problem. One executive said, "The Mexicans are not such a problem for us; they take care of themselves pretty well." Paul S. Taylor wrote that the readiness of Mexicans to aid their own people in need was noted in many areas. "This characteristic, and the lengths to which they would go in extending aid, were objects of frequent comment in the Chicago-Gary region, by both Mexicans and Americans," Taylor wrote.34 There were claims, however, that Mexicans had four to six times the number of charity cases to which their numbers in the general population entitled them.

In 1929, a Protestant charity worker in Kansas City charged that the competition between Protestants and Catholics was demoralizing to those in need. On the other hand, a Mexican accused her countrymen of changing their religion for convenience. She said people in need would say they were Baptists or Methodists if they thought they could get more help, although their children were baptized Catholics. "Quite a few of the Mexicans who at first say they are Protestant, became Catholic in emergencies," added a charity official.35

The conclusions to be drawn from all of the above is that religion for Mexican urban settlers continued to be largely what it was in Mexico: a religión casera consisting of family and community ties. The relationship with the institutional church was fraught with misunderstanding and sometimes marred by prejudice. For its part the church dispensed alms to the needy, though the motivation seems to have been more duty than love. Here and there a church or chapel was built for the Mexicans.

Urban settlers were more fortunate than migrant workers, whose shifting, rootless existence denied them the opportunity to form mutual-aid societies or similar institutions. If such organizations existed, they functioned back home where the migrants wintered. Contact with the churches in the areas where they worked was minimal, one can assume, because organized work with migrants did not begin until the Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking began in the late 1940s and 1950s.

Almost forty years after Mexicans first started coming to Ohio, the Toledo Diocesan Councils of Catholic Men and Women published a booklet in 1962 to orient the faithful about
Mexican Americans. But this publication did little to remove the broad-stroke stereotypes in which Mexicans had been clothed since the beginning. It dealt with the Mexican’s machismo, low level of religious practice, superstitious beliefs, and the claim that “you could get a knife in your back” if you belittled a Mexican’s manhood. But the booklet also called attention to the Mexican “sense of charity that must surely compensate in some way for lack of concern over dogma and observance of moral precepts.” And it wondered whether Mexicans didn’t know more about the real Christian life than given credit for.36
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An understanding of Church history for Puerto Ricans in the United States does not begin when Puerto Ricans come to the continent, but rather when the United States goes to Puerto Rico. The army troops which landed on the southern shore of Puerto Rico on July 25, 1898 ended four-hundred years of Spanish rule over the small Caribbean island and its multi-racial people. Valuable political studies demonstrate incontestably that the religion of the people of Puerto Rico was of prime concern to the new lords from Washington.¹

The parallels between Puerto Rico and New Mexico regarding Church policies have been described elsewhere in greater detail², but it should not go unnoticed that two ordinaries of Santa Fe, New Mexico, Bishops Edwin Vincent Byrne and James P. Davis, first administered dioceses in Puerto Rico.

As in New Mexico some fifty years earlier, Americanization became the focus of United States’ policy for the new territory. Political leaders who resented the colonial significance of Americanization were replaced with appointees of the military governor. The autonomist government granted to Puerto Ricans by Spain was dismantled, local elections were abolished, and English was made the official language. Puerto Rican merchants and land-owners lost much of their economic power when the peso was devalued and the newly established United States banks drastically limited credit on the island. These social, political and economic policies of the United States also had repercussions upon catholicism.³

With the transfer of power and an insistence on the separation of Church and State, Spanish missionary priests and nuns left in great numbers and many hospitals, schools, and churches were confiscated.⁴ The argument used to justify these actions was that public tax money had built the Catholic institutions and that they were, therefore, public not religious buildings.
Public education was designed to transfer the loyalties of the Puerto Rican children from their native traditions, religion and customs to the values of the United States.\textsuperscript{6} Holidays were instituted such as Washington's Birthday, Thanksgiving and the Fourth of July, but classes were held as usual on the Epiphany or Three Kings Day. Children's games, songs and nursery rhymes were introduced along with primers to make Puerto Rican students imitate continental methods of instruction.\textsuperscript{7}

Prominent among the allies of this plan of Americanization were the Protestant Churches, who were particularly useful in the fields of education. Protestant missionaries agreed not to compete with each other in their efforts to take Puerto Ricans away from the Catholic faith and to the Gospel.\textsuperscript{8}

For its part, the Catholic Church was badly disorganized. It was unfortunate that the Spanish-influenced Puerto Rican clergy was so reactionary. The Dean of the Cathedral had written a pastoral letter which blamed the disastrous hurricane of San Ciriaco in 1899 on Puerto Rican infidelity to Spain by collusion with North American Protestants.\textsuperscript{9} Despite pleas for a Puerto Rican to be named Bishop of San Juan, the Holy See nominated a Bavarian-born, North American Marist, James Blenk, who had served the Vatican diplomatic corps. Blenk proved to be a respected and capable Ordinary, taking the case of the confiscated Church properties to court. The issue was decided by the Supreme Court in 1908 with a settlement that was favorable to the Church. The effectiveness of bishops was henceforward to be judged by their ability to understand the Americanization process and make the Catholic Church compatible with its ends. Although native lay Puerto Rican preachers had been banded together as early as 1902 in effort to stem the tide of Protestant evangelization by a movement which came to be called, "Los Hermanos Cheos," the bulk of clergy and all of the Bishops were imported.

In 1917, Bishop Jones convoked a General Synod at which Cardinal Farley of New York was invited to preside. One of the goals of the Synod was to enlist support of mainland congregations for Puerto Rico. Island missions and schools were accepted by the Northeastern Provinces of the Redemptorists, the Holy Spirit Fathers, the communities of Trinitarians, the Dominican Sisters of Amityville, Long Island and the Josephite Sisters of Brentwood. The efforts of these religious were directed, in large measure, at the establishment of a Catholic School system. These early missionaries belonged to their times
and did not internalize the religious values of the Puerto Ricans as a conscious adaptation of the foreign missionary to the native Church. And although they recognized the Hispanic cultural roots of Catholicism by encouraging processions and devotions, this was more than offset by the conspicuous absence of success in recruiting Puerto Ricans to their ranks. The Protestants, on the other hand, were not only prepared to ordain Puerto Ricans to the ministry, but in many instances gave open entry to ex-Catholic priests.¹⁰

Thus, the Catholic Church had begun the work of assimilating Puerto Ricans to the customs and institutions of United States society before the first migrants left Puerto Rico for the United States. Moreover, this practice of importing clergy and the inability to imbue Puerto Rican Catholicism with a nationalistic flavor carried over to the pastoral practice of the Church towards Puerto Ricans in the mainland of the United States.¹¹

THE PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION:
Preliminary Stage Until 1917

The first mass migration of Puerto Ricans occurred in 1900 when the pineapple growers of Hawaii advertised on the island of Puerto Rico for laborers. The response was overwhelming, since the economic upheaval caused by United States rule had created massive underemployment and aggravated the endemic poverty of the mountain people, or jíbaros. Puerto Rican workers left during this period for Cuba, Mexico, and other Latin American countries.¹²

While in Hawaii, one of the Puerto Rican migrant workers was converted from Methodism to the Pentecostal religion. Later, this convert, Salamon Feliciano Quiñones along with Juan A. Lugo and Francisco Ortiz spent time in California studying and preparing for a return to Puerto Rico in 1916. During the Depression, when the funds which sustained the Main Line Protestant Churches on the island dried up, the Pentecostals grew at a rate that quickly made them the most numerous of the Protestant Churches in Puerto Rico.¹³ Their religious appeal was directed to the uprooted peasant who suffered from a disintegration of traditional morality.¹⁴ The Puerto Rican Pentecostal Churches helped make Puerto Rico the most
Protestant of all Latin American countries and sent Puerto Rican Pentecostal missionaries to New York City, the Southwestern United States and parts of Latin America.

THE PUERTO RICAN MIGRATION:
Transition Stage, 1917-1945

In 1917 Puerto Ricans were made United States citizens by act of congress in time for large numbers of islanders to become part of the armed forces. After World War I, many of these veterans who had experienced life in the United States did not return to Puerto Rico, preferring the opportunities of mainland cities to the poverty of the island where the family farm had been rendered virtually extinct by large United States sugar corporations.

Most of these Puerto Rican veterans settled in New York City where merchants, students and anti-Spanish revolutionaries of a previous generation had created a small but articulate Puerto Rican presence in the metropolis. During the latter part of the 1920’s, the veterans were joined by other migrants and their families that had congregated in the tenements of East Harlem looking for jobs in the garment industry and in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Migrants are generally the more ambitious of the native population and leave their homeland with a desire to improve themselves and their families. The Puerto Ricans were no exception to this rule. As their numbers grew, the Puerto Ricans came to equal and eventually surpass numerically the other Hispanics in the population of New York City. A brief glance at statistics demonstrates the concentration of Puerto Ricans in New York City (Table 1) as well as the growing number of immigrants (Table 2).
### TABLE 1

Percentage of the Total Population Born in Puerto Rico and Residing in New York State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>% In NEW YORK CITY</th>
<th>% IN NEW YORK STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

### TABLE 2

Net Migration of Puerto Ricans to the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>ANNUAL AVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-1909</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1919</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1929</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1945</td>
<td>24,129</td>
<td>4,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The initial response of the New York Catholic Dioceses was to open more National Chapels for the increasing numbers of Puerto Ricans. Our Lady of Guadalupe on 14th Street in Manhattan (1902) was joined in 1912 by Our Lady of Esperanza, in 1926 by La Milagrosa, and in 1930 by Holy Agony. Our Lady of Pilar, founded long before 1859, served the Brooklyn population. These chapels were similar to the national parishes of ethnic groups such as the Italians, Germans, and Hungarians, but since the Irish Archbishops of New York had experienced
the frictions and conflicts of other, particularly Italian, national parishes, the Spanish chapels were deliberately kept small. However, the Puerto Ricans did not bring clergy with them, so that the priests of the national chapels were Spaniards, separated from the Puerto Ricans by many cultural differences.

These chapels were to serve as "half-way stations" to provide sacraments to the Spanish-speaking until they could learn enough English to assimilate to local and territorial parishes and enter into full participation of North American Catholic life. Speaking a foreign language was symbolic of being not yet fully Catholic, just as one was not yet fully "American." In effect, this was an imposition upon Puerto Ricans of the general pattern of ethnic assimilation to the Church as had taken place in the large cities of the Northeastern United States in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Thus, the Puerto Ricans -- although citizens -- were treated as foreigners. Moreover, despite the similarity of their religious needs to those of Mexican and other Latin American immigrants, Puerto Ricans were not afforded a missionary status. Instead, they were more or less expected to use the national parish as if it were an extension of Catholicism in their homeland. As has been noted, however, Puerto Rico had neither a native clergy or a tradition of nationalism within Catholicism such as had enabled previous immigrant groups to the Northeast to forge a new North American form of their traditional Catholicism.

Predictably, the pattern of Spanish-speaking national parishes was not successful. The pressures of racism, poverty, and the general disorientation caused by migration inclined Puerto Ricans to become indifferent to Catholic practice in larger numbers than previous non-Hispanic migrations. More telling was the Puerto Rican preferences for the emotional religious feeling generated by a Pentecostal sect.15

In 1939, the new Archbishop of New York, Francis Spellman, turned the parish of St. Cecilia in East Harlem over to the Redemptorist Congregation. It was hoped that these seasoned missionaries to Puerto Rico would provide better pastoral care. This decision by the then Archbishop Spellman represented a radical shift in ecclesiastical policy towards Puerto Rican migrants to the United States. In effect Spellman declared New York "mission territory," and his initiative would later open the door in the 1950's for a large number of Archdiocesan clergy to share in a missionary task towards the Puerto Ricans within New York City.
It must be noted, however, that the Puerto Ricans were not perceived as a national group with political and historical ties to their motherland. Rather, the category of “Spanish-speaking” was used to lump together the disparate Hispanic family of 21 Latin American nations, Spain and Puerto Rico. This linguistic definition was a practical one since in New York -- unlike the Southwest of the United States -- there were many Latin American groups instead of one. However the missionary experiences in Puerto Rico, which were so highly prized by Archbishop Spellman, were inextricably woven with “Americanization.” These characteristics of the Puerto Rican migration to the United States have combined to stamp with uniqueness the history of the Church in its encounter with Puerto Ricans.


4. Father Sherman, son of General Sherman, and chaplain to the American army of occupation in Puerto Rico wrote: “Puerto Rico is a Catholic country without religion whatsoever. The clergy do not seem to have any firm hold on the native people, nor do they have any lively sympathy with the Puerto Ricans or Puerto Rico ... Now that the priests are deprived of government aid, many are leaving the country. The Church was united with the State and so identified with it in the eyes of the people that it must share the odium with which the Spanish rule is commonly regarded ... Religion is dead on the island.” cited in Arthur James, Thirty Years in Porto Rico, 1927, pp. 32-33. This opinion is probably exaggerated , and should not be considered as a global condemnation of the Spanish evangelization on the island. Cf. Antonio Cuesta Mendoza, Historia Eclesiástica del Puerto Rico Colonial, Vol. I: 1508-1700, Colección Arte y Cine: República Dominicana, 1948; and also the various writings of Arturo V. Dávila, official historian for the Archdiocese of San Juan. Cf. Frank T. Reuter, Church and State in the American Dependencies 1898-1904: A Study of Catholic Opinion and the Formation of Colonial Policy, University of Illinois, 1960.

6. "The institution selected to assimilate the Puerto Ricans into American life was the school. The school system introduced by the United States was given a three-fold task. First, it should build into as widespread an institution on the island as possible. Second, it should make the people loyal to the United States and transfer national feeling to the American flag. Third, English should be taught to everybody." Earl U. Antilla, United States' Educational Policy in the Caribbean, University of Texas, 1953, p. 199. Cf. also the letter to the President of the United States from the American Baptist Home Mission Society of New York, Jan. 14, 1901: Bureau of Insular Affairs; Document N.2396, National Archives: "The great additions to the responsibilities of our government in connection with Porto Rico, Hawaii and the Philippine Islands have brought to our door the duty of deciding upon some system of public education by which the people of those islands may be fitted for such civil responsibilities as are required of them by the genius of our form of government."


14. The strict Protestant Commissioner of Education, Martin Brumbaugh attributed this decline in morality directly to the public school instruction in his report for 1900: "The religious sentiment in all peoples, so powerful when aroused for their uplift in any community or state was in the main untaught or perverted." Yet this was viewed as an unfortunate consequence of the liberalizing separation of Church and State. The only moral rules permitted were those against smoking, drinking and dancing -- traceable directly to certain Protestant beliefs. Cf. Negron de Montilla, op. cit. passim. Lopez, op. cit. p. 114, says Commissioners Miller and Huyke recruited teachers for Puerto Rico only from Protestant Church-related schools. He concludes that both "were moved by the desire to secure the best candidates," and disclaims any sectarian prejudice.


PART FOUR

The Protestant Presence
(1845 to the Present)
HISPANIC AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Edwin Sylvest, Jr.

Hispanic American Protestantism is an exceedingly complex and comparatively recent phenomenon. It is a concomitant of the processes that have led to the internal colonization and marginalization of Hispanic Americans. As Hispanic Americans became U.S. citizens, either through conquest or out of economic or political necessity, some also became Protestant. Protestants have immigrated to the United States from Latin America, but they have been relatively few. Even these people owe their Protestant heritage to the growth of Anglo-American hegemony in the western hemisphere.

Given the current state of resources and scholarship, this article will focus on aspects of the development of Hispanic American Protestantism in the American Southwest, although there are Hispanic Americans resident in every state of the Union.

A focus on the Southwest effectively leaves out of consideration the important Puerto Rican and Cuban communities, and does no justice to the large Mexican American communities in such cities as Chicago, Gary, Indiana, and Detroit. Historical investigation of the Protestant churches in these groups is a desperately felt need.

The study is also narrowly conceived in terms of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist traditions as representative of Hispanic American Protestantism. Even those groups are not studied in detail but selectively in order to show patterns of development. Pentecostalism, especially, is an important tradition among Hispanic American Protestants. A thoroughly comprehensive study would need to develop and utilize the
sources necessary adequately to interpret the significance of Pentecostalism as a Christian force in the Hispanic American community.

Given these limitations, the study will show the development of Hispanic American Protestantism as a movement from oppression and dependence toward liberation and self-determination. As with any life process, there is no clear delineation of growth stages, nor is there every any point that is unambiguously either dependent or free; hence the schema will be somewhat artificial.

IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

Although not always articulated as a formal principle of social organization or governance, it is remarkable how often the terms of the Peace of Augsburg of 1555 seem to function as the basis of social interaction through the institutions of formal religion. In the succeeding waves of conquest and colonization that brought to the Americas a complex blend of populations and institutions, the principle of *cujus regio, ejus religio* has served both officially and when not officially, actually, to order the religious life of the society.* It is regrettably true that Christianity in whatever form it is manifest in the Americas is here as the consequence of the conquest and oppression of antecedent populations. It remains the case, even in the pluralistically conscious epoch of the 1980s, that those regions of the New World first conquered by the Catholic monarchs of the Iberian Peninsula and of France have an essentially Roman Catholic ethos, and that those areas originally occupied by Protestant Europeans retain a fundamentally Protestant orientation.

The close linkage between religion and culture is not surprising, but the very obviousness of that religion frequently contributes to the failure to take it into account when studying religion as a historical phenomenon. Religion is so crucially important as a focus of cultural identity that it almost always becomes a critical issue when differing cultures come into contact, through whatever circumstances. Even in the absence of avowed missionary intent, religious conflict is inescapable in the process of acculturation, which is the inevitable concomitant of cross-cultural interaction.

Whether or not there was any intentional effort to Christianize indigenous peoples in the Americas, as Europeans and native Americans interacted, the religious and value traditions of each group would necessarily have come into
conflict, and both would have been subject to certain degrees of change. Some indigenous persons would have become Christian; some Christians could conceivably have adopted indigenous religious values and practices. Of course, it was the case that proclamation of the Christian gospel and the extension of the Christian church were offered by the Catholic monarchs of Spain as a major justification for their presence in the New World. What might have occurred to some extent by accident was expedited as a matter of intentional policy.

While some would argue that the evangelization of the Americas under the aegis of the Spanish and Portuguese crowns was not complete, or was deficient, it is nonetheless true that rare, indeed, is the Latin American indigenous culture not influenced in some significant way by the belief and practice of Iberian Catholicism.

Just as Roman Catholic Christianity, however sensitive and loving it might be in its ministry, is a sign of Iberian imperialism and conquest in Latin America, so is Protestant Christianity, wherever it exists in the New World, a sign of the imperial power, either economic or political, of some European Protestant community.

Whether or not Protestant Christians were advocates of United States imperialism in the Americas, it is simply a fact that Protestant ministry and mission to Hispanic Americans within the present limits of the United States has followed the growth of United States political and economic interests on this continent and beyond. Such an assertion rests upon the assumption that Protestant Christianity was somehow intrinsically related to United States society. That just such a relationship did obtain, and perhaps still does, though constitutionally forbidden in the institutional sense, must necessarily be acknowledged in serious critical reflection upon the history of Hispanic American Protestantism in the United States.

The importance of Manifest Destiny and Know-Nothing ideology as factors in defining the milieu of the first important contacts between United States Protestants and Mexicans, later also Cubans and Puerto Ricans, requires a summary statement of their basic features.

MANIFEST DESTINY

While it might be too much to claim that territorial expansion by the United States was altogether motivated by a
sense of Manifest Destiny, the ideology of such a divinely appointed end was an important element in the ethos of the nineteenth century. It was articulated most powerfully by those who had designs on Mexican and Spanish territory especially. Manifest Destiny was certainly not a "Protestant" doctrine, but it was religious in overtone. In some respects it fed the interests of those who advocated the principles of nativism and anti-Catholicism in United States politics. The combination of these elements resulted in a kind of anti-Catholic, anti-Mexican attitude, which by some might be called pejoratively "Protestant."

To be sure, Protestant Christianity gave impetus to the conquest and colonization of the "Promised Land," the North American continent. Not unlike the Spaniards to the south, seventeenth-century Protestant colonists of Virginia employed the rationale of evangelization of native Americans as a justification for conquest:

"If the Indians could not be converted 'apostolically, without the helpe of man,' they would have to be approached 'imperialle, [as] when a Prince, hath conquered their bodies, that the Preachers may feede their souls.' The English would marchandize and trade the natives 'pearles of earth' for the 'pearles of heaven.'"¹

Especially after the evangelical awakenings of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries United States Protestants came to regard themselves as instruments of Divine Providence for the conversion of people and the extension of the benefits of "Christian civilization." God has chosen American Protestants for the creation of the "true, Protestant, scriptural' paradise on earth."² It was their conviction that "the evangelical character of our land is to tell upon the plans and destinies of other nations."³

Nothing less than the conversion of the world was the mission of the North American Protestant empire. That process entailed simultaneously expansion to fill and to evangelize the geographical space of the continent and the support of an extensive foreign missionary enterprise.

Not all Protestant groups supported the missionary enterprise. Some were supportive as much for the beneficial effect on the home churches of prompting missionary effort as for the actual conversion of those who were the object of mission. There were even those who transformed the mission from an ecclesiastical enterprise into a secular effort to extend
the benefits of the American system to others. Herman Melville would say, "We Americans are the peculiar, chosen people -- the Israel of our time; we bear the ark of the liberties of the world."\(^4\)

To the extent that the Protestant heritage has been characteristic of the religious ethos of the United States in its first two centuries of growth, it might be said that Manifest Destiny expressed the ideological rationale of the Protestant empire. However, it might be more accurate to observe that Manifest Destiny is more nearly a doctrine of United States civil religion, as Melville's statement suggests.

The term "Manifest Destiny" was not used in any widely recognized sense until 1845. John L. O'Sullivan, editor of the Democratic Review and the New York Morning News, explicitly employed the concept to justify the annexation of Texas and as warrant for the United States claim to Oregon.\(^5\) In each case territorial expansion was rationalized either as "our manifest destiny to overspread and possess the whole of the continent which Providence has given us for the development of the great experiment of liberty and federative self government entrusted to us,"\(^6\) or as "our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions."\(^7\)

In both instances O'Sullivan expressed the providential aim of U.S. destiny as a secular, human good intended for the well-being of its Anglo-American citizens.

But it was not only for the benefit of its citizens that the nation's boundaries were destined to encompass the continent; there were those who argued that the United States should expand in order to become a refuge for the oppressed of Europe.\(^8\) Congressman Belser of Alabama exhorted:

"Long may our country prove itself the asylum of the oppressed. Let its institutions and its people be extended far and wide, and when the waters of despotism shall have inundated other nations of the globe, and the votary of liberty shall betake himself to his ark, let this government be the Ararat on which it shall rest."\(^9\)

Some even asserted that the entire Western Hemisphere was destined to be "an asylum for the oppressed."

Up until the time of the United States' war with Mexico, it had been assumed that territorial expansion would occur gradually as Anglo-Saxon peoples spread through the "vacant"
lands of the continent and established political entities which, upon petition, could be annexed to the United States. The process by which Texas came into the Union was the model. (The fact that Texas was itself the product of violent rebellion did not become an issue of this point). The war with Mexico presented a challenge to the ideology of expansion by the voluntary association of Anglo-Saxons. It became necessary to develop a rationale for expansion by conquest and for the possible assimilation of a non-English speaking population that came, not by choice, but as inhabitants of conquered territories.

To accommodate to the need for a new rationale, Manifest Destiny came not only to express the obligation to extend the area of freedom in the New World but also to represent election for the task of regenerating the backward and deprived people of Mexico.

That Anglo-Saxon peoples should eventually populate the whole of the Western Hemisphere, north and south, had been an article of belief for Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was their conviction, however, that the process would be slow and nonviolent, i.e., not the result of military conquest. Colonialism as an intentional policy of government was antithetical to the traditions of the young nation. Jefferson envisioned the new republic, which itself would never extend territorially farther than the Rio Grande and the Rocky Mountains, as a “nest” from which the Americas would be eventually populated by Anglo-Saxons governing themselves in independent democratic republics.11

In a letter revelatory of the racist convictions that, in part, were formative of Jefferson’s thought, he expressed the opinion to James Monroe that none of the territory of either American continent would serve as a place for the relocation of freed Negroes:

“However our present interests may restrain us within our limits, it is impossible not to look forward to distant times when our rapid multiplication will expand itself beyond those limits, and cover the whole northern, if not the southern continent, with a people speaking the same language, governed in similar forms, and by similar laws; nor can we contemplate with satisfaction either blot or mixture on that surface.”12

The purchase of Louisiana had already raised anxieties concerning the ability of the nation to assimilate the “Gallo-Hispano-Indian omnium gatherum of savages and adventurers”
in the West. But the relatively sparse population of the territory and the success in incorporating it into the Union had, by mid-century, somewhat allayed, if not eradicated, such fears. Mexico, however, with a large stable mestizo population of “lessers breeds” presented a more serious challenge.

John C. Calhoun’s opposition to total conquest and incorporation of Mexico was based on less that noble ideals. He argued that never had it been envisioned that any but the “free white race” should be incorporated into “our Union.”

“The greatest misfortunes of Spanish America are to be traced to the fatal error of placing these colored races on an equality with the white race. That error destroyed the social arrangement which formed the basis of society... Are you willing that your States should be governed by... a population of about only one million of your blood, and two or three millions of mixed blood better informed... all the rest pure Indians, a mixed blood equally ignorant and unfit for liberty, impure races, not as good as the Cherokees or Choctaws?... None but people advanced to a very high state of moral and intellectual improvement are capable, in a civilized state, of maintaining free government.”

The notion that the United States was destined for the regeneration of backward peoples offered an ideological adaptation that served for some to ameliorate the traditional racism and and antipathy toward wars of conquest. Many in the United States believed President James K. Polk’s assertion that the war had been thrust on the nation by Mexican aggression. Given that circumstance, it became the obligation of the United States to make the best of the situation and to recognize that Providence is capable of using bad circumstances to produce good results. Extension of the interests and ideals of the United States into the conquered Mexican territories would in the end have a salutary effect.

The influential press that articulated the doctrine of Manifest Destiny challenged the nation to “grapple manfully with the evil” of annexation, undertaking not only to develop the resources gained, but to “regenerate the natives.” A letter published in the Washington Daily Union referred to the war as “the religious execution of our country’s glorious mission, under the direction of Divine Providence, to civilize and Christianize, and raise up from anarchy and degradation a most ignorant, indolent, wicked and unhappy people.”
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It was but a relatively short step from such rationalization concerning the nation's destiny in the war with Mexico to the justification offered for the unabashedly imperialistic designs of the United States in the 1890's. With the blessing of the Protestant religious establishment and of some Roman Catholic clergy, Methodist William McKinley paced the floor of the White House and on his knees "prayed Almighty God for light and guidance." One night the response came:

"There was nothing left for us to do but take them all and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and Christianize them, as our fellowmen for whom Christ also died."18

The obligation to regenerate backward people had become the White Man's burden. United States colonial conquest was justified on religious and humanitarian grounds. It was, of course, only coincidental that economic opportunity should attend the task of uplifting benighted peoples. As in mid-century, imperial expansion rested upon the foundation of racist paternalism and economic advantage.

Though the Harvard historian Frederick Merk in his *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History* would distinguish between the doctrines of Manifest Destiny and the insular imperialism of the 1890's, it cannot be said that the evolution of imperialist warrants seems to be a direct outgrowth of the rationale for United States' continental expansionism.

Manifest Destiny was indeed a critical element in the cultural ethos of the first Protestant efforts to minister among Hispanic Americans; for those efforts were coincident with the movement of Anglo-Americans into Texas. They became ever stronger and more urgent as the Lone Star Republic and the formerly Mexican territories of the United States Southwest became linked to the Union. In the religious sense it became the task of Protestant churches to undertake the mission of regeneration that had become the national obligation.

"Prosperity and happiness would be found wherever one introduced the more intellectual influences of American life -- 'the Schoolmaster, the minister of the gospel, and a free press.' The Protestant minister of the gospel, formerly excluded by religious oppression, appeared ... essential to the Mexican's eternal as well as mundane happiness."19

It should be noted that the assignment of Bishop Jean
Baptiste Lamy of France to the Diocese of Santa Fe was a Roman Catholic response to the same obligation.

Regeneration of the conquered peoples was a task for the religious community of the United States. But for many, during the epoch in which the trans-Mississippi West was being settled by Anglo-Americans, there was serious question as to whether Roman Catholics might be regarded as fully “American,” Lamy notwithstanding. Many would argue that Roman Catholics had no role whatsoever to play in the regeneration and assimilation of the conquered Mexicans. Indeed, there were nativists who believed the acquisition of Catholic-populated territory was itself a part of a plot to surround the United States in order to make it susceptible to “papal subjugation.”

**NATIVISM**

Although nativism did not become an organized political force until the middle of the nineteenth century, the roots of anti-Catholic sentiment were deep, and had grown for two centuries in the formerly English colonies. The Puritans in Massachusetts and the Anglicans in Virginia came to America from an England but recently in the throes of the Reformation and its attendant intrigues, domestic and international. Both groups were staunchly opposed to the pope and the Roman Catholic church. Having been subjected to anti-papal propaganda and a legal system that discriminated against Roman Catholics, the colonists not surprisingly manifested the desire to eliminate the supposed threat of papal rule from the beginning. Even Maryland, despite its deep associations with the Roman Catholic church in the United States, was especially hostile to Catholics in the early colonial period. “Only in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania were Catholics safe from persecution,... and “so general was anti-Catholic sentiment in American that by 1700 a Catholic could enjoy full civil and religious rights only in Rhode Island...”

Conflict along the frontier with French Canada and Spanish Florida exacerbated the inherited bigotry of the English colonists. “Every Catholic within the Colonies was looked upon as a potential enemy who might let his papal allegiance supersede his loyalty to the [English] crown by cooperating [with the rival armies] against the settlers.”

So firmly based was the spirit of anti-Catholicism that it survived even the alliance with Catholic France in the Revolution and the toleration of the framers of the Constitution,
who, through the First Amendment, prevented Congress from making any "law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The election of Jefferson to the presidency tended to quiet nativistic emotions. However, prejudice lay just below the surface of early republican life, needing only external stimulus to revive its passions.

The stimulus was not long in coming. With the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, Europeans who had been employed in wartime production were left without jobs. The mechanization of British industry further sweled the ranks of the unemployed. In Ireland the situation became especially critical. As a means of relieving the pressures of surplus population, the European states, particularly Britain and Germany, made it possible for their people to migrate to the United States.

Actually, Britain was reluctant to strengthen the population of its recent enemy so it sent its Irish emigrees to Canada. Most eventually found their way into the United States.

Most immigrants exhausted their meager resource in getting to the United States; hence they became a heavy drain on the public institutions and resources of the Eastern ports of entry. New York City alone in 1837 was spending $279,999 for the support of the poor, three-fifths of whom were foreign-born. In the same year more than half the 105,000 persons in the United States receiving assistance of paupers were immigrants, and the annual bill for their maintenance was in excess of $4 million. The problem was further complicated by the deliberate effort of some European cities to shift the burden of caring for their poor by sending them to the United States. In some German cities organizations existed for the purpose of arranging the transport of minor criminals to this country.

The economic burden notwithstanding, resentment of immigrants was occasioned not by the fact that they were paupers or criminals, but fundamentally because they were Roman Catholics. Old fears of Roman designs for domination of the United States were revived. Succeeding waves of immigration and the corresponding growth of the Roman Catholic church served to increase the suspicion and fear of many, gave rise to sensationalist propaganda, and resulted in the formation in the early '50s of the Know-Nothing, or American party. The basic agenda of that party was to oppose foreign and Catholic immigration and to save the Republic from Roman domination.
General confusion in the American political-party structure in the 1850s gave some advantage to the Know-Nothing movement, and made it possible for the party to have some degree of electoral success in the elections of 1854 and 1855. That success was short-lived, however, and produced no legislation carrying into effect any of the anti-Catholic, anti-foreign program of the party. The American party nominated Millard Fillmore as its candidate in the 1856 presidential election. Though he received 25 percent of the popular vote, Fillmore gained only the electoral votes of Maryland.26

Anti-Catholic, anti-foreign sentiment was the unifying bond in the Know-Nothing movement, but deeply felt as those passions were they were not strong enough to survive the cleavage experienced in every United States institution of the period, the controversy over slavery.27 Thus Fillmore's defeat and the increasingly rancorous debate that led the nation into civil war saw the demise of organized nativism.

Nativism is worthy of note as an element in the ethos of the nineteenth century, not because of its institutional success but because of the insight it provides into the mind of the Protestant majority of the United States population of the period. Evidence does not permit the claim that most Protestants were as prejudiced against Roman Catholics and foreigners as were the leading spokespersons of the Know-Nothing movement, but it does present a picture of widespread suspicion and distrust of Roman Catholics and reflects the fear and rejection of non-Anglo-Saxon, non-native Americans, i.e., non-U.S. born, also apparent in the notion of manifest destiny.

These two ideological currents — seen alongside the institution of slavery, however controversial it might have become — present the spectacle of a nation essentially Protestant and Anglo-Saxon in religious and cultural provenance. It was a nation that expressed the noblest of human ideals, but with the reservation that none but white Anglo-Saxon Protestants were really capable of their realization or worthy of their enjoyment. Proclaiming the "inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" for all, the United States expanded its territory at the cost of the life, liberty, and oppression of many native Americans and Mexicans, not to mention the blacks, whom it dehumanized and destroyed as chattel.

Through missionaries of the Protestant religious establishment of such a nation, Hispanic Americans were
offered a ministry and invited to identify with Protestant churches. In just over a century somewhat more than 150,000 of the 10 to 12 million Hispanic Americans in the United States have become Protestant.

The historian wonders how and why even such a statistically unimportant number of persons should have become part of the religious establishment of the oppressors of their people. Even though it might be possible to account for this phenomenon on the basis of the natural process of acculturation alluded to earlier, it is nonetheless a process whose dynamics are worthy of critical study and reflection. Such study is further warranted for the church historian who affirms that God and human persons work together in history for human liberation and fulfillment.

A CONQUERED PEOPLE:
THE PROTESTANT RESPONSE (1821-98)
TEXAS (1821-45)

Texas was the locus of initial contact between Protestant Christianity and Hispanic culture within the present limits of the United States. Anglo settlers began making their way into the frontier province of Texas and Coahuila in the waning years of the second decade of the nineteenth century. Indeed the first Protestant sermon preached on the Spanish side of the Red River was delivered by Methodist Henry Stephenson in 1818.28 That sermon, and most of its immediate successors, was preached to Anglo settlers in territory along the boundary with Louisiana. By 1821 Mexico had become an independent nation. The Mexican government found it in its interest to encourage colonization in Texas and Coahuila. Stephen F. Austin and his colony at San Felipe were among the first Anglos to benefit from the Mexican immigration policy.

Although Anglo colonists were required officially to become Roman Catholic, Protestant practice was actually tolerated, and in some instances encouraged, by Mexican officials:

"The emigrants to Texas under the colonization system did not fall into the Roman Catholic mode of worship. That they had faith, their works abundantly attest; but theirs was the Protestant
form of worship, and they saw nothing among their new neigh-
bors to induce them to abandon the religion of their fathers. It
is true that the law of their immigration required them to pro-
fess the Catholic faith; but they winked at this law and tacitly
disclaimed papal jurisdiction. Nor did the Mexican rulers at-
temt to force it on their consciences. It is due to truth to say
that, among all their grievances, they had little complaint to
make on the score of religious intolerance ... The Protestants
were not persecuted in Texas.”

Protestant missionaries took advantage of the tolerant
situation to travel freely about the state, preaching to the
burgeoning Anglo population. By 1833 Baptists, Methodists, and
Cumberland Presbyterians had established congregations and
erected church buildings. Perhaps it was only prudent that the
state of Coahuila and Texas should have provided in the Land
Law of 26 March, 1834 that “no person shall be molested for
political and religious opinions, provided he shall not disturb the
public order.” The way was legally open for the practice of
Protestant Christianity.

The principal interest of Protestant missions in Texas was for
the nurture of Anglo settlers. Clearly the first efforts to provide a
Protestant ministry to Mexicans in the region were coincidental
to the task of serving the needs of colonists who were at least
cultural Protestants.

Summer Bacon, a Cumberland Presbyterian minister, came
to Texas in 1829 to care for Anglos, but he soon became alert to
the needs of Mexicans who lacked consistent attention from the
Roman Catholic church. Following the pattern that became
normative for much of beginning Protestant work among the
Mexicans, Bacon sought, and in 1833 was granted, a commission
as colporteur for the American Bible Society. With that support
he worked until his death in 1844 to supply the Scriptures to a
Spanish-speaking population that he discovered to be more
literate than was generally supposed. Indeed, Bacon discovered
that the Mexicans were interested enough in reading the Bible
that those who could willingly paid for the book. 31

David Ayers, a Methodist layperson and contemporary of
Sumner Bacon, discovered similar interest on the part of
Mexicans in receiving the Bible. He also discovered that the 1834
law regarding the liberty of religious and political opinion
notwithstanding, some Roman Catholic priests were seriously
opposed to the distribution of the Scriptures.
In a letter reflecting the dangers and difficulties of travel at the time, Ayers described how he and his family were shipwrecked near San Patricio in the summer of 1834. Among the things salvaged from the wreck was a box of Bibles:

"In San Patricio I procured a small cabin for my family; this was made of poles drove in the ground, and covered with grass, without a floor. We were thankful for the shelter. This settlement was composed of Mexicans and Irish Roman Catholics — all, or nearly all, were very ignorant. Having some testimonials from several Catholic clergymen in New York... I called on the priest and presented them. These testimonials procured us a very hospitable reception, and we soon were supplied with all the comforts the place afforded. The priest called at our cabin and expressed a desire to inspect my library, which the rabble had not thought worth carrying off. A Spanish Testament attracted his attention; he examined it, and pronounced it a correct edition, and expressed a desire to possess it. I immediately presented it to him, and he appeared pleased with the present. Father Malloy was our constant visitor, and his example was followed by the inhabitants, including the officers of the garrison. My library was the chief attraction to our visitors, and I took care to have two copies of the Spanish Testament always in a conspicuous place. These they all were sure to see, and invariably they would be sure to express a desire to procure a copy, and then I would avail myself of the opportunity to present it to them — at the same time informing them that Father Malloy had examined it, and pronounced it a genuine translation. In this way nearly all the intelligent part of the inhabitants procured Spanish Testaments. My supply was nearly exhausted, when one day the priest came to my cabin in a rage, and demanded of me how I dared to circulate that damnable book among his flock. He threatened me with imprisonment, and said he would burn my books and confiscate the little property I had remaining. (He actually did seize on a quantity of tracts which, by order of the alcalde, were publicly burned in the public square.) I reminded the priest that he had pronounced the translation a good one, and that I supposed he wished his people to read the word of God. He left, denouncing me in the severest manner. In a few minutes I was called on by the alcalde, who informed me that I had committed a great offense. He threatened me, etc. I showed him my passport as an American citizen, and claimed my protection as an American. I afterwards learned that the priest went around, and demanded all the Testaments he could find. I
was much gratified that he could not procure all. Some from whom the priest had taken their Testaments away came and requested another copy, promising to conceal it from the priest. I concealed the box of Bibles under my bed. The priest soon made the place too hot for me; and I was constantly annoyed with vexatious lawsuits before the alcalde, which always went against me — and in this way my resources were nearly exhausted."

Recognizing that it would be difficult to remain in San Patricio, Ayers gathered up his family and the remaining Bibles and moved on "east" supplying "every family that I found destitute with a Bible." Nine years later, in 1843, David Ayers was actively engaged as a Methodist lay leader at Centre Hill in the Republic of Texas.

The Republic of Texas! Despite efforts of both the Anglo and Mexican leadership, relations between the colonists and the Mexican government became increasingly abrasive. The result was a two-year period of open hostility in which Texans revolted against the central government of Mexico. Goliad and the Alamo became symbols of Texas "courage" and Mexican "perfidy and cruelty," — stereotypes that prevail even today. With the victory of Houston's army at San Jacinto in April 1836, a new order was established. Although there were Mexicans who espoused the Texas cause, it was the Anglos who prevailed in the formation of the new republic. Mexicans became increasingly marginalized and alienated in their own land.

War was disruptive. Bacon and Ayers distributed their Bibles, but no real Protestant community had yet emerged among the Mexicans. Nothing was done to forward the work until after the authority of the new government had been established.

Protestant churches showed increased interest in missionary activity in Texas as the Republic was established. In April 1836, the very month of the San Jacinto victory, Methodist bishops and the Board of Missions determined to pursue a vigorous ministry in the new nation. That ministry, however, was intended primarily for Anglo Texans.

Even efforts at ministry directed toward Mexicans in Texas were undertaken in anticipation of a missionary advance into Mexico. On behalf of the Old School Presbyterian Synod of Mississippi, William C. Blair in 1838 made a survey of mission possibilities in Texas. He became excited about the prospect of
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ministry among the Mexicans and returned to Mississippi with the intention of learning Spanish so that he might undertake "the enlightening of the Semi-Heathen, Semi-Catholic people who use the Spanish language in Mexico."

In 1830 Blair was commissioned as a missionary to Texas "with special reference to Popery in Mexico." He was the first person formally designated by a Protestant denomination for work among Mexicans in Texas. Serious about the Texas mission, Blair nonetheless saw it as a way station not only to Mexico but also to all of South America. With rhetoric reminiscent of Jeffersonian dreams for the hemisphere he maintained:

"Although this mission is for the present located in Texas, it is properly a mission to Mexico. The day is not distant when the intolerance of popery will no longer be able to retain in seclusion and darkness the millions of Mexico and South America. As well may the attempt be made to stem the current of the Mississippi as to arrest in our hemisphere the progress of civil and religious liberty which already, by the independence of Texas, has reached the borders of Mexico."35

Yet another of Blair’s strategems, the foundation of a college for the purpose of training Mexican youth for mission in their own land, was a short-lived effort. Aranama College opened in Goliad as a prep school in 1852. It was chartered as a college by the Texas legislature in 1854, but by 1870 the project was abandoned.

William Blair died in 1873, still convinced that Texas must assume the burden of extending Protestant missions into Mexico. Both the college concept and the notion of the importance of Texas for the conversion of Mexico were to survive for years to come as features of Protestant missionary efforts among Mexican Americans.

Brief analysis of initial contact with Mexicans in Texas reveals several interesting facts about Protestant missionary objectives and methods.

1. The first Protestant missionaries in Texas showed little or no interest in the Mexican population. Most serious effort and resources were directed toward care and organization of Anglo churches and denominational structures.

2. When concern was shown for ministry to Mexicans, it was frequently viewed as an expedient strategem in support of the objective of "evangelizing" Mexico and the southern continent.
3. The school emerged as an instrument of mission just after the war with Mexico and was less a response to the needs of the Spanish-speaking population of Texas than an effort precisely to extend the mission south of the Rio Bravo.

4. Distribution of the Bible in Spanish offered the most effective contact with Mexicans. Indeed, response to the colporteurs suggests that a major need perceived by the Mexicans themselves was that of access to the Scriptures in the vernacular.

In the contact period itself a somewhat unconscious marginalization of Mexicans through the churches' very ministry to them is clearly evident. A people already victimized by changing political and economic relations suffered the further insult of being, for the most part, only of secondary importance to the religious establishment of the Anglo settlers. The lack of comprehensive and systematic planning for ministry among Mexicans must be seen, not as a function of respect and concern for a more adequate Roman Catholic ministry (which was badly needed), but as an expression of the insidious racism and sense of cultural superiority that were unfortunate characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon Protestant ethos of the United States.

THE NEW SOUTHWEST (1846-69)

Annexation of Texas to the Union in 1845 exacerbated United States-Mexican relations and led to the provocative movement of United States troops into the disputed Nueces strip. Mexico's response to that action was used by President James K. Polk as a warrant for invading the southern neighbor and exacting half its territory as indemnity for the costs of war. Mexicans who did not exercise the options of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to declare their Mexican citizenship or to "remove" to the Mexican Republic became ipso facto United States citizens — Mexican Americans! With the important exception of native Americans, the United States acquired its first citizens and territory by direct military conquest.

The disruption of war brought a pause to the extension of missionary activity in Texas, but, once settled, the conflict opened the way for new missions in New Mexico and California especially.
Reduplicating the pattern of Texas almost exactly, the first Protestant ministry in California was to Anglo families. Adna Hecox, a licensed Methodist exhorter, preached a funeral sermon in Santa Clara on 1 October 1846. In November of the same year the first Protestant church in California was organized in Santa Clara.36

New Mexico received its first Protestant missionaries in the years 1849-50. Hiram W. Read established the first Baptist work in Santa Fe, even erecting a small adobe building in 1849. Methodist E. G. Nicholson and Presbyterian William J. Kephart, the latter working as a journalist, came to Santa Fe in 1850.37 Once again, however, the primary interest seems to have been in providing a ministry to Anglo inhabitants of the newly acquired territory. Indeed, the corresponding secretary of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal church said in his 1855 report that “Rev. E. G. Nicholson was sent expressly to the population speaking the English language.”38

As the war opened new areas to Protestant mission in the United States, so did it afford new opportunities in Mexico that led to important activity in Texas.

Spurred by nativistic anxiety that the legions of the papacy were intent on establishing a base on the western frontier from which to encircle the United States, calls were made for Protestant missionary teachers to work in the Mississippi Valley. A young New England woman, Melinda Rankin, set out in response to the challenge.

Teaching in Natchez in 1846, Rankin heard returning soldiers speak of the “moral destitution” of a people whose land had never been penetrated by “pure Christianity.” Her “sympathies became enlisted in behalf of these long-suffering and neglected people” who had been “ground down under the most despotic bondage:”

“Our country had conquered them [the Mexicans] and subjugated them to its own terms; and was there nothing more demanded for this bleeding, riven, and desolated country? Were there no hearts to commiserate the helpless condition of these perishing millions of souls under the iron heel of papal power, with all its soul destroying influences? I could not avoid the impression that an important duty devolved upon Evangelical Christendom to try and do something for the moral elevation of this people who had so long been “sitting in the region and
shadow of death." Indeed, I felt that the honor of American Christianity most imperatively demanded that some effort should immediately be made."

With such motivation, and through great determination and perseverance, Melinda Rankin finally made her way to Brownsville, Texas, among the Texas Mexicans since it was not possible to minister as a Protestant in Mexico. Beginning with five-young girls as students, Rankin opened a school that was to become in 1845 the Presbyterian-supported Rio Grande Female Institute.

The school grew and was chartered by the state of Texas in 1851 under the trusteeship of the Western Texas Presbytery. Ironically, in the same year Rankin moved to Matamoros, Mexico, in pursuit of her long-held dream to be a missionary to Mexico. Her move was made possible by the Reforma, which liberalized the Mexican Constitution and gave legal sanction to Protestant Christianity in that republic.

The Rio Grande Female Institute faltered. With that event ended an epoch of Presbyterian ministry to Mexican Americans in Texas. The work seems to have been a stimulus to the Roman Catholic church. Rankin’s school had been in operation only a short while when the Order of Mary Immaculate arrived from France to establish a school and convent in Brownsville. Protestant mission had become the occasion for a serious effort on the part of Roman Catholics to give more care to their Mexican brothers and sisters. Tragically that care was offered by foreign clergy whose cultural traditions were not those of Mexico, or even of the new regime, the United States. Even that church, which was ostensibly the bearer of the religious tradition of the Mexican Texans, became an instrument of alienation.

Another aspect of the work undertaken by Melinda Rankin was the distribution of Bibles. As had been the case with Bacon and Ayers in the previous decade, there was much interest in receiving the Scriptures in the vernacular. Indeed, Rankin learned that many of the Bibles she gave out were carried across the river where she "doubted not but it would ultimately be seen that, by them, essential damage had been received in this kingdom of darkness where Satan had so long reigned with undisputed sway."42

The Bible was indeed an essential element in Protestant missionary activity. Many Mexican Americans, poorly attended by the Roman Catholic church and more literate than commonly
believed, were eager to receive and to read the book. Earlier
distribution of the Scriptures frequently opened the way for
preaching and church organization by those who came later. At
times the Bible itself was the instrument of conversion. Thomas
Harwood records just such a development.

E. G. Nicholson had been appointed missionary to New
Mexico in 1850 by the Methodist Episcopal church, the first of
that denomination. After a year or so of ministry to the Anglo
community in Santa Fe, Nicholson was forced by his wife's poor
health to go back East. Returning in 1853 as superintendent of
the New Mexico Mission, he was given the responsibility of
extending the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal church to the
Spanish-speaking populace. On a visit to Peralta, Nicholson
spent some time with the family of Don Ambrosio Gonzales.
Gonzales, who was given a Bible by the missionary, later
commented:

"Brother Nicholson, the Methodist minister, came down
from Santa Fe and spent a few days at my house, and gave me this
Bible. It was the first Bible of any kind I had ever seen. I think it
was in 1853. The book was a charm to me. When the rest retired, I
sat up and read the good book. I read nearly the whole book of
Genesis. I then turned to the New Testament and read several
chapters in Saint John. One chapter was the fourteenth — "Let
not your heart be troubled, etc." — It was to me a new book. I
read until the chickens were crowing for day. I laid down on a
lounge in the same room and soon fell asleep. When I woke the
sun was shining through the window into my face. The Sun of
Righteousness was shining brightly in my soul. I have been a
Christian and a Protestant ever since." 43

Ambrosio Gonzales became the first Protestant Mexican in
New Mexico. The visit by Nicholson was the "starting point
of Protestant work in Peralta if not in the entire territory." 44 Gon-
zales was appointed Methodist class leader in Peralta in 1855, and
functioned in that capacity without the assistance of any trained
clergy until 1871 when Thomas Harwood reorganized the class.
During that period the Methodist class in Peralta had grown to
include forty-two members — treble the number of adherents
sixteen years earlier.

Such stories of the significance of the Bible in Protestant
mission are numerous, some even have about them a
providential aura. A certain traveler discovered a Spanish Bible
in the road a short way from Las Vegas, New Mexico. Not being
interested in the book himself, the finder traded it with Albino
Madrid for a Spanish spelling book. Madrid read the Bible, and
began to question his Catholic tradition. His dissatisfaction with
Roman Catholicism was further reinforced through reading
some Spanish-language evangelistic tracts. He became a
Protestant. Madrid’s conversion was not only a private event.
Among others of the family who converted was a nephew,
Manuel, who eventually became a leader in New Mexico
Presbyterian missionary activity.45

Slowly Protestantism deepened its roots in the Hispanic
American community. Indigenous leadership began to emerge.
Ambrosio Gonzales exemplifies the strong lay leadership upon
which Protestant groups depended. In 1853 Benigno Cardenas
became the first Hispanic American preacher in the Methodist
church, indeed in any Protestant church. Cardenas had been a
priest in the trouble-racked Apostolic Vicariate of Santa Fe.46

Jean Baptiste Lamy arrived in Santa Fe in August 1851. As
vicar apostolic, he had the task of bringing order and discipline
into the Roman Catholic church, which had long functioned in
isolation from its distant see of Durango. With United States
occupation came the necessity to align ecclesiastical jurisdiction
in accordance with new political realities.

The church, which, however inadequately, had been the
focus of the people’s religious life and identity, became a foreign
church. A French bishop was given the task of integrating the
institution and its members into the society of the conquering
power! Priests and people long accustomed to virtual autonomy
were required to submit to unwelcome authority. Notwithstanding the appropriateness of certain of Lamy’s efforts
to order church practice, widespread hostility and reaction were
manifest among the clergy. Although the grounds of his protest
are not clear, Benigno Cardenas was one of the priests who
rejected the Roman church and its authority.

During the year of E. G. Nicholson’s first service as Methodist
missionary in New Mexico, 1850-51, he became acquainted with
Cardenas who “expressed dissatisfaction with the Roman
Catholic Church and with the Bishop. But Brother Nicholson
fearing it might be a matter of a personal quarrel . . . gave it no
encouragement.”47

Cardenas’s feelings were deeply held. He journeyed to
Rome to seek relief, but left apparently without satisfaction.
Passing through London, his ecclesiastical faculties intact, the
priest visited a certain Rev. Mr. Rule, a British Methodist
missionary returned from Spain. Rule took Cardenas into his household, and for a period of ten weeks "carefully observed him and instructed him in evangelical doctrines." Upon his departure for New York, Cardenas received from Rule letters of introduction to the Methodist Episcopal Mission Board.

In New York the staff of the board received the priest and introduced him to certain Methodist Episcopal bishops. At the 1853 session of the New York Annual Conference, Bishop Beverly Waugh, in consultation with Nicholson and Bishops Edmund S. Janes and Matthew Simpson, decided to renew the New Mexico mission and to extend its ministry to the Spanish population in the territory. Nicholson, designated superintendent of the mission, was authorized to take along Cardenas and Walter Hansen, who had worked as a missioner among Swedes in New York but who spoke Spanish and wanted to go to New Mexico.

The conditions placed upon Benigno Cardenas's acceptance as a Methodist missionary reveal the hesitancy of the church in using the services of a dissident priest and led to one of the most dramatic events in the creation of Hispanic-American Protestantism. Chief among the provisions were that Cardenas "should apply publicly to the Mission for admission and service and [that] his spirit and service [be] satisfactory to Brother Nicholson.”

On 10 November 1853 the trio arrived in Santa Fe with plans for Cardenas to preach in the plaza and to make his public declaration and appeal for admission to the Methodist ministry. Printed notices were posted, but soon torn down. Bishop Lamy denounced Cardenas from the pulpit and threatened with excommunication anyone who might listen to his words. No such sanction was enjoined against listening to the preaching of Hansen or Nicholson. They were not apostate priests nor were they as competent in Spanish.

The fateful day, 20 November 1853, arrived. Services were announced to begin on the plaza at eleven o'clock when Mass should have been terminated in the "Bishop's Chapel." Lamy prolonged the Mass, closing with another warning and denunciation of Cardenas. He kept the bells ringing longer than usual in an effort to delay the event.

Nicholson reported:

"Their attempts to interrupt our service and prevent a free man of being heard by a few of the people excited indignation."
The people who had listened to the Bishop lounged about the Chapel for a long time; many went to their homes without looking at Cardenas; some came under the portal of the palace; others came forward and filled the seats; others squatted on the ground and a great many gathered in groups about the plaza within hearing distance of the preacher. Cardenas spoke with great force and clearness. He had the unbroken attention of the people and uttered his reasons for renouncing the dogmas and legends of Rome and embracing the faith and worship of Protestants in a most noble and touching manner. ... At the close of the service, Cardenas announced to the people as the Rev. Superintendent of the Methodist Mission in New Mexico; and after unfolding and explaining his parchment and letters of ordination and character, as a presbyter in the Church of Rome, and missionary apostolic to New Mexico, he placed the, one by one, in my hands, expressing ... a desire to be connected with our Mission and to be authorized to officiate as a minister among us.  

One of the conditions of Cardenas’s becoming a Methodist missionary was thus fulfilled. The other was soon to be. It became the custom of the two men to engage in disciplined prayer and Bible study, in Spanish, every day and to visit families willing to receive them. Cardenas’s message on these visits was “the religion of Jesus, the only true Catholic religion found in the gospel of Christ.” Nicholson found his colleague’s conduct in public and private to be “worthy and such as becomes a servant of God.”

Benigno Cardenas met all the conditions placed on his service with the Methodist mission. Indeed, in a very short time he was left alone as the sole Methodist minister in New Mexico. Hansen and Nicholson left, Nicholson for the second time, at the end of a year. Both were discouraged. Hansen had tried to open a school at Tecolote, but Bishop Lamy and some priests came from Santa Fe and, after a few days visitation in the community, persuaded parents to take their children away from the Protestant teacher.

Working in the Rio Grande Valley, principally in the Socorro area, Cardenas managed to maintain “the only productive Protestant ministry in the territory.” He laid the foundation of a living evangelical church among the Spanish Americans. Harwood offered the judgment that up until 1855 the entire success of the Methodist Episcopal church in New Mexico was due to the preaching and pastoral ministry of Benigno Cardenas.
Hispanic American Protestantism thus gained its first ordained indigenous minister from the Roman Catholic church. Cardenas’s orders were recognized as proper warrant for his ministry, though later Harwood and the Methodist bishops were to require that Roman priests be received into the “evangelical ministry” by the same process as any other Protestant candidate.

Apparently Cardenas requested the help of other Anglo missionaries after the departure of his earlier colleagues. In 1855, D. D. Lore was sent to New Mexico to ascertain the situation. He visited the Methodist communities in Socorro and Peralta and reorganized the classes. His letters to the Board of Missions persuaded the corresponding secretary, J. P. Durbin, to observe the need for a new superintendent and assistant to reestablish the English mission and “guide and assist” Cardenas in his work.52

Without doubt Cardenas was in a lonely position, subject to pressure and rejection by his Catholic neighbors and former colleagues in the clergy. He surely welcomed help from Lore, especially as Cardenas was also in failing health. It is interesting that there was evidently no consideration given to the possibility of commissioning Benigno Cardenas as superintendent of the New Mexico mission. Indeed, Durbin’s judgment concerning the need for assistance to Cardenas shows that the priority mission was deemed by the Methodist Episcopal Board to be that of caring for the Anglo community in New Mexico. Despite an ordained indigenous leadership, Protestant ministry to Spanish Americans was a missionary enterprise directed by Anglos.

Other Hispanic Americans were to become ministers, but the pattern of the patronizing Anglo mission was to prevail as the norm of Hispanic American Protestantism. A final incident involving Cardenas shows a particularly unpleasant aspect of Anglo attitudes toward their Hispanic colleagues. It reveals as well something of the unhappy spirit of competition sometimes manifest among Protestant groups.

Hiram Read came to Santa Fe as a Baptist missionary in 1849. Apparently he and a colleague, Samuel Gorman, who established a “successful” mission at Laguna Pueblo, published a report in the United States claiming that they were going to baptize Benigno Cardenas in September, 1854. That report must have been based on conversations with Cardenas in which he agreed with them to “act as one in preaching the gospel.” Upon
hearing of the published report, Cardenas wrote a letter in which he expressed at their publishing a "base supposition as fact; thus abusing my generosity and the candor and confidence of my congregation. I have resolved from this moment to withdraw my friendship from (them)."  

Relations among Anglo missionaries of the various denominations seem to have been cordial and supportive on the whole. The incident with Cardenas, though, suggests that Hispanic Americans were not viewed as full colleagues, but as instruments of the effort to expand membership. The Baptists could hardly be blamed for expressing their hope that they should soon have the services of an effective indigenous preacher. They would certainly have had no intention to abuse or to compromise the integrity of Cardenas, which, in itself, indicates the unconscious and subtle character of paternalism. 

The importance of the present Rio Grande Conference of the United Methodist church makes it necessary to note the beginnings of organized Methodist mission activity among Mexican Texans. 

The Methodist Episcopal church, South, itself an evidence of the increasingly critical rupture in United States society, meeting in general conference in 1858 in Nashville, Tennessee, established the first Rio Grande Conference. In 1859 the conference made its first institutional effort to provide a ministry to Mexican Americans. "Robert P. Thompson was appointed agent for the American Bible Society 'in the valley of the Rio Grande and contiguous regions.'" Three of the twenty-eight appointments in the new conference were missions to Mexicans. 

It would appear that Bible distribution was more effective than efforts to organize new congregations. The report of the 1860 session of the Rio Grande Conference makes no mention of Mexican mission appointments. It does commend Robert P. Thompson for a successful year and requests his reappointment. Significantly, the conference also adopted a resolution "calling for the preparation of tracts and a catechism in Spanish, and the preachers were urged to circulate them, wherever there were Mexicans in the bounds of their charges." 

The Civil War, destructive of so much in United States national life, was also a seriously disruptive element in Protestant missions among Hispanic Americans in the Southwest. A hiatus in Methodist mission work in Texas resulted from the conflict.
Jasper K. Harper, appointed to Brownsville in 1859, worked effectively amongst Mexicans in the region. His intention to work more extensively with Spanish-speaking Texans was threatened by the war. Consequently, apart from the Bible Society work of Thompson, little direct official attention was paid to Mexican Texas by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Notwithstanding, some Mexicans found a ministry in the Methodist church.

The Soledad Street church in San Antonio held a revival in 1859 at which time several Mexicans converted, among them the daughters of the illustrious Antonio Navarro. The Navarro women became active in the congregation, and taught Sunday School classes for Mexicans. Their father also became a member of the Soledad church. This meager information indicates that some Mexicans were able to participate in Anglo congregations in spite of the generally low regard in which many of their compatriots were held. Of course, Navarro had already endeared himself to Anglo Texans by virtue of his participation in the Texas revolt against the Mexican central government and for his role in the Mier filibuster.

The most substantial evidence of an Anglo congregation intentionally extending its services to Mexicans is the work of William Headen, a lay member of the Methodist congregation in Corpus Christi in the 1850s. He became fluent in Spanish, and from his youth taught a Spanish-language class in the Sunday school. Giving much energy and attention to the needs of Mexicans, Headen distributed Spanish-language catechisms and tracts among the people. So effective was his work that Hamilton G. Horton, pastor of the Corpus Christi church in 1861 and a Methodist historian, maintained with good reason:

"The work among the Mexicans of Corpus Christi may be put down as the first important step toward evangelizing that race in Texas — the first where Catechism and Spanish literature were scattered among them and where they were made welcome to seats in Protestant organizations."

In the Corpus Christi Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1869 a young Mexican, Alejo Hernandez, began his historically significant ministry. His story is part of the resurgence of interest in ministry and mission to Mexicans, not only in Texas but all over the Southwest after the end of the Civil War.
MISSIONARY RENEWAL AND INSTITUTIONAL GROWTH
(1869-89)

Although some effort at providing a ministry to Mexicans in California began as early as 1850, little interest was manifest in the work. Until the late 1870s the focus of all Protestant efforts in the new state remained the growing Anglo population. New Mexico and Texas continued to be the centers of greatest interest for Hispanic American ministries in the immediate post-Civil War period.

Methodists of both northern and southern churches committed themselves to mission among the Spanish-speaking. The Methodist Episcopal church worked to rejuvenate the classes organized in New Mexico before the war began.

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, undertook the task of extending the mission in Texas. Strong Anglo churches already existed in Texas, whereas the New Mexico venture required the establishment of English-speaking as well as Spanish-speaking missions.

Missionary efforts among Mexicans in Texas rested on the residual strength of Anglo congregations, especially the congregation in Corpus Christi. William Headen helped create an ethos in that church that nurtured Alejo Hernandez and led to his decision to become a Methodist minister, the first indigenous Mexican minister in Texas.

Hernandez, unlike Benigno Cardenas, was not a priest, although he had attended a seminary. His distaste for the Roman Catholic church resulted, in part, from the support the hierarchy of that church gave to the French venture of establishing the Austrian Archduke Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico. Leaving the seminary in 1862, the young Mexican joined the liberal army, the Juaristas, against Maximilian and the French. Hernandez was captured by the French and eventually found himself on the frontier along the Rio Bravo (Rio Grande). There several aspects of the nineteenth-century ethos of the United States converged in his experience.

A concomitant of the United States invasion of Mexico in 1848 was the distribution of Bibles, tracts, and other evangelical literature provided for the purpose to soldiers of Zachary Taylor by the American Tract Society. At a time when Mexico was
officially closed to Protestant missions, military action opened the way. Most of the materials were distributed in the frontier region of northern Mexico. Alejo Hernandez came into possession of a piece of American nativist propaganda, *Evenings with the Romanists*. He was interested in the book as a possible support for his own anti-clericalism. It was, however, the frequent use of Scripture in the writing that fixed his attention and motivated him to search out a Spanish-language Bible.

One day, while walking along a street in Brownsville, Texas, the eager searcher was lured into a small Protestant church by congregational hymn-singing. Although he could not speak English, Hernandez was so moved by the service that he went to the altar at the close and dedicated himself to God. In words reminiscent of John Wesley’s account of his own Aldersgate experience he later wrote:

“My was seated where I could see the congregation; but few could see me. I felt that God’s spirit was there; and though I could not understand a word that was said, I felt my heart strangely warmed. Never did I hear an organ play so sweetly; never did human voices sound so lovely; never did people look so beautiful as on that occasion. I went away weeping for holy joy.”

Hernandez went back to minister to his people in Mexico, but was so persecuted that he returned to Texas. In Corpus Christi he met William Headen, who brought him to the Methodist church where he was licensed to preach. At the 1871 session of the West Texas Annual Conference Hernandez was elected to the diaconate and appointed to perform missionary work among the Mexican Texans. The conference designated the first Friday in April as “a day of fasting and prayer for the success of the Mexican Mission of which our brother Alejo Hernandez is pastor.”

As was earlier the case with Melinda Rankin and the Presbyterians, Mexico itself continued to command the interest of Methodists. The end of the United States Civil War and the triumph of liberalism in Mexico helped to create a climate of openness in which Protestants responded eagerly to new opportunities south of the border. Thus in 1872 Bishop John C. Keener took Hernandez to Mexico City, where he was assigned the task of developing a Methodist ministry. Failing health sent him back to Corpus Christi where he died in 1875, but Alejo Hernandez left behind an enduring legacy, both in Texas and in Mexico.
For Methodists Hernandez's work signalled a breakthrough and the possibility of an indigenous Spanish-speaking church in Texas. In Hernandez's own life the effects of ambiguous events and ideologies, American nativism, and the Mexican-American War converged to shape a ministry that was, and continues to be, a response to human need. In the year of his death, two other Mexican men, Jose Policarpo Rodriguez and Santiago Tafolla, took up the task of ministry, insuring that the Methodist Church in Texas would continue to have effective indigenous leadership.

Tafolla and Rodriguez were not the first indigenous clergy, but their interesting story reveals the family consequences of conversion to Protestantism, and demonstrates how the lay character of Protestant Christianity enabled it to take root in the culturally Catholic Mexican American community.

Santiago Tafolla and Policarpo Rodriguez were cousins. They had both been in military service; Tafolla evidently fought with the Confederate Army in Texas. Rodriguez had been a scout for the United States Army until the Civil War. With the advent of that conflict, he retired to his ranch on Privilege Creek in Bandera County, Texas.

As a young man, Tafolla was in the service of the Matthews family in Georgia. There he was converted at a Methodist camp meeting. That experience apparently lay dormant for years. His cousin said of him that he was a Protestant at heart, though he did not share that fact with his Roman Catholic family. "Such a thing as a Protestant Mexican was unknown then. Some of our Mexicans were Masons (I was one myself), but not Protestants." 60

Tafolla, with help from Rodriguez organized, in 1875, a mutual help and instruction society in the Privilege Creek community. The organization was not institutionally a Protestant church, but the cousins adapted Masonic prayers, translating them into Spanish for use by the group. At their meetings the society "read from the Bible, and also stood up and read prayers from the book. . . [They] had debates and discussions. The attendance was good. Most of the men in the community belonged to it." 61

In 1874, the year before the formation of the Privilege Creek society, the West Texas Annual Conference created a Spanish-speaking district. Alexander H. Sutherland, superintendent of the district, heard about the work of Tafolla, and sent Jose Maria Casanova, one of his preachers, to visit him. Casanova preached
in the schoolhouse. That event angered Rodríguez, who felt that Tafolla had used the society as a pretext for bringing Protestant missionaries to Privilege Creek. Rodríguez was probably mistaken in his judgment, but the circumstances did lead to the apparent dissolution of the society and a break in relations between the cousins.  

Tafolla soon became a Methodist. One day Trinidad Armendáriz, whose appointment as a Methodist preacher included the Privilege Creek community, was visiting the Tafolla home. Rodríguez and Tafolla, who were negotiating the terms of a horse trade, came into the house just as the circuit rider was about to offer prayer before leaving. Once again Rodríguez felt trapped, but he stayed. The prayer over, Rodríguez took his filly and left, but he could not forget the prayer. After a sleepless night he went to his old haunt, a barroom in Bandera, where he hoped to forget the whole incident. However, Rodríguez experienced such repulsion in the barroom atmosphere that he could not even drink a lemonade. An old friend invited him to share his problems. The friend, a Roman Catholic also, became so incensed at the possibility that Rodríguez might become a Protestant that he began to fight with a son who insisted that his father hear the whole story.

Discouraged, Rodríguez left "as miserable as before." On the way home, he got off his horse and fell on his face in some bushes to pray. Remounting, he began to feel a great sense of relief and spurred his horse toward home. He so startled his family with his exuberance that they thought him "crazy." He insisted that the holy images be taken from the walls. That night he read from the Bible and prayed with his family.

More than a year passed before Señora Rodríguez was able to become Protestant herself. She was deeply troubled by the change in her husband’s life and tried to prevent the children from being influenced by their father’s "ideas." In an effort to understand what was happening, she began to read the Bible. Eventually she decided to convert, but only after all the children had also been led to do the same. The whole family then became members of the Methodist church amidst the derision and harrassment of friends and neighbors.

Santiago Tafolla became a Methodist minister. In 1878 his cousin Policarpo Rodríguez joined him as a colleague. They both served effectively in such places as Laredo, San Marcos, and Del Rio, Texas.
Protestant Christianity was gradually beginning to acquire not only membership but an indigenous clergy as well. There was, however, an important relational problem to be resolved. Paternalism was not as consciously felt in the 1870s as today, but its roots extend through that earlier epoch to the period of initial missionary contact. Notwithstanding the capacity and contributions of Mexican leaders, lay and clerical, Protestant Christianity was a missionary enterprise whose control and supervision rested in Anglo hands. In some instances, if not all, Mexican pastors were regarded as second-class clergy.

Certain degrees of paternalism are inevitable in any missionary situation. For Hispanic American Protestantism the decade of the 1870s was the critical point, at least for Presbyterians and Methodists. Both groups had been at work, the Civil War hiatus aside, for almost twenty years in Texas and New Mexico. Institutional structures had come into being and capable persons had emerged as leaders, but no effort or thought seems to have been given to the possibility of enabling Mexican Americans to control policy making or administrative processes.

It was patently the case that in New Mexico Benigno Cárdenas and Ambrosio Gonzales had kept alive the tender Protestant plant. Yet when the Methodist Episcopal church renewed interest in New Mexico, it was Thomas Harwood who was tapped, not only for the English-language mission but the Spanish-language mission as well. It was Alexander H. Sutherland, not Alejo Hernández, who was given the task of administration in the Spanish-speaking district of the West Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

To an important extent this problem was a function of the educational qualifications of the Mexican leadership, but even in that respect decisions were made, however expediently at the time, that resulted in a perpetual secondary role for Hispanic Americans. Developments in the work of the Presbyterian church in the United States in Texas illustrate the problem.

José María Botello, a ruling elder from the presbytery of Tamaulipas, was instrumental in forming the first indigenous Texas Mexican congregation of the Presbyterian church in the United States. Botello moved his family to San Marcos in 1883 or 1884, and began work as a sharecropper. Soon after his coming, a death in the Mexican American community gave Botello an opportunity to function as a minister. A Roman Catholic priest was unable to conduct the burial. Botello stepped in, conducted
the graveside service, and took advantage of the occasion to preach an evangelistic sermon. The result was that a nucleus of Mexican Texans in San Marcos began to look to Botello as their pastor. They petitioned for admission into the Presbyterian church of San Marcos, and were received as members in July 1884.

By 1887 the group, then twenty-six adults along with their children, who were officially members of the Anglo church but actually served by Botello, asked for recognition as an independent congregation. So effective had been the work of Botello in preaching and teaching that J. W. Neil, pastor at San Antonio and member of the examining commission appointed by the presbytery, declared, "I wish that every American church had elders who knew as much about the doctrines of our church as these men do."  

The Mexican Presbyterian church of San Marcos was duly organized, and Juan C. Hernández was taken under care of the presbytery with permission to minister within the bounds of the San Marcos church. The untimely death of his wife led Botello to return to Mexico; otherwise he surely would have become pastor of the congregation.

In view of the excellence of Botello’s nurturing and teaching ministry, it is instructive to observe the expectations placed on him by the presbytery’s committee on care. He was examined on “experimental religion, motives for selecting the gospel ministry, natural and revealed theology, Church sacraments, history, and government.” The candidate was exempt from customary exams in “arts and sciences, language, Latin thesis, Greek exegesis, and popular Lecture — First, because he is a Mexican and does not speak English; second, because his labors have already been greatly blessed as a teacher and ruling elder among his own people; and third, because Presbytery is fully satisfied of his ‘soundness in the faith’ and ‘aptness to teach.’”

The committee was appropriately sensitive to the language problem and the practical adequacy of Botello’s work. The consequence of its action, however, was to establish a precedent that expected less academic preparation on the part of Mexican American clergy. Ministry among Mexican Americans did not require the same degree of preparation as ministry with Anglos. Such a patronizing though well-intentioned decision was to become institutionalized in the next decade as the norm for preparation of Mexican American clergy.
Henry B. Pratt, a former Presbyterian U. S. missionary to Colombia and a Bible scholar, established in Laredo, Texas, a "Bible Training School for Christian Workers." The curriculum of the school was essentially a concentrated study of the Scriptures. Such a policy of restricting the curriculum to so narrow a focus was partly caused by a concern to prepare ministers whose level of experience and schooling was commensurate with that of their parishioners. Furthermore, if the pastors did not have a truly comprehensive education, they would be less likely to be lured into secular occupations.66

Ministers so trained certainly did participate in the common life of their people, but they were ill equipped significantly to change the condition of dependence and servitude that characterized Mexican American relations with Anglos. Without the training believed necessary for functioning in decision-making positions, Mexican American clergy were not likely ever to influence the church's mission except insofar as their work with and among the people gave actuality to an indigenous church. Theirs would not soon become a determinative voice regarding ministry for their own community. Thus for all the "good" done through Mexican American clergy, theirs was the tragically ironic function of enhancing the dependent and subordinate status of their people.

José Maria Botello was a Presbyterian, but his experience and the limits placed upon it by church policy were not uncharacteristic of his brothers in other Protestant groups. Thomas Harwood, with all good intentions and with pragmatic wisdom, noted the difficulty in providing Anglos with the language skills and willingness needed to enter the rude life of Hispanic Americans in New Mexico. His judgment was that Divine Providence was offering a better way to extend the mission. "Natives of the country" were the answer. They knew the language, could ride well, and would need no cultural orientation. Such schooling as was necessary was already available. The money necessary to train one Anglo to preach in Spanish could be used to train six Mexicans to perform the same service.67

Despite all the appropriate concern for cultural differences and their bearing on the mission, and despite his distress over the poverty of the people, it did not occur to Harwood that the preparation of an indigenous ministry of second class would help perpetuate the dependence of Hispanic Americans in New Mexico. Critical systemic questions that might have dealt with
the reasons for the oppressed condition of the people were simply not asked.

Such problems notwithstanding, Protestant Christianity was beginning to establish an indigenous base from which to develop. The post-Civil War period of institutional growth in Hispanic American Protestantism was especially important for Methodists and Presbyterians. In 1874 Spanish-speaking Methodists in Texas were organized into one district of the West Texas Annual Conference. In New Mexico they were a part of the New Mexico mission, which encompassed English- and Spanish-language work. By 1890 the Southern Methodists had created two Spanish-speaking conferences: the Mexican Border Conference, in 1885, the Northwest Mexican Conference in 1890. Both conferences included churches on either side of the international boundary, and extended from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific. Northern Methodists established the Spanish-speaking mission as an independent unit in 1884, and made it a mission conference in 1892.

Presbyterian work with Hispanic Americans, though important, had no independent judicatory organization until 1908 when the Texas Mexican Presbytery was formed. Presbyterian missions in New Mexico, Colorado, California, etc., were simply related to regional presbyteries.

Schooling was a major missionary thrust; hence the foundation of schools was an important aspect of institutional ministry.

After 1848 there was considerable interest in educating Mexicans to the "American" system. It was hoped that by the educational process new citizens might be more adequately assimilated into national life. Melinda Rankin's early efforts at Brownsville were reduplicated at many points. Laredo Seminary, later known as Holding Institute, was opened in 1882 by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, although with the principal intent of serving children from Mexico. The Harwoods undertook an educational ministry in New Mexico, opening a school in Tiptonville in 1870, and by the turn of the century operating boys' and girls' industrial schools in Albuquerque.

The schooling problem was especially acute in New Mexico because there were no provisions for public education in the territory until 1891. Presbyterians responded in exemplary fashion to the need.

David McFarland, John A. Annin, and James Roberts in
Santa Fe, Las Vegas, and Taos respectively worked to establish Presbyterian missionary work in New Mexico. Each discovered that schools would "effect more for the evangelization of the Spanish population than a direct attempt to introduce the scriptures among the people generally." The Board of Home Missions was not impressed, however, and requested that the General Assembly transfer the New Mexico missionary enterprise to the Board of Foreign Missions. "Inasmuch as the missions of New Mexico furnish scarcely any opportunity for preaching the gospel (italics mine), and are engaged almost wholly in teaching the children of Mexican papists, the Board asks that the missions in New Mexico be transferred to the Board of Foreign Missions." Henry Kendall, Secretary of the Board of Home Missions, defined the Board's priority in 1870:

"With our present resources of men and money, our leading idea must be to preach the Gospel in English and to an English-speaking people. We cannot pay for school teachers, for colportage, or for any other work among other nationalities till we have first cared for our own. . . . But for the probability of an early influx of our own people in New Mexico, we should doubt the propriety of sustaining missionary work there. The old Spanish population there we regard as best looked after by the Foreign Board and by the American and Foreign Christian Union."

In 1871 the work was given to the Foreign Board, but by 1873 all but the Indian missions had been given back to the Home Board with the provision that "our women . . . assume the work, to them so strikingly appropriate, and support the mission schools called for. Let the Board of Home Missions go on to establish these schools so far as the women supply the means."

The Department of Schools was established in 1877 to serve "the degraded and deluded women and children of Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona." It was hoped that such an approach would lead indirectly to the conversions of adults through the children. An important side effect of the schooling process would be the "Americanization" of the "bigoted Romanists, speaking a foreign language," yet American citizens.

Subsequently a system of plaza schools was established and operated throughout the territory. There was no desire to compete with public schools, so as soon as the territorial government began to provide public education, all but a few of the Presbyterian schools were closed. In addition to the plaza schools, boarding schools were opened in Santa Fe and Albuquerque.
Fundamental to the curriculum of the plaza schools was the Bible. Daily Bible study was compulsory. Spiritual disciplines were taught and observed along with the Shorter Catechism. All instruction was in English, though preaching was in Spanish.73

The daily routine in Presbyterian and Methodist schools was much the same. The following account of a day in one of the Harwood’s schools indicates that training in disciplined life-style was fully as important as theological and “literary studies.”

"After an early breakfast the boys will assist in sweeping, washing dishes and in the care of the rooms. At half past seven a military drill of fifteen minutes will be held. . . . After the drill, precisely at 8 a.m. the bell rings for morning prayers. Each with his Spanish Bible reads in turn his verse; the rule is that one who chances to read the last verse must lead in prayer. The Catholic boys are generally told at first that they . . . need not pray unless they wish to. . . . After this comes the recitation in easy theological studies, such as the catechism, Borth’s history of the Bible, Methodist discipline, Binney’s Compendium, Church history, the Reformation etc. . . . "

"The assistant teacher for the regular school now calls the school to order, by a short Scripture reading, prayer and singing, one of the boys always presiding at the Chapel organ.

"The literary studies are all in English... Much is made of the English studies, for nothing pleases the Mexican parents so much as to know that their children are becoming proficient in English. The Biblical studies alone are in Spanish.

"At seven in the evening the bell rings for evening devotion, which is often led by some of the Bible students, followed by a short discourse in English or Spanish, one of the students acting as interpreter. Thus every opportunity is utilized to develop their power of public speaking. Then follows an hour of close hard study."74

The Harwoods stressed that no effort was made to proselytize the Roman Catholic students, but they were certainly as pleased as the Presbyterians with those who did become Protestant. It is surely the case that curricula could hardly be better designed for the formation of skills and interests necessary to the style of Protestant ministry as conceived by those stalwart frontier missionary pastors and teachers.

The essential patterns and structures of Hispanic American Protestantism in the Southwest were set in the years 1859-90. Texas and New Mexico were the principal geographic foci of
Protestant missionary effort during the period. Methodists and Presbyterians were the principal missionary agents. Allowing for differences in polity, their efforts and results were remarkably similar. Within both groups significant indigenous leadership, lay and clerical, emerged, but in neither group was there any serious inclination to allow the churches to develop without paternalistic, however benevolent and enlightened, control by Anglos. Even though the Methodists established Spanish-speaking annual conferences, control of those conferences was placed in the hands of Anglo superintendents and bishops.

Schools of various kinds were designed less to enable the self-determination of a people than to facilitate their assimilation into the customs and institutions of the majority, i.e., conquering culture. Training of indigenous leadership was generally more of an expedient than an affirmation of the values and possibilities of the other culture. Indeed, it was almost entirely the case that ministry to Mexican and Spanish Americans was itself an expedient, either as a way into Mexico or as a means of worthwhile activity while waiting to go to Mexico.

Had the circumstances of the 1870s prevailed on into the 80’s and the turn of the century, it is not unlikely that the efforts of Protestants, and of Roman Catholics as well, would have resulted in a more thorough assimilation of Mexican and Spanish Americans. Circumstances did change, however.

Before we turn to an exploration of those changes and their consequences for Hispanic American Protestantism, we need to note the serious and concerted entry of Southern Baptists into Hispanic American ministry. That entry is remarkable, not because it was different from work undertaken by Methodists and Presbyterians but because, even despite a later beginning in the 1880s, the Southern Baptists are today stronger numerically than either Methodists or Presbyterians.

Una Roberts Lawrence observed that by the time Southern Baptists began mission activity among Mexican Texans “the American pattern of life was well established, the development and expansion of the Southwest well underway, and the Mexican, once the owner, had taken his place as the humble laborer and farmer in this development” (italics mine).75

As with the Methodists and Presbyterians before them, Southern Baptists were basically more interested in Mexicans south of the Rio Bravo than in Texas. The familiar pattern of the colporteur moving across the border, in this case John Hickey, who moved from Brownsville to Matamoros during the United
States Civil War, was reduplicated. Thomas Westrup, whose father, a mechanical engineer, had moved to Monterrey in 1852, invited Hickey to that city to preach. In Monterrey Thomas Westrup was baptized in 1864 and ordained in 1866. He later baptized a certain Mr. Korman, who eventually was to come to San Antonio and in 1881 to organize a Sunday school class for Mexicans. This led in 1888 to the formation of the First Mexican Baptist church in San Antonio.76

In this instance, as in the organization of the Methodist Conferences, the border was shown to be the artificial boundary it was in fact. For the Baptists a mission in Monterrey resulted in the formation of a church in San Antonio.

In 1888 the Texas State Mission Board established the Department of Mexican Mission Work. The Southern Women's Missionary Union joined in support, and erected a chapel in San Antonio in 1889. Women missionaries were supported in Pecos, Corpus Christi, and Galveston. By 1893 there were also Baptist Mexican missions in Corpus Christi, Laredo, and El Paso.77 Growing on that base, significant Southern Baptist work was to be done after the turn of the century.

With the active entry of Southern Baptists into Hispanic American missions in the 1880s, the major Protestant groups that continued a ministry to significant numbers of Spanish-speaking people were all in the field. The foundation for slow, steady growth was laid. However, events in the thirty years from 1890 to 1920 produced important changes for Hispanic Americans — changes that had their impact on the churches as well.

NEW PEOPLE, NEW MINISTRIES
(1890-1920)

In the 1880s an important trend began in the movement of the Mexican population. Railway construction was one of the important features of the Porfiriato. Rail lines were laid so as to open the nation's interior through the northern frontier to commerce with the United States. The tracts that facilitated the movement of goods also moved people.

Because immigration records were not consistently maintained for much of the nineteenth century, and because
even under the most careful scrutiny it has proven impossible to control firmly and account for entry across the border into the United States, it is really impossible to say how many people migrated from Mexico during the years prior to 1900. Evidence indicates that the period 1900-10 was really the peak time of Mexican immigration, although large numbers crossed the border through the 1920s. 78

Impetus for emigration to the United States was varied. Some came to seek employment; others, especially during the Mexican Revolution, for political reasons. Whatever the circumstances, the newcomers swelled the Spanish-speaking population in the Southwest, and created a new challenge for the churches in the region. Many Mexicans also made their way into the mid-west and other areas of the United States as they sought employment and better economic conditions.

The year 1898 witnessed the United States’ imperialist war with Spain. As a result of that conflict, Spanish-speaking persons in the Philippines, Cuba, and Puerto Rico were brought directly into the sphere of missionary activity. Indeed, concern for mission was one of the determinative aspects of the ethos that led to United States occupation of those territories. The work in those areas lies outside the purview of this article. (See Volume 4, of this series, which covers the Caribbean area for information about developments in Puerto Rico and Cuba.)

A significant consequence of the conquest of the islands was that large numbers of persons found their way into the United States, establishing important areas of Puerto Rican and Cuban presence. These communities occupy an important position in Hispanic American Protestantism. At this writing, however, it has not been possible to gather sufficient data to show adequately the development of Protestantism among those groups within the United States. Important historical work needs to be done in this area.

Revolution has been noted as a factor in the growth of the Spanish-speaking population in the United States. World War I served also to create a need for labor, which served as a magnate to draw additional Mexicans into the country during a period of travail in their own homeland. Many who came during that period believed their move to be only temporary. In actuality, it is probably true that most of the immigrants stayed north of the Rio Bravo.

Church institutions and ministries that had begun to
stabilize and be somewhat adequate to the needs of indigenous Spanish-speaking people were no longer so. New demands for service were felt, new responses made. In some instances the newcomers were already Protestant Christians. Such persons added strength to existing churches, both as lay persons and clergy.

Notwithstanding these important developments, there is some evidence to suggest that at least in the first twenty years of the period 1890-1920, a kind of inertia arrested the vitality of at least one major group. That attitude was partly a function of the frequently noted interest of all the Protestant missionary groups in working in Mexico itself. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, then organized into two annual conferences astride the international frontier from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific, showed increasingly more interest in its Mexican churches than in its churches within the United States:

"In 1890, out of 47 appointments in the two conferences, 19 were in the United States and 28 were in Mexico. As for schools, the only one remaining in Texas was Holding Institute in Laredo: while in Mexico, schools had been established in Saltillo, Monterrey, San Luis Potosí, Durango, Chihuahua, and several more in Central Mexico. This emphasis on the work in Mexico brought a period of stagnation to the work in Texas... so that by 1910 the strongest and most prominent leaders were in Mexico."79

The Revolution brought radical change. The disruptions of war were too serious a handicap for a church whose centers of power and decision making were in the United States. In 1914 the Methodist churches in the United States were reorganized into two new missions and dissociated from the Methodist churches in Mexico, although ministers retained membership in the Mexican Conferences until 1930. Churches east of the Pecos were organized into the Texas Mexican Mission; those west, including work in New Mexico, Arizona, and California, into the Pacific Mission. The Pacific Mission became the Western Mexican Mission in 1918.80

With attention diverted away from Mexico, and with the influx of new people in the United States, Protestant churches experienced new missionary challenges. The Texas Mission came under the supervision of the Home Mission Board of the Methodist Episcopal church, South. Frank S. Onderdonk was named superintendent.

For the first time in Texas, Presbyterians organized a
Spanish-language judiciary (church governing body), though it was more a mission than a standard presbytery. In 1908 the Synod of Texas acceded to the petition of the Western Texas Presbytery to create the Texas-Mexican Presbytery. Walter Scott, a senior missionary, was designated presiding officer over the organizational meeting.

For all practical purposes the Texas-Mexican Presbytery functioned as a mission under the leadership of two Anglo evangelists, whose own personal conflicts created serious problems for the judiciary. Salary subsidies were disbursed to the Mexican pastors by the Synod of Texas through the Home Missions Committee of the presbytery. Robert D. Campbell acted as treasurer. Pastoral assignments were made by the presbytery rather than by call of local congregations. Although the business of the presbytery was scrupulously carried out according to the Form of Government, in important respects the structure served fundamentally as a conduit for the distribution of Synod Home Mission funds.81

Tragically, there seems to be no evidence that the Texas-Mexican Presbytery actually functioned as a particularly effective instrument of ministry to the increased Mexican population. It was consumed with financial problems and a leadership crisis, problems internal to the organization. Ironically the rationale offered in support of the creation of the presbytery was that a separate judiciary would “magnify the sense of responsibility among our Mexican brethren for self-development and vigorous growth from within… The question of mission policy boiled itself down . . . to . . . self-support, self-propagation, self-government.”82

When the presbytery was “amalgamated” into the Anglo presbyteries of Texas in 1955, only six of thirty-four congregations had attained self-support.83

It is important to note that there was serious, though not successful, opposition to the formation of the Texas-Mexican Presbytery within the Mexican American community itself. At the time that the presbytery was being organized, a group of Mexican Protestants, the Independents, began an effort to establish a Spanish-speaking Protestant church unaffiliated with any of the Anglo denominations. Some seventy members and five congregations that might have been in the presbytery joined the Independents. The group did not last, however, because of a lack of resources and leadership.84
That such an effort should have been made is significant, for it points to the serious problem of dependence upon Anglo leadership and resources. There seems to have been no serious inclination anywhere in the Southwest in any group to place leadership in the hands of Mexican Americans.

The point of most effective service by the Texas-Mexican Presbytery was its educational ministry. The Spanish Department of Austin Theological Seminary proved to be a disappointment, but the Texas-Mexican Industrial Institute and the Presbyterian School for Mexican Girls, established in 1912 and 1924 respectively, merged in 1956 on the campus of the former in Kingsville, as the present Presbyterian Pan American School. Academic and practical skills were given equal stress in the school's program, with particular attention to the acquisition of proficiency in the English language. These emphases provided tools for survival in a new cultural environment. 85

If the Texas-Mexican Presbytery was not totally successful as a means of establishing an indigenous Presbyterian church, it did provide, for some, the means of a ministry to basic human need.

Though there was also important church growth, especially within Methodist Missions in Texas and California, 86 perhaps it was the ministry to human need that most nearly characterized Protestantism among Hispanic Americans in the population-growth years of the Mexican Revolution and World War I. The social ministry of Protestant churches was of vital importance in burgeoning Los Angeles.

As early as 1850 Presbyterians in the Presidio of Monterey (California) established a Sunday school program for Spanish-speaking children. Other groups undertook ministries with California Mexicans as well, but their efforts were generally scattered and short-lived. It was in the period of greatest immigration that Protestantism gained most strength. American Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists all increased their efforts to serve newcomers. Other groups, some of whom had been present in smaller numbers, also grew as they offered themselves in ministry.

Just as in Texas, so also in California the Protestant ministry with Mexican Americans was a missionary enterprise under Anglo auspices. There was, in fact, a smaller organized indigenous base from which to work.

Much of the impetus for the work was represented by the desire to win Mexicans to "Americanism." Anglo Protestants
were concerned lest the abysmal living and working conditions that greeted immigrants as they came into the United States lead them to opt for some other political alternative. The statement of a Home Missions executive of the Presbyterian Church is representative:

"The thousands of Mexican immigrants on our border are just now in a most receptive mood. Mentally, socially, religiously, they are in a state of transition, and the forces of evil are at work among them. The question which is to be decided within the next few years is whether they are to be won to anarchy or Americanism; to Bolshevism or to democracy; to Trotsky or to Christ."\(^87\)

Vernon McCombs, Methodist director of Mexican mission activity in southern California, in assessing the reasons that some Mexicans refused to become United States citizens, maintained that "so-called socialists" were agitating and "haranguing" Mexicans in the plazas and "quarters" with the notion that "America [was] a nation of oppressors, dupes, and grafters" who might some day compel them "to fight against their own country, Mexico." The "agitators" claimed that they were the "only true friends of the masses and that the revolutions in France, Russia, and Mexico must sweep over the entire world."\(^88\)

While it would be misleading to assert that concern for Americanization was all motivated by anxiety over the supposed socialist thrust, it is nonetheless significant that such sentiments were expressed. That much of the ministry took the form of social service cannot be wholly attributed to such anxiety, but the fear of subversion may well have been an unconscious stimulus for some.

The sentiment of a contributor to an educational project of the Methodist church in Southern California is probably more characteristic of the attitude of most Anglo Protestants:

Why should I send more money to the non-Christians who are my neighbors?
Why may I not have the privilege of helping the faithful men and women who are helping to build up my own country?
Cut out the Mexicans and you cut out a large factor in our industries. Educate them and you add a sound and useful aid to our country's development, especially here in the Southwest.\(^89\)

There was a genuine, though paternalistic, desire to support Mexicans in becoming a part of United States society. They had, after all, been engaged in the building of its railroads, the
development of its mines and steel industry, and the production of its food.

Despite such concern for the social well-being of Mexican Americans, there is no evidence of any resistance by the churches to the mistreatment of many who were repatriated during the years of economic depression. It was the sad plight of many Mexicans to be made welcome as laborers as long as there was a need for their services, but the moment jobs became scarce they were sent "back where they came from." The tragic reality was that many native-born Mexican Americans, especially those who could not document their nationality, were deported along with their foreign brothers and sisters. Mexican Americans were pawns of the labor market. All efforts of the churches to provide pastoral care and social services did not alter that significant fact. Systemic factors producing the marginalization of Mexicans in U.S. society were left unaddressed.

The ministry that was offered was seen by many to be valuable and necessary. For some, the response to material need led to the adoption of Protestant Christianity:

"It was certain Protestant churches, especially the Methodist, that appeared to be most cognizant of the plight of the immigrant. It is, therefore, not strange that bitterness toward the Spanish-speaking aristocracy, and some antipathy toward the [Roman Catholic] Church should have developed—a bitterness that characterized the "aristocracy" as una junta de cabrones and resulted in the conversion of many Mexicans to Protestantism."90

Schools and community centers were especially important institutions in the ministry to the social needs of Mexican Americans. While a number of institutions had been formed in advance of the waves of immigration, their period of greatest service came with the growth of the Mexican population. Genuine concern for the social well-being of the people was coupled with the desire to evangelize them.

Robert N. McLean, superintendent of Mexican Work for the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., offered to the General Assembly of 1920 his rationale for "The Home of Neighborly Service" concept:

"One of our great points of failure in Mexican work has been the point of social contact. For years it has been our custom to enter a field by opening up preaching services...To a people who have been Roman Catholic for centuries, we have come
simply with a ministry of evangelization. The people have been warned against us by the priests as though we were representatives of the devil. Consequently, our work has not made progress which our effort has deserved. Our experiments this year convince us that the most effective work is done when a social ministry is made to cooperate with our evangelistic efforts. To win the good will and the friendliness of the people is a prerequisite to success among evangelical lines.”

An early “house of neighborliness” was established in Azusa, California, in order “to win the women and through them to develop Christian American homes.” The social worker, Sara J. Reed, lived in the house and furnished it as a model home with goods accessible to people in the neighborhood.

Ms. Reed visited the homes in the community and invited the women to come to her house to learn English. There she used the English lesson as an opportunity to teach homemaking, hygiene, child care, etc. Bible study was offered twice a week.

So successful was the Azusa effort that between 1920 and 1930 fourteen Homes of Neighborly Service were erected. Nine were in California, three in Colorado, and one each in Texas and Arizona. The depression hit hard, however, and in 1932 when Paul Warnshuis assumed responsibility for the Presbyterian Spanish-speaking work, only six houses remained open. Warnshuis worked hard to maintain the Homes of Neighborly Service and managed to increase their number to twenty, though by 1961 only twelve remained in operation.

Conflict arose over the neighborhood houses as community people began to regard them as “theirs,” and to “secularize” them. The sponsoring churches were also disturbed by the growing interest in providing for ecumenical ministry that involved Roman Catholics as well as Protestants in setting policy for the institutions. As neighborhood priorities displaced the evangelistic emphases of the church, relations became even more strained. Not only Presbyterian Homes of Neighborly Service, but community centers in all Protestant groups became relatively independent secular agencies.

The changing focus of community ministry was also to produce resistance within Spanish-speaking congregations whose pietism was offended by the social activism of the centers. That resistance came to be manifest more clearly during the activist decade of the 60s in the ambivalence of many Hispanic Protestants to the various activities that contributed to the movement of La Raza.
Before we turn to this new movement that challenged the church to assume an explicit political posture, we need to note efforts made to move beyond treating Hispanic American ministries as just a missionary enterprise.

**AN “INCLUSIVE” CHURCH? (1920-56)**

The “amalgamation” of the Texas-Mexican Presbytery was paralleled in California by the integration of Spanish-language congregations into the Southern California-Arizona Conference of the Methodist church. That process is especially significant because the continued existence of the Rio Grande Conference in Texas and New Mexico makes possible some comparison of the relative effectiveness of two modes of church organization among Hispanic Americans. A brief look at the remarkable growth of Southern Baptist churches will reveal yet another polity and its effectiveness in ministry with Hispanic Americans.

Methodist ministries among Mexican Americans in California had been sporadic and disorganized prior to the employment of Vernon M. McCombs in 1911. His energy and organizational ability were soon manifest not only in the Plaza Community Center, a significant institution of social-service ministry that still serves (though in a new locale) but also in the development of Methodist connectional structures. Under the superintendency of McCombs, the Spanish-Portuguese District of the Methodist Episcopal church was organized in 1912. By 1920 the work had so developed in numbers and geographical extent that the Methodist Episcopal church authorized the establishment of the Latin American Mission. The mission included all of the states of California and Nevada, part of the state of Arizona, and Baja California in the Republic of Mexico. Continuing the concern to “handle wisely” the influx of “Latin” immigration that had helped motivate the work of the Spanish-Portuguese District, the new mission was to serve not only Spanish- and Portuguese-speakers but French- and Italian-speakers as well.

In 1931 the Latin American Mission was joined to the Southwest Mission, the work of the Methodist Episcopal church in New Mexico and Arizona, including some few churches in
Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and El Paso, Texas. Since that territory was too vast to administer adequately, the Latin American Mission was reduced in 1936 to include only the coastal states and Arizona. Churches in the other areas were to be supervised by the annual conferences in which they were located.

When the Methodist Episcopal church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant church merged in 1939 to form the Methodist church, the Spanish-speaking conferences of the Southern church were reorganized. The Western Mexican Conference was disbanded and its churches in the United States placed in the Latin American Mission, which was also reconstituted. The former Texas Mexican Conference was restructured to include Spanish-speaking congregations in Texas and New Mexico and was called the Southwest Mexican Conference. In 1948 the South Central Jurisdiction of the Methodist church honored the petition of the Southwest Mexican Conference and renamed it the Rio Grande Conference.

The Rio Grande Conference continues to serve the states of Texas and New Mexico. Although it remains under the supervision of Anglo bishops and is heavily subsidized by United Methodist mission funds, the Rio Grande Conference has developed strong Mexican American leadership and enjoys a high degree of self-determination within the Methodist connectional system.

The Latin American Mission was to have a different experience. Vernon M. McCombs continued to be superintendent, but there was a growing sense of restiveness among Hispanic pastors and churches. Although few pastors had more than minimal preparation for their tasks, the sentiment for self-determination became ever stronger. Young leaders such as Cesar Lizarraga and Carlos López emerged as persons qualified to assume administrative positions.

The increasing agitation came to be focused in the demand for a Hispanic conference. Specific expectations for the conference were expressed:

1. Appointment of Hispanic ministers to supervisory positions;

2. Appointment of Hispanic persons to key boards, committees, or departments;
3. Use of the Spanish language in conducting sessions of the conference;

4. Determination of the total program of the Hispanic church to be made by Hispanics by themselves.

In response, the Latin American Provisional Conference was established in 1941, ushering in what José Moreno Fernández terms "the Golden Era of Hispanic Methodism."98

Not all the demands of the Hispanic pastors were met by the new structure. Two Hispanics, Lizarraga and Lópex, were appointed as executives of the Conference Board of Education and Epworth League (youth movement); three Hispanic district superintendents were named; Hispanics constituted conference committees. However, Vernon McCombs was appointed general superintendent, to be assisted by his long-time colleague, J. Scott Willmarth. Significantly, the latter was designated conference treasurer. Two Anglo administrators were interposed between the conference and the bishop, also an Anglo! Little wonder that the request to conduct conference sessions in Spanish was denied (through McCombs and Willmarth were bilingual)!99

Important concessions in the direction of self-determination were made. It is important to note, however, that they were concessions, and seriously circumscribed at that! The mission had become a conference, but it was finally still a "mission" in terms of its top administrative personnel.

Despite these liabilities, the structural changes did boost morale, and the years 1941-56 were a period of growing confidence. Though the numerical increase in membership was slight in view of the later experience of membership loss after integration, it was real and significant.

Despite the failure of Hispanics to gain key positions of leadership in the conference and the refusal to allow Spanish in the meetings of the conference, Spanish was used in the day-to-day life of the churches and in worship. Hispanics filled positions of leadership on conference committees and in local churches. A strong youth organization developed. It might have been expected that the foundation was laid and the structures were forming for an indigenous Hispanic Methodist church in southern California and Arizona.

That such an expectation was not realized is attributable in significant degree to the inability of the Hispanic churches to become totally self-supporting. Lack of financial resources made
it difficult to pay adequate salaries to Hispanic pastors. As late as 1955-56, the last year of existence for the Provisional Conference, the recommended annual salary for a married pastor with a family was $2,687 plus $25 per child. Hispanic pastors could not be faulted for seeking a merger with other annual conferences that provided more adequate support for the ministry.

Fernández attributes the failure of the Latin American Provisional Conference to achieve self-support to another failure, viz., the failure to grow. In fifteen years there was only a gain of 226 members. It must be noted, however, that the period 1947-50 witnessed a gain of nearly 700 members, an approximate 26 percent increase. Changing residential patterns resulting from disruptions caused by freeway constructions are cited as factor in the decline of Hispanic Methodist membership after 1950. There was another issue of importance as well, however.

The experience of many Mexican Americans during World War II led them to question their exclusion from the institutions and decision-making processes of the larger society. Many sought more seriously to assimilate into the mainstream in order to achieve the benefits of the United States economic and political system.

Additional impetus for assimilation came from Anglos who held the dream of an integrated society. Unfortunately that dream of integration expected that Mexican Americans and others would adopt the culture of the Anglo majority. Uncritical idealism envisioned a social order and a church in which Hispanic Americans and Anglos were equal but on the Anglos' terms.

Anglo idealism, the Hispanic desire for participation, and economic need all contributed to the decision to integrate the Latin American Provisional Conference into the Anglo annual conferences. Beginning in 1948, the negotiation processes resulted in 1953 with the decision to integrate and the actual dissolution of the Latin American Provisional Conference in 1956. This action was viewed by Hispanics as a defeat. They had struggled to be free and to establish a Hispanic Methodist church, but at last had failed:

"Integration to the Hispanic meant not merger but absorption. The Hispanic was getting anxious about his failure, but it seemed that the only alternative was to integrate. . . . A feeling of unfulfillment, of courtship without a consummating
marriage, an air of defeat was the innermost feeling of a people whose heritage was one of suffering and struggling for freedom. For many...integration was a step backwards in their journey for self-determination, but if this was the only way to go, then they were willing to take the step.”

By 1967 Hispanics were persuaded that integration viewed as assimilation was not providing an adequately responsive ministry for their people. Membership decline had begun in the early fifties, and continued even more seriously after integration. Although ministers and some church leaders believed integration on the conference level was a viable alternative to the problems faced, lay people were not persuaded. The Methodist church school curriculum replaced Spanish materials. No longer were Hispanic Americans making decisions about conference and connectional programs. They were absorbed and all but eliminated as a distinct community within the Methodist church in southern California.

By contrast with Methodist and Presbyterian experience in southern California, Baptists, both American and Southern, experienced significant growth in the period 1950-70. American Baptist membership in Los Angeles doubled during the twenty years, and Southern Baptists experienced a 375 percent increase in the decade 1960-70. Such remarkable growth commands attention. It is especially important to attend briefly to the Southern Baptists who today probably have the largest Hispanic constituency of any single Protestant group in the United States.

Baptist polity has been a key to the rapid growth and national extension of Hispanic ministry by that group. Although related to a large Anglo-dominated bureaucracy through convention structures, each Baptist congregation is autonomous and places heavy stress on lay leadership. As Baptist families move from place to place, either in the migrant stream or in search of better living conditions, they establish congregations based on family structure or other significant affiliation. The phenomenal growth of Southern Baptist membership in Los Angeles began in just such a way. Jesús Rio moved from San Antonio to Los Angeles in 1949 and organized the Primera Iglesia Bautista. Twenty years later there were 61 Southern Baptist churches in the state of California.

Clifton L. Holland maintains that the growth of Baptist churches among Hispanic Americans is a function of the fact that they are not forced into integration with Anglo structures of the
same denomination. This may be true, but is perhaps too simple. It is true that Southern Baptists led by Oscar Romo and Gerald Palmer in the 1950s did resist assimilation into the Texas Baptist Convention, for example. In addition, Southern Baptist policy under Romo has continued to stress the importance of fellowship among ethnic congregations. But is is also the case that Hispanic Baptist congregations are as integrated into the larger structures as any Southern Baptist congregation anywhere. Romo's very presence as a denominational executive is itself a manifestation of that reality!

Furthermore, the experience of the Rio Grande Conference of the United Methodist church suggests that the explanation that forced integration is the key to declining membership is problematic. To be sure, the Rio Grande Conference is ultimately "controlled" in significant fashion by an Anglo-dominated connectional system, but as a conference in the pursuit of its ministry it does enjoy a high degree of self-determination. It certainly has not been forced to integrate. Yet Rio Grande Conference membership has been in slow decline since 1970.\textsuperscript{112}

**A CHURCH OF THE PEOPLE (1960-75)**

After a century of development, Hispanic American Protestantism has achieved an important indigenous base, though even among Southern Baptists it is heavily subsidized and patronized, however benevolently, by Anglo-dominated institutions. Given such a circumstance, the deeply ambivalent response of Hispanic American Protestantism to the struggle for liberation as it developed during the 1960s and 1970s is not surprising. To embrace the farm workers' movement, for example, would often result in conflict between Anglo and Hispanic churches of the same denomination in the same town. Many were reluctant to take a political stance that envisioned a radical change in United States social institutions.

Nonetheless, there is evidence of the quickening of a church not defined by institutional affiliation or structures but by its identification with the struggles of the people. It is much
too soon to do more than point to certain signs of the emergence of this church and to attempt a comment on its relation to the history that has been sketched to this point.

As the Hispanic Methodists of southern California were absorbed in their efforts to make the Latin American Provisional Conference a workable instrument of the Hispanic community, the so-called pachuco riots took place in Los Angeles. While the city of Los Angeles watched passively, Mexican American young people who were struggling to discover and to express their unique identity were brutalized by United States naval personnel on leave.\textsuperscript{113} Although the struggle of Methodists and pachucos was fundamentally the same, viz., the effort to assert a cultural and personal identity different from that of the Anglo majority, neither group saw the other as an ally. Moreover, there is little to indicate that any Hispanic or Anglo Protestant church attempted a ministry that reflected an understanding or appreciation for the struggle of the pachucos. Indeed, the young people were viewed by Hispanic Protestants as social outcasts.\textsuperscript{114} The distance between organized Protestant Christianity and “the first people to call themselves Chicanos”\textsuperscript{115} was great.

As the Chicano movement developed during the 1960s, the distance between it and the churches became narrower in some respects, though continuing to be problematic. Important leaders of various of the groups through which the Movement was manifest were persons deeply influenced by Protestant Christianity. Reies López Tijerina was a Pentecostal minister, and Corky González was affected greatly by his nurture in the Presbyterian church. But there was little or no participation of the churches as such in the Movement.

When Cesar Chávez, in the early 1960s, undertook the organization of farm workers as a Christian vocation, Anglo Protestants of the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches responded with early support for the movement and for La Huelga. There was considerable local opposition to Chávez and the Migrant Ministry’s involvement with him. The Delano Ministerial Association disclaimed any relation to the actions of visiting clergy, Protestant, Catholic or Jewish, who came to Delano in support of the strike. The association maintained “that it was not the function of the clergy to organize farm workers.”\textsuperscript{116}

Significantly, it was Protestant Christians who offered the first institutional support to the farm workers. Chávez was appreciative:
“The Protestant Church has ... been with us every day we have been on strike and they have been identifying with us and not asking for anything in return. They are not saying, 'Look, become a Protestant,' and not proselytizing because that is one of the rules that we set, and we didn't have to set it but just so the score would be clear.”

It is also significant that initial support came largely from Anglo Protestants. Although individual Hispanic ministers became involved, few Hispanic churches ventured forth in the cause. “Most . . . Spanish-speaking church people . . . began to react with the same hostility against the movement as did their Anglo counter-parts, even though they were not involved as were the Anglos in the agri-business management interests. They were merely imitating the Anglos whose values they were adopting, even though it was against the interests of their own people.”

The farm workers' struggle deepened and spread to Texas where some Anglo Protestants were active through the Migrant Ministry of the Texas Council of churches. Hispanic Protestants as a group reacted with ambivalence. Funds provided by the Methodist General Board of Missions were used to support the radio program of Tony Orendain, an organizer for the United Farm Workers Union, in an effort to extend the organization to the Rio Grande Valley. Tensions were severe within the Rio Grande Conference and especially within the Southwest Texas (Anglo) Conference. Nonetheless, the Rio Grande Conference did take the important step of officially supporting the United Farm Workers' boycott. Some Hispanic pastors in the Rio Grande Valley and elsewhere in Texas became increasingly involved in the struggle. However, ambivalence over such action continues in Hispanic congregations and renders problematic institutional support for and participation in La Causa.

Presbyterians as a group made perhaps the most extensive and active institutional response to the critical Mexican American situation. Effectively motivated by Alfonso Rodríguez and Jorge Lara-Braud, they established in 1966 the Hispanic American Institute in Austin, Texas, for the purpose of developing a ministry equipped for service in bilingual, bicultural contexts. Lara-Braud became director of the institute and worked to make it responsive not only to the interests of the judicatories that established it but, more importantly, to the needs and aspirations of Hispanic Americans themselves.

Convinced that the institute was called to a “demonstration
of a response to the reconciling presence of [the] Lord,” Lara-Braud associated the institute in solidarity with secular groups in their struggle for justice for Mexican Americans. He insisted that the church must listen to, and share in the labor of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the G.I. Forum, the Political Association of Spanish-speaking Organizations (PASO), the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA), the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO), the Federation for the Advancement of Mexican Americans (FAMA) and the United Farm Workers Organization Committee (UFWOC). These groups represent a broad spectrum of interests and styles of action. Each is an effort to secure economic, political, and social justice for Mexican Americans.

Lara-Braud became an effective and articulate advocate for La Causa within the Presbyterian churches and among Protestants generally. He affirmed the theological ideal of an inclusive church, but maintained that for the immediate future the movement of Anglos into Hispanic churches ought to be emphasized.

Even the usual antipathy of Protestants toward the Roman Catholic church was challenged. “The urgency of the church’s entering into partnership with the Mexican Americans demands that it ‘subordinate all ecumenical protocol to our common task of service to Christ and ministry to His children,’ and ignore many of the former barriers and distinctions between Protestant and Roman Catholic.”

The 1966 General Assembly of the United Presbyterian church directed its judicatories to intensify their concern for, and ministry with, Spanish-speaking peoples. In response, such efforts as the West Side Ministry in San Antonio, the San Gabriel Larger Parish that involved the Methodist church in California, Centro Hispano in Los Angeles, and La Raza Churchmen were begun.

By 1969 such momentum had developed that the United Presbyterian General Assembly, meeting in San Antonio, adopted far-reaching recommendations in support of linguistic and cultural pluralism in education, the participation of Hispanic Americans at all levels of decision making, and the principle of consultation with indigenous leadership in working out mission priorities among Hispanic Americans. The assembly also “urged the United Presbyterian Church to support ‘as a matter of conscience and witness, the demands of farm workers for bargaining rights and legislative protection.’”
As might have been expected in a predominantly Anglo institution, there was deep ambivalence in the church in response to these developments. Despite the fact that the 1970 General Assembly took further actions in support of Hispanic interests in education, health care, and economic development, the general mood of the church in congregational life was not supportive of such "concessions" to the "radicals." National leadership and parish leadership were out of step with each other. The result was that much of the church's call to participation in the struggle for justice as a Christian ministry became empty rhetoric.

Lara-Braud and his associate, Benjamin Canales, resigned their positions with the Hispanic American Institute. Lara-Braud, who became executive secretary of the Faith and Order Commission of the National Council of Churches, declared that he loved the leaders of the church "too much to continue to apologize for them." Far from becoming full colleagues in ministry, much less self-determining indigenous churches, Hispanic American Protestants continue to find themselves patronized. They are forced to resort to the tactics of caucus organization and pressure group action in order to assert their interest in the large Protestant denominations of the United States. This is true despite such hopeful signs as the appointment of a Hispanic district superintendent, Elías Galván, in the Southern California-Arizona Conference of the United Methodist church, and despite the presence of Hispanic Americans in decision-making positions at all levels in the bureaucracy of United States Protestantism.

Even the autonomous congregations of the Baptist churches in the United States and the Río Grande Conference of the United Methodist church are dependent on the subsidy of the denomination for their maintenance. Subsidy, however well-intentioned, brings with it a degree of control and dependent status.

Despite the perpetuation for Hispanics of structures of dependence and despite their relatively insignificant numerical strength, Hispanic American Protestants are integral members of the community of La Raza. Their Protestant affiliation is not viewed as a means of acculturation and escape, but as a way of identifying with the strength of the people. Once the victims of Manifest Destiny, Hispanic American Protestants now begin to convert the institutions of their oppressors into instruments of
service. Institutionally such a conversion may never be complete, but Hispanic American Protestants are uniquely situated to put the power and resources of the conquerors' institutions to the service of the conquered. That service will increasingly be defined by Hispanic Americans who choose their identity as Hispanics and Christians, even as Protestant Christians.\textsuperscript{126}

There are signs that a Hispanic church, a church of the people, is stirring beneath the institutions of Protestantism (and in the Roman Catholic church as well). What its future manifestation may be is yet uncertain; its relation to the structures of oppression is yet to be defined. It is the conviction of this writer that through all the vicissitudes of a century and a half of labor, through the multiplicity of structures and ambiguous motives has been formed a Hispanic Christian community, Catholic in its concern and ministry, and committed to the embodiment in the flesh of \textit{La Raza} of the suffering love of One who died Servant of all, yet Lord of all, the Sign of the coming liberation of all humankind.
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PART FIVE

The Awakening of Hispanic Catholics
(1946 to the Present)
EFFECTS OF WORLD WAR II ON THE HISPANIC PEOPLE

Moisés Sandoval

The most recent period in the history of the Hispanic church in the United States has been the most bountiful. And the seeds that led to that bumper harvest were all sown in one singular event -- World War II. The cataclysm did not just redraw the map of Europe and other parts of the world. It did not just destroy, divide, and reunite people. It also changed the character of those who emerged from it, be they Jews or Gentiles, Europeans or Americans, soldiers or civilians, Anglos or Hispanic Americans. Events in that war left a deep and permanent imprint upon the conscience and consciousness of the world. Hitler’s extermination of the Jews and the obliteration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the atom bombs were catastrophes of such magnitude that they would henceforth shape the future of humanity. With less notoriety but no less significantly, the course of history of many peoples was changed by the war. One of these peoples were the Hispanics in the United States.

Hispanos entered the conflict as a largely rural population. The vast majority of them lived in isolated villages of New Mexico, in colonies alongside the Rio Grande, or in largely Mexican American towns throughout the Southwest. Even when they were in cities, they usually lived across the tracks, and had little social contact with gringos (English-speaking Americans.) The war brought an end to their isolation. In 1940 the Hispanic population of the United States was 15 percent urban and 85 percent rural. Those proportions were exactly reversed in a little more than a decade. Such was the rush to the cities that in the 1950s one could go through many rural barrios of northern New Mexico and find scarcely anyone still living there, even though
before the war there were many inhabitants. It was as if some Pied Piper had gone through entire communities and led the population off. Terromote, a rural farming area tucked into the foothills of the Sangre de Cristo Mountains of New Mexico some 80 miles northeast of Santa Fe, is a good example of how the population scattered.¹ Some families went to Los Angeles to take jobs in war industries. Others moved to Colorado to work in the beet fields, and later in the packing houses and federal bureaucracies, both military and civilian, of Denver. Still others went to Kansas City, Wyoming, and South Dakota. Today people who once lived in Terromote are scattered all the way from New York to San Francisco and from Texas to Montana.

This massive migration to the cities affected the Hispanic people both positively and negatively. The scarcity of labor during the war years gave many an opportunity to learn new skills and enlarge their earning capacity. Their performances punctured the myth that Chicanos or Mexican Americans were incapable of anything but common labor, an assertion one heard often in those days from gringos. Economic power improved the chances of the next generation to enhance its education. However, for people who had previously lived in monocultural isolation, the move to the cities brought them into an environment of cultural clash, prejudice, discrimination and, sometimes even of violence on the part of the dominant majority. In Los Angeles, for instance, this clash led to the so-called Pachuco riots that took place during World War II. Pachuco was the name applied to urban Mexican Americans, whose distinctive flared pants, and slicked down long hair, inflamed the prejudice of Anglo soldiers and sailors stationed in the Los Angeles area. The rioting was blamed on the Pachucos but subsequent investigation revealed that they were only the victims of restless soldiers and sailors inflamed by the press.

Thousands upon thousands of Hispanics went to war. They fought in every theater of the conflict. The percentage of Chicanos in the armed forces was higher than that of any other ethnic group. They were also the most decorated group.² Some received the nation's highest decoration for valor -- the Medal of Honor. Units of the New Mexico National Guard, in which Hispanics were heavily represented, fought heroically in the Philippines, suffering through the death march when the islands fell to the Japanese. Americans gained a new perspective on the Hispanic minority that had been stereotyped so cruelly and so falsely in the literature, movies, and media of the majority.
Hispanic soldiers returned from the war with a new consciousness of themselves and new vistas of future possibilities. Some who had previously lived in areas where discrimination was strong received military training in less prejudiced parts of the country. In the armed services Hispanics had contact with Anglos who accorded them respect and equality. The result was that the returning Hispanic soldiers were less prone to accept the indignities of the past. They were determined to enjoy the freedoms and opportunities for which they had shed their blood. The new skills and opportunities acquired in the armed forces enlarged their economic horizons. The G.I. Bill opened doors to educational institutions that had previously been denied by poverty.

All this would one day flower in a struggle that was to be known as the Movimiento. It is really part of the same struggle that has characterized the dealings of the Hispanic people with their oppressors ever since the occupation of the Southwest in 1836 and 1848. But the roots of the present-day phase of the struggle can be traced back to the new consciousness with which Hispanic veterans returned from World War II and to their first futile attempts to desegregate schools, theaters, and restaurants, and to insure fair employment practices.

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

The returning veterans of World War II could hardly have imagined how the Spanish-speaking people would increase in numbers. In 1947 after the Catholic church awakened to the need for special structures serving the Hispanics, Father John J. Birch, executive director of the Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking, estimated that there were 3 million Spanish-speaking people in the United States.\(^3\) Fifteen years later in 1962, Archbishop Robert E. Lucey of San Antonio called attention to “the immense number of new arrivals of adult age who come to our country week after week to reside here and who for the most part speak little or no English.” He pointed out that according to some statisticians, the Spanish-speaking population of the United States was 8 million.\(^4\) Only fifteen years later -- in 1975 -- Paul Sedillo, director of the National Conference of the Bishops’ Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking, reported that the Hispanic population of the United States had increased to 14.4 million or 6.9 percent of the total population. The secretariat’s figures did not include 3 million Puerto Ricans living on the island of Puerto Rico who are American citizens or the Immigration and
Naturalization Service's estimate of 5 million immigrants, migrants, and undocumented aliens of Hispanic origin in the United States.\(^5\) What's more, such a figure might be conservative. The U.S. Labor Department estimated in 1975 that there were between 8 and 12 million illegal workers and their families in the United States.\(^6\)

By the end of 1975 Fernando de Baca, special assistant to President Gerald Ford for Hispanic and other minority groups, expressed the opinion that the Spanish-speaking were well on their way to replacing blacks as the nation's No. 1 minority. He added that blacks (who then totaled 22.6 million) were not growing as fast as the Hispanics. The White House official asserted that the birthrate of Hispanics was more than double that of American blacks. Additionally, the Hispanic people were using their immigration ceiling to the maximum, and were younger by more than seven years than the national average. The Spanish-speaking had a median age of 20.8 years while that of the nation as a whole was 28. According to de Baca, the total number of Hispanics in the United States ranged from 16 to 20 million.\(^7\)

Between 1950 and 1960 Mexican Americans increased at a rate of 4.1 percent annually. Meanwhile, the U.S. population as a whole was growing at a slow rate of 1.7 percent a year.\(^8\) What those figures say is that the Mexican American population was doubling every twenty years while the rest of the nation was taking seventy years to double. Thus the Hispanic were well on the way to becoming the largest ethnic group in the United States. By the end of 1975, only two other groups in addition to blacks were larger: the people of British background (29.5 million) and those of German origin (25.5 million).\(^9\)

Census Bureau figures on the Spanish-speaking are more conservative. According to a report issued in the fall of 1975, the Hispanic population had increased from 10.8 million in mid-1974 to 11.2 million. About 60 percent of Hispanic Americans come from Mexico; 15 percent, from Puerto Rico; and 7 percent, from Cuba. That means there are 6.7 million Mexican Americans, 1.6 million Puerto Ricans, and 780,000 Cubans. The same proportions cannot be projected to the higher estimate of 14.4 million because immigration is an important factor, and Cuban immigration has stopped and the Puerto Rican flow has reversed, while other Latin newcomers have increased dramatically. Estimates of the number of Dominicans in the United States range up to 400,000; of Haitians, 250,000; and of
Colombians, at least 500,000. According to Colombian sociologist Juana Castaño de Escobar, half a million Colombians emigrated to the United States between 1957 and 1975, including 60,000 qualified professionals.\textsuperscript{10}

The Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking reported in 1975 that the Spanish-speaking were 33 percent of the total population of the northeastern states, with heavy concentrations in New York, New Jersey, and Florida; 10 percent of the total population of the southcentral states, with heavy concentrations in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado; 10 percent of the total population of the midwestern states, with the majority of the Hispanics living in Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1972 the then Division for the Spanish-speaking of the United States Catholic Conference claimed that there were 11.4 million Hispanics in the country, breaking that down by regions as follows: the West, 3.28 million; Southcentral states, 3.25 million; the Midwest, 745,000; and the Northeast, 4.21 million.\textsuperscript{12} If we employ the same ratio of distribution for the 14.4 million total estimated by the Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking in 1975, the Northeast has 5.3 million Spanish-speaking; the western and southcentral regions, 4.04 million each; and the Midwest, 941,000.

In 1975 there were more than 1 million Puerto Ricans in New York City. Chicago had an estimated 500,000 Spanish-speaking, most of them Mexican Americans but including an estimated 125,000 Puerto Ricans. "The Great Lake State of Michigan has more than 300,000 Chicanos-Latinos," according to a newspaper report.\textsuperscript{13} San Francisco is said to have 18 different Latin groups. Miami has more than 400,000 Spanish-speaking people, the vast majority of whom write Cuban.

The United States has thus become the fifth largest Spanish-speaking nation in the world. Only Mexico, Spain, Colombia, and Argentina are larger in population and, if present growth trends continue, the United States might pass two of these nations.

The phenomenal growth of the Spanish-speaking people in the United States has been shaped by two main currents of migration. One has come from the Caribbean and has settled largely in the urban centers of the East and Midwest. The other comes from Mexico, which is among the fastest growing countries of the world. A third stream of migration comes from South America.
THE PUERTO RICANS

Puerto Ricans have been migrating to the United States since the beginning of the century. From 1908 to 1946 the average number of Puerto Ricans migrating to the mainland totaled 4000 a year. After World War II when commercial aviation opened economical routes to the island, the tide rose. From 1945 to 1961, 847,000 persons are estimated to have moved to the continental United States. From 1962 to 1968 inclusive, the inflow added up to 114,000. But beginning in 1969, every year except 1970 has registered an outflow back to the island. Between 1969 and 1974 the net reverse flow from the mainland to the island added up to 76,463.

Sociologists agree that the motivation for the Puerto Rican migration was strictly economic. Overcrowding of the island resulting from the large-scale acquisition of Puerto Rican land by North Americans is one reason given for the mass migration. Thirty-four years after General Miles led invading troops into San Juan in 1898, 80 percent of the land was in the hands of North Americans.

In 1953 when the U.S. economy was booming, 69,000 Puerto Ricans arrived on the mainland. But in 1954 when recession replaced expansion, only 2531 persons migrated to the mainland. Migration went up to 45,464 in 1955 and to 53,315 in 1956 as the economy improved. But in 1960 the number of new arrivals dropped to 16,298. The decrease was attributed to a better standard of living in Puerto Rico. Between 1955 and 1960 the annual per capita income in Puerto Rico went up from $427 to $565. Francisca Bou, assistant director of migration for the Department of Labor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, reported that "tremendous progress" has been achieved in the fields of housing, education, and public health. "For instance," she pointed out, "infant mortality has decreased from 113.4 in 1940 to 14.7 in 1959." Also life expectancy increased from 38 years in 1910 to 68 years in 1955. Literacy rose from 75 percent in 1950 to 86.6 percent in 1959.

Between 1940 and 1950 most Puerto Ricans who came to the mainland settled in New York. Only 2 percent moved beyond New York City. The reason was that New York was the city from which fixed-passerenger routes were established to Puerto Rico. Commercial aviation proved to be an air bridge between Puerto Rico and New York. Later this bridge was extended to Chicago and the rest of the Midwest.
The 1960 census showed that Puerto Ricans had spread to all fifty states. They were widely dispersed from east to west and from north to south. By then the number of new arrivals who chose New York City as their home had declined from 98 to 60 percent. Most Puerto Ricans who came to the mainland moved their residence permanently. However, temporary migrants were also brought in through agreements worked out with the Puerto Rican Department of Labor. But many people in the second group also became permanent residents after their work contracts expired.  

Though a small number of Puerto Ricans became farm workers, most of them settled in urban centers. The newcomers were not, however, from urban areas in Puerto Rico but from the countryside. A priest assigned to work with Puerto Ricans in Hartford, Connecticut, said that his people came “from rural, mountainous communities, unskilled and inexperienced in a mechanized society.” The Puerto Ricans acquired a wide variety of jobs in big cities in restaurants, clubs, hospitals, laundries, and factories. Since most of them were poor and had only a few years of schooling, their pay was often pitifully low.

The cultural shock of the move from a rural to a highly urban environment was great. Low economic potential, exploitation, and discrimination often forced new arrivals to settle in slums, with all attendant dangers to the family structure of the people. Sociologists spoke about the “slow disintegration of the old, solid family life” the Puerto Ricans knew at home.  

THE CUBANS

Large-scale Cuban migration to the United States began as soon as Fidel Castro entered Havana in triumph in January 1959 to topple the Batista regime. Food slowed to a trickle as Castro tightened his grip on the island, and as his difficulties with the United States increased. By the time of the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, when the United States and the Soviet Union went to the brink of war over the Soviet aim to station ballistic missiles in Cuba, most of the refugees had arrived.

The new arrivals were not poor people like the Puerto Ricans who traveled the air bridge from San Juan to New York or like the Mexicans who crossed the border to work in the agribusiness of California. Among the first wave of Cuban migrants were former government officials, physicians, dentists, teachers, engineers, owners of large sugar plantations and refineries, university students, professors, and even priests,
Sisters and Brothers. They were mostly well-to-do, but among them were also members of the working class.

The initial destination of the new arrivals was usually Miami, but from there they quickly spread to all parts of the nation. A government-financed program to resettle the refugees, administered through Catholic Charities, sought homes and jobs for Cubans all over the United States. But a large number remained in Miami. By 1975 there were 140,000 Cuban families in the Miami area, and they had greatly improved their economic condition. In the beginning as many as twenty-five groups were crammed into one home. Physicians washed dishes in Miami Beach hotels. Wives of former governmental officials made beds in motels, attorneys scrubbed floors at night, and other professionals drove taxi cabs. But fifteen years later the presidency of eleven of Dade County's ninety banks was held by Cubans. There were 1900 practicing physicians; another 2500 were in the process of revalidation of their licenses and working in hospitals. More than 12,000 businesses in Miami, one third of the total in the city, were in Cuban hands. A high percentage of service stations and clothing industries were run by Cubans. There were over 150 bank presidents. The Cuban community generated more than a billion and a half dollars in income annually.

THE MEXICANS

The largest wave of immigration between 1945 and 1975 came across the Mexican border. Official figures of the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service are not impressive. For instance, between 1945 and 1968 INS reports show that only 761,669 Mexicans were legally admitted to the United States. But at the same time countless Mexicans entered the country illegally. The 1953 INS report referred to the human tide of "wetbacks," as illegal immigrants were called, as its most serious problem. For every agricultural laborer admitted legally, the INS estimated that four aliens were apprehended by the Border Control. During that period -- between 1942 and 1954 -- hundreds of thousands of Mexican workers were brought in each year for seasonal work under the bracero program. This was an arrangement worked out between the U.S. and Mexican governments during World War II to alleviate an agricultural labor shortage in our country. Later the program was formalized by Congress in the controversial Public Law 68, which continued in effect until 1964. At its peak in 1956, the bracero program imported 445,197 Mexican agricultural workers.
If the bracero program was meant to control immigration after the wartime need was over, it failed. Border traffic has increased through the years as the economic gap between the United States and Mexico widened. By 1975 the total of legal crossings had increased to 140,000 a year. The estimate of illegal immigrants in the United States had climbed steadily through the years to a high of 12 million, though not all of them by any means were Mexicans. Deportations had also escalated. During the great roundups of the 1950s, an unprecedented 4 million were deported across the Mexican border. Deportations had continued. Harassment by law enforcement officers of anyone who looks Latin is increasing. Social workers report that immigration officers stand outside factories in the New York area and accost Latins to demand birth certificates. In Chicago the experience of being stopped by police officers and asked to prove citizenship is common for persons who look Mexican. “In effect,” said a WMAQ-TV editorialist in Chicago, “a person’s appearance allowed treatment as a second-class citizen.” Such abuse led the American Civil Liberties Union to file suit in federal court in Chicago. Judge Prentice Marshall ruled that agents may not stop people simply because they look Mexican. He ruled agents must get arrest warrants or have some real reason to believe that a person is in the country illegally.

Despite harassment and deportations, newcomers still arrived. In one plant visited by Department of Labor inspectors in Los Angeles, 430 out of 600 employees were illegals. It was estimated in 1974 that more than half of all workers in the textile industry in Los Angeles were in the same predicament.

Of course, illegal immigrants are not solely a Mexican problem. In 1975 the National Conference of Bishops of the Dominican Republic requested President Gerald R. Ford, President Balaguer, the pope, and the U.S. National Conference of Catholic Bishops to resolve the problem of 250,000 Dominicans who had come to the United States without documents. The New York Times reported that same year that many of the 250,000 Haitians in the United States were illegals.

Besides legal and illegal immigration and the seasonal importation of braceros, an increase in another kind of traffic also has taken place. Speaking before the annual meeting of the Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking, James Strauss, district director of the Texas Employment Commission in San Antonio, declared, “In the years of 1951 through 1955 the
issuance of general passports increased alarmingly.” He added that in 1951 about 7000 Mexicans came to work in the United States under general passports. These persons had a guarantee of employment in the country. By 1956 the number had increased to 58,000. According to Strauss, the San Antonio District of the Immigration Department, 95,568 Mexican citizens with legal visas to work in the United States registered in 1962. Such aliens could remain as long as they wished, provided they registered annually at their local post offices in the month of January. The Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking reported in 1961 that 230,000 such Mexicans with legal visas came to work in the United States that year. The advantage for employers guaranteeing a job to viseros, as these people were called, was that such workers were not under contract like the braceros. The viseros therefore could be paid most any wage. Further, the bracero program applied only to agriculture; viseros could work anywhere.

Still another type of entry into the United States is that of commuters, that is, persons who cross the border daily to work and return to their homes in Mexico at night. All that such aliens have to do is secure an I-151 card. Robert Sanchez, adviser on Latin American Affairs for the Texas AFL-CIO, told Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking that the influx of these commuters has been large, in 1955 alone, 55,000 cards were issued. Sanchez told the Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking:

“To get an idea of the magnitude of this human traffic, all one has to do is stand at the foot of the International Bridge linking the United States and Mexico at either the El Paso or Laredo border crossing points. Here one can observe thousands of human beings crossing into the United States every workday morning and then back into Mexico the same day afternoon.”

These movements of people across the border in turn generated other currents within the United States. The bracero program, in particular, was blamed for forcing domestic agricultural labor into the migrant stream. In 1961 the U.S. Department of Agriculture published a graph showing the distribution of farm laborers by states. It indicated, for instance, that in 1960 more than 100,000 agricultural jobs in Texas were held by braceros. Meanwhile, domestic farm workers by the thousands had to leave the state to go as far as Michigan to find work. “The [bracero] program has caused unemployment among citizen workers,” charged Archbishop Robert E. Lucey of
San Antonio. "It has kept down wages, it has enlarged the migrant stream and it has had adverse effects even on the braceros themselves." 36

THE EMPTY STRUGGLE

Thus the Hispanic people has spread north, east, and west, adding substantially to their numbers in all the agricultural states of the Northeast, Midwest, and Far West. It was the same search that brought them from Mexico: the quest for bread, for dignity, and for a livelihood.

In a 1975 issue of Encuentro, the Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking expressed for all Hispanics their motivation in coming to this country:

"We come from Cuba because our Christian beliefs were incompatible with emerging political beliefs, were our dignidad was suppressed, where our children had little, if any, opportunity for the future.

"We come from Puerto Rico to join our families already living here -- some for many years -- to better ourselves educationally and economically, to give our children more opportunities to grow and develop themselves as 'first class citizens' of our country.

"We come from Central and South America for more or less the same reasons -- political, educational, employment, better future for our children.

"We were born in the United States of Mexican American parents, yet suffer all the problems of immigrants, exiles in our own land because we cherish our culture, our language, our heritage." 37

The Secretariat described the Spanish-speaking in the United States as a minority with large families, poor homes, less educational opportunities, and work employment problems. In 1974 there were approximately 7.7 million school children with a limited ability to speak English. Ninety percent of them (6.9 million) were Spanish-speaking, but fewer than 5 percent had access to bilingual education. Thus it is not surprising that the attrition rate -- dropout and force-outs -- is higher for Spanish-speaking children than for any other groups. The national rate for Anglos is 20 percent, for blacks 40 percent, for Hispanics 55 percent and for Hispanic migrant children 85 percent. While 61.2 percent if the U.S. population completes high school and 93 percent of the graduates continue on to some form of higher
education, the Spanish-speaking complete only an average of 7.1 years of school, and only 5 to 7 percent of Hispanic high school graduates go on to college. Furthermore, only about 1 percent graduate from college.

The employment situation for Hispanic people is bleak. A study made by Centro de Estudios Chicanos at South Bend, Indiana, in 1974 reported that the jobless rate among the Spanish-speaking was 27 percent, that is, more than three times the national rate. But in 1975 the Midwest Council of La Raza asserted that there was evidence that the rate of unemployment had climbed even higher. The council proposed a massive, emergency public-works program on a national scale to combat unemployment: “Many of the migrants whom we helped settle were the last ones hired and due to their low seniority, were the first ones to be let go during the recent recession.”

Willie Velásquez, director of the Industrial & Service Employees Center in San Antonio, Texas, stated in 1973 that Spanish-speaking skilled workers in Albuquerque were getting $1,000 less than Anglos doing the same job. In Detroit the difference between Mexican American and Anglo wages in the same crafts was $2,000. The median income for a Spanish-speaking family in the United States was then $7,548 annually, as compared with $10,000 for the United States population as a whole. “Our families are larger than the typical Anglo family,” Mr. Velásquez said. “More people work to earn less.” One fourth of all Spanish-speaking families live at poverty incomes or below; 28 percent of Mexican Americans are in the poverty-income class; and in the Southwest that percentage increases to 30 percent.

The Spanish-speaking, along with blacks, are “virtually absent from the upper echelons of management” in the 106 largest corporations of the Chicago area, according to a 1973 study prepared by Professor Russell Barta of Mundelein College for the National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs in Washington, D.C. Only two corporations had officers of Spanish-speaking origin. And a reader of Maryknoll magazine claimed in a 1975 letter to the editor that he had wrecked his chances for promotion by protesting the undeserved low ratings given to Hispanic employees at a multinational corporation that kept them from advancing up the corporate ladder.

Bishop Patricio Flores of San Antonio said in 1971 that the Mexican American in the United States finds himself or herself in one of three categories. In the first are fewer than 5 percent of the people, that is, the Mexican American who has a good
education and has succeeded in his or her business enterprise and thus joined the American middle class.

He now lives on the other side of town, has purchased or is paying for a $40,000 home and associates only with other professionals, Mexican American or otherwise, and he has managed to move into another world:

"In the process of being absorbed into the middle class, some Mexican Americans have forgotten their dreams, ideals, aspirations, and the obstacles they had to overcome when they were poor. Today they find that identification with the poor endangers their newly won status. Thus they often claim not to understand the problems of the poor in lower brackets. But though they may want to forget their origins, language, and culture, upper-class Mexican Americans are not allowed to forget that they are "Spanish-speaking" or "Mexican Americans" by their Anglo neighbors. "These are caught between the Mexican American they do not care to identify with and the Anglo-American who does not allow them to identify with Anglos," Bishop Flores declared.

The second category takes in 10 percent of Mexican Americans. These are people Bishop Flores calls "the sleeping giant just now beginning to walk." They are the Mexican Americans in high schools, colleges, and universities who know that they must persevere if they are to bring about change. They understand that they have to get into politics, seek economic development, and acquire power. "They are opening doors into every walk of American life," Bishop Flores said. "These have gone to Vietnam and died in great numbers, not understanding what rights they have fought for but asking questions and making demands." These young people will take over, at least in Mexican American communities, as educated leaders and as interested and concerned citizens. They do not want to move across town, but prefer to stay in the barrios to improve the social, economic, and educational structures there. "These are the ones who have been moving forward in spite of much opposition," Bishop Flores said. "These are the ones who have been telling us, the Church, that they want the Church to move with them and give encouragement and direction, but that they will move forward with or without us."

The third category consists of 85 percent of the Mexican American people. They find themselves 120 years behind the times in every aspect of life. "For years and in every area, they have toiled under conditions and handicaps unknown to others.
who have been more fortunate. Not only are they not catching up, but every day they are falling further behind,” Bishop Flores declared. These people were peones in Mexico. Though they have been in the United States for generations, their life has not changed measurably. “These are the voiceless, the powerless, who until recently were for the most part farm-migrant, low paid laborers,” Bishop Flores added. Now a great number have moved into cities, but little has been done to help them adjust to city life. They live in dilapidated ghetto housing. “It is not unusual to find Mexican Americans living in dwellings far below the standard of human dignity,” the bishop remarked. They are barred from many jobs on the basis that they do not qualify because they do not speak English well or lack education. ‘Living conditions and poor wages increase health problems,” Bishop Flores said. “People are ill because they are poor, and they become even poorer because they are ill and the accumulated poverty engenders in its turn more sickness.”

**THE MIGRANT WORKERS**

There are about 2.4 million farm workers in the United States, of whom a high percentage are Hispanics. In California, for instance, 800,000 of the state’s estimated 3.5 million Hispanic people are farm workers. A questionnaire sent to 161 Catholic dioceses by the Division for the Spanish-speaking in 1974 revealed the presence of some 630,000 migrant workers. Of the total, 71 percent were Mexican Americans, 8 percent Puerto Ricans, 15 percent blacks, 3 percent Anglos, and 3 percent a combination of other groups. The Diocese of Brownsville alone reported 100,000 migrants.

Of all the Hispanics, the migrant workers have the worst plight. The Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization describes them (and other such workers) in the following way:

“If you were a farm worker, you would be paid around $1,500 a year. If everybody in your family worked, you might make $2,700. Many days you would not work. None would be available. Your life expectancy would be 49. Your children would be more than twice as likely to die at birth, and your wife in giving birth. Your family’s chance of catching influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis or some other infectious disease would be three times the national average. You could probably never have reached eighth grade. You’d be lucky to have two rooms in which to lodge your family. You might have some electricity, but probably no toilet, sink, bathtub, and shower.”
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In the early 1970s the Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame and then chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, observed that migrant farm workers in the Rio Grande Valley were living under conditions close to peonage or slavery. Testimony presented by Dr. Raymond Wheeler before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor on 10 July 1970 included the following statistics about migrants:

"His infant and maternal mortality rate is 125 percent higher than the national average. The death rate from influenza and pneumonia is 200 percent higher than the national rate and from tuberculosis, 250 percent higher than the national rate. The accident rate among migrant farm workers is 300 percent higher than the national rate." 

Conditions have not improved with the passing of time. Back in 1958 Archbishop Lucey asserted the minimum living wage for common labor in Texas was "somewhere around $1.40 per hour with a special allowance to those who have numerous children." However, agricultural workers in the Rio Grande Valley were getting 50 cents an hour. "How can growers in Texas do this to their fellow American citizens?" asked the prelate:

"How can they expect a human being to work eight hours for $4, pay his cost of transportation and supply his family with food, clothing, and shelter on such a wage? Defrauding the laborer of his hire is one of the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance." 

Despite such outcries, the wages of agricultural workers did not improve. In 1962 the Farm Labor Bulletin of the Texas Employment Commission still listed jobs at 40 and 60 cents an hour. Ironically, the braceros, or Mexican nationals, were getting better pay than U.S. citizens. The Department of Labor that year set hourly wage rates for braceros: $1 an hour for all states except Arizona, where it was 95 cents; Georgia and New Mexico, 75 cents; Texas, 70 cents; Tennessee, 65 cents; and Arkansas, 60 cents. Because there was no minimum wage for agricultural labor in the United States, American workers received much less than the state minimum. In the case of wetbacks or viseros, the workers received "any wage the employers desires to pay."

As far as housing is concerned the migrant faces a "particularly acute problem." Two thirds of the nation's substandard housing is in rural areas and small towns where farm
workers live. Migrant housing, both at home and on the road, does not meet in many cases minimum health and safety standards. A study published by the Washington State Council of Churches in 1969 concluded that substandard housing in migrant camps in Washington clearly contributed to poor migrant health:

"Toilet and washing facilities were often unclean; row cabins frequently did not provide sufficient ventilation or fly screening, and migrants had no place to keep food fresh.

"The study concluded that all these conditions increased the danger of infectious diseases, snf produced other health problems."  

By far the biggest tragedy about migrant farm worker, however, is that it robs children of their future. Manuel P. Servin wrote that one-fourth of the children between six and nine years of age and four-fifths of those between ten and fourteen worked in the fields alongside their parents. Children over fourteen were considered regular workers. These patterns have continued at least until recent years. It was true in my own family. My brothers and I had to work in the fields of northern Colorado from the age of seven onward. The Reverend William D. O'Connor, executive secretary of the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish-speaking, reported in 1956:

"Children of migrants are still missing weeks and even months of their schooling and many communities are doing nothing to remedy the situation. Political leaders, for the most part, are not interested in this minority because they do not part, are not interested in this minority because they know most of them do not take out their poll tax and consequently do not vote."  

Improvements come slowly for migrants, despite the growing awareness in recent years of their plight. Perhaps symbolic of how their oppression continues was an item which appeared in the New York Times in the fall of 1974. A grower’s crew leader was charged by a federal grand jury with holding four Puerto Rican laborers in involuntary servitude. The crew leader was charged under a rarely used post-Civil War law.

THE ILLEGALS

No people suffer more than immigrants without documents, the so-called illegals. Contrasting the treatment of non-citizens in the United States with the hospitality proffered
to Vietnamese refugees. Commonweal commented that illegal Mexican aliens "are subjected many times to hunts resembling those for runaway slaves."\(^5\) Ricardo Parra, executive director of the Institute for Urban Studies of the Midwest Council of La Raza said that the "violations to the dignity of man, human and civil rights, due process of law, warrant an investigation by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the United Nations."\(^6\) Para listed a number of injustices suffered by illegal workers:

1. Illegals pay more taxes than all other residents or workers "because the U.S. Internal Revenue Service denies workers without visas the right to deduct the costs of supporting and sustaining their legitimate dependents even though these are United States citizens or permanent residents." Illegal workers are forced to fill out their tax forms and to pay taxes as if they were all single, charged Parra.

2. Workers without visas cannot collect unemployment insurance benefits or Social Security payments. Even though they have paid for the benefits through regular weekly payroll deductions, they are denied benefits when jobless, old, or sick.

3. Illegal workers have no recourse when employers refuse to pay their wages. "When these workers complain, they are deported," commented Parra.

4. Illegal workers are denied disability insurance benefits. Payments for which deductions have been made from their paychecks.

   Doctors often ask workers to produce their visas before certifying payment:

5. Workers without visas must pay higher hospital, medical and drug bills at county hospitals because they are billed as non residents who must pay higher rates.

6. Children without visas cannot get school or college assistance grants or scholarships or school-programmed jobs. \(^5\)

   "No one is abused more than those who are here without documents," said Bishop Flores at a workshop at Notre Dame in 1975. "They are abused in so many different ways, in horrible ways."\(^6\) He has had the task of trying to get employers to make good on worthless checks they issued to illegal workers. Once the bishop had twenty such checks signed by employers. But the illegals could not complain to the police because they would face deportation.

   Persons without documents are not necessarily noncitizens. Bishop Flores told about U.S. citizens who faced deportation
because they could not locate baptismal certificates. (Many had no birth certificate because they were not born in hospitals, where such matters are automatically handled. Midwives in barrios do not make out birth certificates.) One case in which he was asked to help involved some Mexican Americans who were in jail in Wisconsin, accused of being illegal aliens. Their baptismal certificates could not be located. Bishop Flores had great difficulty locating the baptismal records because the individuals had been baptized at a mission chapel, and the visiting priest had taken the records to his home church. The family, with Bishop Flores' help, was finally able to furnish the proof of birth in the United States and thus avoid deportation.59

The Border Patrol and Texas Rangers have followed a tradition of repression, especially during massive deportations like Operation Wetback in the mid-1950s. According to one historian, people were put through humiliating tests of citizenship to prove they were not deportable. Such harassment is said to happen frequently as the Border Patrol attempts to meet its responsibility.60

In the spring and early summer of 1973, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) again launched large-scale raids on illegals in Los Angeles. Agents accosted brown-skinned people at work, on the streets, and in schools. They also broke into homes without the formality of search warrants. The American Civil Liberties Union of southern California filed suit on behalf of some of the victims, charging "mass arrests without probable cause, physical assaults on persons and property, forcible entry into homes and subsequent destructions of personal property without justifiable cause and other acts of violence, brutality, harassment, humiliation, and intimidation."61 The suit was not filed on behalf of aliens but of citizens caught in the dragnet. Here is what happened to some of these citizens, according to the American Civil Liberties Union.

Yolanda Loya, born in Texas, was forcibly removed by Immigration agents and deported without due process. Max Anthony and Gerald Duarte, both U.S. citizens, were approached in their home by raiding agents, and their mother was ordered to produce proof of their citizenship. An agent assaulted one son, took the legal documents, and then left. Hours later other agents came by and shipped the entire family to Tijuana, Mexico.
Velia Limón heard her neighbor, Bertha Duarte, scream. As she went to see what was happening, she was assaulted by INS agents. Rogelio Buenas was accosted at the office of the Autonomous Center for Social Action (CASA), which aids immigrants. He was grabbed and handcuffed. When he asked to see the arrest warrant, he was told none was needed because he was a wetback.

The ACLU suit was supported by affidavits from citizens who saw twenty INS agents raid an apartment building. Witnesses said that the Immigration officers entered apartments without knocking. They shoved people of Mexican descent into vans parked on the street. "One 14 year old boy," said one affidavit, "was treated extremely rough by these officers. Although he was not resisting or struggling, the boy was handcuffed and pushed around very harshly. One of the officers had a gun pointed at him."

The American Civil Liberties Union said in its statement: Too much of the history of Mexican-American relations has been replete with arrests, beatings, killings and deportations of millions of persons with brown skin. 62

Under the laws of the United States, say officials of CASA, every person, whether a citizen or not, has the right to refuse to answer questions asked by Immigration agents before he or she has had an opportunity to talk to a lawyer. Immigrants have a right to deny entry into their homes without a warrant. They have a right to a hearing before they can be deported. They have a right to go free on bail pending an immigration hearing. 63 All these rights are frequently trampled by INS agents during mass roundups such as occurred in 1973, the mid-1950s, and during the Great Depression. Historians say that in the 1930s legal process was totally ignored. Whole families were summarily notified to pack their belongings for the long ride back "home." More than half of those deported were citizens of the United States. 64

As a priest and author, Mark Day has been in close touch with immigrants without documents. He believes that the problem will never be solved by deportation raids and repressive legislation. Such measures have failed in the past and will fail again, in his view, because none of these solutions have sought to remove the stigma of illegality that makes undocumented workers so vulnerable to exploitation. He writes that the United States welcomes aliens when the country is prospering, but
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deports them when the economy hits a slump. "They are not given proper visas; they are kept in limbo, manipulated and denied access to our normal economic and social life."

Days attacks the popular belief that Mexican immigrants will flood the U.S. labor market.

"This isn't true. The reasons that undocumented workers are sometimes favored over domestic workers is that they don't have papers and can be exploited. If they were on an equal footing with domestic workers, such competition would cease and domestic workers would have the edge because they speak the language and are generally more skilled. He adds that fewer immigrants would come because there would be fewer jobs. Equal footing also would mean fairer treatment by employers for all workers -- citizen and noncitizen alike."66

Another myth Day attacks is that the aliens are entirely unrelated to the Mexican American people. On the contrary, immigrants often have relatives who are citizens. What affects the alien touches the citizen, too, Day contends. He cites as an example a bill passed by the California legislature a number of years ago that penalized employers hiring undocumented workers. The bill was declared unconstitutional in a short time, but in the meantime large numbers of brown-skinned people were fired indiscriminately by jump employers.66

Illegals have been exploited not only to keep wages down, but also to break strikes. The history of agricultural strife in California abounds in examples of illegals brought in to replace striking domestic workers. Such a situation continues. Gilbert Padilla, secretary-treasurer of the United Farm Workers, told a church bicentennial committee in the fall of 1975:

"Today, 90 percent of our workers are not in the fields of California ... Those jobs are now taken by people who have been brought in by labor contractors from Mexico to break our strike to take the jobs away from our workers. We haven't today won one strike. All the strikes we have had were broken by labor contractors bringing illegals in to break our strikes. The immigration department knows that; it knows it very well.67

Immigration authorities deny the United Farm Workers' charge of complicity with growers to bring in illegal aliens to break strikes. "Nothing could be farther from the truth," INS commissioner Leonard Chapman testified before a House subcommittee investigating charges of corruption in the Immigration Service. He said that enforcement of immigration
aws is limited only by the small number of officers who carry out INS responsibilities and by inadequate funds. The House Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs sympathized with Chapman’s views, and asked President Gerald Ford for $50 million to hire 2200 additional INS officers.68 Whether a wall can be established between a people, a culture, and a land that are the same on both sides of a border is doubted by many historians. Carey McWilliams made the point back in 1949 that the Mexicans coming to Southwest of the United States are not leaving home and going to a foreign environment, for the land, people, and culture are the same as those they have known all their lives.69 The fortunes of the United States are tied to those of the people who live along its borders.

PREJUDICE: THE PERSISTENT POISON

Writing about Latin Americans in Texas in 1946, Pauline Kibbe, an American sociologist, catalogued some of the inequitable conditions they suffered. She pointed out that Latins were often refused service in public places, denied the right to vote in some counties, kept off juries, and not permitted to rent or own real estate in some cities. She cited also the terrorism of law-enforcement officers. Economically Latins were victims of unfair employment practices, discrimination by both management and labor unions, and exploitation in agriculture. They were thus condemned to substandard housing that lacks proper sanitary facilities and services, to an improper diet, and to malnutrition and its consequent high incidence of tuberculosis, diarrhea, and other communicable diseases.70

Kibbe stated that there was arbitrary segregation against Latins in public schools. Working children could not attend school, and there was lack of interest among school administrators in encouraging their attendance. Teachers were improperly trained. School buildings and equipment were inferior. She blamed prejudice and lack of understanding for such injustices, and said that there was a “failure to appraise properly the important cultural, social, and human contributions made by Latin Americans, especially Mexicans, to the greatness of this State and nation.”71

Perhaps no group has been so victimized by prejudice as braceros brought from Mexico for seasonal work. The Reverend Joseph H. Crosthwait, executive secretary of the Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking, said in 1958 that braceros were “often treated more like cattle than like men.” After visits
to migrant and bracero camps in thirty-one states, he remarked that camps for braceros had "the atmosphere of a concentration camp." Even so, bracero housing was better than that of domestic migrant workers, whose living conditions Father Crosthwait called "a national disgrace."\(^{72}\)

In that era there was a self-justifying rationale by the majority to justify discrimination. Lyle Saunders, assistant professor of sociology at the University of New Mexico, expressed it this way:

"There is a widely held belief that Spanish-speaking people are stupid, a belief which grows in part out of the inability of wetbacks and certain citizens to understand English even when it is shouted. 'Of course, some of them are bright,' a Border Patrol Inspector told us, 'but it is about the same kind of brightness that you'd find in a trained dog.' That belief, of course, is very useful in explaining why so many of the 'Mexicans' drop out of school about the third grade; why so few ever learn English; why so many are found in unskilled, low-paying jobs; why they cannot be trusted with full political responsibility; why they have to be given different treatment than that accorded citizens in general."\(^{73}\)

Much progress was made against discrimination during the years that followed. Hispanic people could no longer be denied service in places for public accommodation. Fair employment laws were passed. The desegregation of schools was ordered by a historic Supreme Court decision. Yet in 1971 Father Alberto Carillo of PADRES demonstrated that, in essence, little had changed. In a speech at the PADRES national convention, he said that Chicanos were the most uneducated persons in the U.S. -- "illiterate in two languages." Politically, Chicanos were legally disenfranchised. Though only 5 percent of the national population, Chicanos represented 21 percent of the casualties in Vietnam. They lived in the worst housing, were "more welcome in jail than in a college classroom," lived in a system of "educational abortion and economic atrocity," and were "programmed to poverty because indeed opportunity and poverty in this country are ethnic."\(^{74}\)

On the surface, improvements have come. "One cannot say that because I can go into any motel [or] restaurant, there is no problem," Father Carillo affirmed. Discrimination was no longer of an overt type, which is easily recognizable and easy to fight. The discrimination Chicanos feel is systematic and inadvertent.
Leo Grebler and other historians wrote in the early 1970s that Pauline Kibbe's observations were still valid.

"With rare exception, Mexican Americans are without due representation on school boards, city councils, or other governmental or quasi-governmental units. And her analysis of the reasons for this state of affairs is also sound today."

These same authors cited findings of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican Affairs to the effect that apprenticeship training controlled by labor unions and employers still barred minorities. They cited also the gerrymandering of electoral districts to block the election of minority representatives on legislative bodies.75

Sabine R. Ulibarri, professor of modern languages at the University of New Mexico, has perhaps summed up the plight of the Hispanic people best:

"A dynamic and aggressive Anglo culture has come between him and his past and is uprooting him from the soil, cutting him off from his ancestors, separating him from his culture. Very little is being done to facilitate his transition from the culture of his ancestors, whose voice is silent, to the culture of the majority, whose voice makes his laws and determines his destiny. As his language fades, the Hispanic's identity with a history, with a tradition, with a culture, becomes more nebulous with each passing day. His identity as an Anglo is not yet in sight. There is no assurance that such an identity is possible or even desirable."76

HISPANICS AND THE CHURCH

A reporter by the name of Stan Twardy wrote an article in the Oklahoma Courier of 30 November 1962 that eloquently described the status of Hispanics in the Catholic Church in the following words:

"A wandering and vagabond Christ is being spurned by millions of church-going and otherwise devout American Catholics. He comes to them as a hungry, ragged, and socially ostracized Spanish-speaking citizen or immigrant. He meets them across the whole width and breadth of these United States and sometimes he brushes shoulders with them in church on Sundays.

"But after these fleeting encounters He withdraws to the unspeakable migrant slums of Texas, the Puerto Rican Harlems of New York, the Cuban refugee encampments in Florida, the..."
filthy shacks and shanties of Oklahoma cotton gins and all other barns, chicken-houses, pigsties and barracks where Spanish-speaking migrant workers live during the cotton, fruit, and vegetable season.”

Thirteen years later a Mexican American priest and a Puerto Rican priest asked a question that touched the same theme:

“Why have the Spanish-speaking been so invisible to the American Church when they were the first Catholics here, practicing the faith for more than 150 years before the Constitution allowed freedom of religion?”

The Hispanics were “invisible” in many ways. Until 5 May 1970 they were totally absent from the episcopacy, a condition that had prevailed since the Southwest became part of the United States -- in 1836 in the case of Texas, and in 1846 for the remainder of the territory. In early 1975 there were five Hispanic bishops, but only one was the ordinary of a diocese -- Archbishop Robert F. Sánchez of Santa Fe. Bishop Juan Arzube, auxiliary in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, is an Ecuadorian who migrated to the United States before becoming a priest. Two others are Mexican Americans, Bishop Patricio Flores, auxiliary of San Antonio, and Bishop Gilbert Chávez, auxiliary of San Diego. Bishop René Gracida, initially the auxiliary of Miami, became the ordinary of the Diocese of Tallahassee-Jacksonville, late in 1975.

The Spanish-speaking were acknowledged by Catholic and Protestant leaders alike to be at least 85 percent Catholic and perhaps even as high as 90 percent. That meant that if the total Hispanic population were 14.4 percent of the U.S. population as claimed by the Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, there were at least 12 million Hispanic Catholics in the United States. If the total was 16 million, then there were at least 13.6 million Spanish-speaking Catholics. The Catholic population of the entire nation was 48.7 million. Thus the Hispanic people were between 25 and 28 percent of their goal.

Visibility would have been maximum if one fourth of the bishops, priests, Brothers, and Sisters in the United States were Hispanic. But the five Hispanic bishops were only 1.6 percent of the total number of bishops (approximately 310). The two hundred native Spanish-speaking priests were only three tenths of 1 percent of the total number of priests (58,909). Thr 961 Hispanic Sisters were only seven tenths of 1 percent of the
135,225 nuns in the country. The 120 Hispanic Brothers were only 1.39 percent of the 8,625 Brothers in the nation.²⁹

Therefore it was painfully evident that the Spanish-speaking were almost totally invisible in the institutional church. Furthermore, the future looked bleak. A survey of Hispanic candidates for the priesthood in U.S. seminaries and/or houses of formation for the 1974-75 academic year turned up 733.³⁰ However, 418 of them were in high school, 179 in college, and 136 in theology. Even in the unlikely possibility that all 733 became priests, they would still be only 4.3 percent of all U.S. seminarians enrolled that year. In theology Hispanics were only 2.7 percent of the total.

Hispanics also had a low visibility in parish councils, diocesan boards, and church commissions. But the absenteeism that really troubled religious leaders was that of the laity. Hispanic people were staying away from the worship life of this church. Cardinal Timothy Manning of Los Angeles, in a report presented to the annual meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in November 1974, stated that many of the Spanish-speaking seem to be losing their faith.³¹ In a more dramatic fashion Bishop Flores compared the situation to a pot of coffee on the stove, "It is already boiling, and if it isn't taken off the fire in time, it will boil over and all will be lost to the Church."³² According to Bishop Flores, only 5 percent of Hispanic youth attend Mass, compared with 90 to 95 percent who attended twenty-five years ago. A sociologist from Michigan State University who made a study of recently settled migrants in 1973 found that 30 percent of 274 former migrant families had left the Catholic faith.

Bishop Gilbert Chávez reported that in the San Diego Diocese only 15 to 20 percent of the Spanish-speaking go to Mass regularly. Bishop Juan Arzube gave similar figures for Hispanic attendance in the Los Angeles Archdiocese. Lupe Anguiano, director of the Southwest regional office for the Spanish-speaking, affirmed that the majority of the Hispanic people do not go to Mass each Sunday.³³ Robert Sam Anson, writing about Puerto Ricans in New York, expressed the opinion that only the very young and the very old went to Mass -- only 15 percent of the faithful.³⁴

This lack of participation was interpreted as a signal that the Spanish-speaking were ripe for evangelization by Protestant denominations. Press releases of Dr. Billy Graham's three-day crusade to the Spanish-speaking of New York in 1960 claimed
that 50,000 Hispanics in that city were “unchurched,” which meant -- according to Nathan Glazier and Daniel Patrick Moynihan -- that New York’s Protestant community considered “most of the field available for sowing.”

Yet the Hispanic people did not see themselves as anything but Catholic. Dr. Jorge Lara-Braud wrote that 95 percent of Mexican Americans regard the Catholic church as theirs. Father Virgil Elizondo, president of the Mexican American Cultural Center of San Antonio, reported that “The Puerto Rican culture is profoundly Christian, but they (the Puerto Ricans—do not tend to express their Christianity through the religious practices which are typically ‘Yankee’ or ‘North American.’” Archbishop Robert Sánchez, speaking about the Hispanics of the Southwest, declared, “They haven’t been going to Church every Sunday because they couldn’t understand the liturgy or the language, but they are very intense Catholics nonetheless.” They and other Hispanic leaders agreed that the disillusion of the Spanish-speaking was not with their faith but with the ill service they had received from church leaders.

Bishop Patricio Flores, perhaps the most articulate and outspoken yet loyal critic of the church, put the problem this way:

“How many times when the Spanish-speaking person needed the warmth of the Church the most, the doors of its institutions closed to him.

“Not too long ago, it was common for Churches to have signs saying ‘Mexicans not allowed’ or ‘The last four benches reserved for Mexicans.’ Perhaps today there are no signs: they have been removed, but there are still unremoved attitudes that are very evident and easily sensed. In some parishes, even though the physical doors have been opened, the North American people have not opened the door to their hearts.

“In many visits to the Spanish-speaking, how often do the migrants tell me that the Churches do not want to allow them Masses in Spanish, or use of the parish halls for meetings, or, if they do loan the hall, someone comes to fumigate it even before the meeting is over in order to deodorize it of the Mexican and Puerto Rican odor.”

On the same theme Father Elizondo declared that the Christian who is not Spanish-speaking has not accepted the Hispano as his brother. “He has not made an effort to
understand, accept, love, and pay just wages to his Spanish-speaking brother.”

The First National Encuentro, historic meeting held in Washington in 1972 to begin drawing up a pastoral plan for the Spanish-speaking nation wide, reached the following major conclusion:

“Generally Spanish-speaking Catholics in the U.S. feel isolated from the official structures and institutions of the Church and recognized a long history of lack of knowledge about and sensitivity toward Spanish-speaking traditions on the part of the American Church.”

Father Alberto Carillo of PADRES gave the Hispanic reaction to that lack of knowledge and sensitivity on the part of the official church: If our people are not in the mainstream of Catholicism in this country it is because the Church has not been relevant to them...They have not been given the dignity of being accepted for what they are, what they wish to be.

A HISTORY OF ISOLATION

Ignorance and lack of sensitivity were not accidental, but the long range consequences of segregation, isolation, and discrimination. Leo Grebler and his fellow historians wrote that the formation of segregated congregations was a notable strategy among both Catholics and Protestants. Segregation was de facto among Catholics and de jure among Protestants. Separate churches existed through the 1940s and even into the 1950s. Large communities had one church for the English-speaking, another for the Spanish-speaking. In small communities that had only one church, there were separate Masses for the Spanish-speaking, and woe to Chicanos who dared go to the Anglo Mass! A survey of pastors in Los Angeles and San Antonio acknowledged past prejudice and discrimination. According to Grobler, “Mexicans were told by ‘Anglo’ pastors to go to their own church.” In some places Mexican church was built close by so that Mexicans “would have some place to go” since they were not wanted in the Anglo church. But all claimed that the discrimination had ceased.

The Spanish-speaking were excluded in other ways. In 1948, for instance, only 30 percent of parishes in Los Angeles in Mexican areas had parochial schools, compared with 58 percent for all parishes. Not until the Communist scare of the early 1950s was more interest shown in school building in heavily
Mexican areas, but the heavy emphasis placed on Americanization was a new injustice: the attempt to strip the Spanish-speaking of their culture. In Detroit Archbishop Mooney tried to destroy the sense of community of his Mexican parishioners. Carey McWilliams wrote that he “strongly discouraged development of group-consciousness.”

Some of the Spanish-speaking were simply not served by the church — the legacy of more than a hundred years of discouraging Spanish-speaking leadership. A survey in Arkansas in 1956 revealed that there was only one Spanish-speaking priest to care for thirty thousand braceros who had contracted to work in the state. The previous year there had been no Spanish-speaking priests to minister to tens of thousands of braceros in Arkansas.

The attitudes engendered by discrimination and exclusion lingered into the 1970s. Father Donald Hessler, a Maryknoll missioner who visited thirty U.S. cities to establish contacts with Hispanos, reported that contact between Anglos and Spanish-speaking Catholics was minimal. Because of racism Anglos tended to identify more with the poor overseas than with those at home. “There is the feeling that the Spanish-speaking person has nothing for me,” he said.

According to a 1971 report of a pastoral encuentro in New York, the Spanish-speaking were not welcomed or accepted by the clergy or the laity in some parishes. “When a Mass in Spanish is permitted to be celebrated, it comes across as if it was a special favor granted by the pastor — something extra instead of one of the rights of the Spanish-speaking community.”

Cultural conflict left many suspended between two worlds. David Gómez, a former Paulist priest, wrote:

“I became a withdrawn person living on the periphery of the white world and wanting to have less and less to do with the brown world. And having been taught Mexican good manners at home I waited to be invited into the white world which I saw as all-important and superior to my brown world. But no one in the white world would invite me in. I should have realized that the Anglo-white promise of acceptance and equality was a total lie and a double-cross, but still I held out hope. So I waited and waited, and gradually waiting became a way of existence — existing in neither the white world nor the brown. I was indeed a “Mexican American,” a hyphenated person who was somehow both Mexican and American yet neither a Mexican nor an American in any clearly defined sense.”
Gómez, like many other Hispanics who had wandered far over a cultural Sinai, solved his dilemma by returning once more to his own culture, for the Spanish-speaking community had never ceased to exist. Every tactic to destroy the culture failed. "To the question of whether the Americanizing goal of the Catholic Church has been achieved, the answer is an unqualified no," wrote Jorge Lara-Braud. Culture flowed across the border even more freely than people. And even though the 1970s found 90 percent of Mexican Americans with citizenship in the United States, at least 65 percent retained Spanish as their primary language at home. The culture was alive and well.

A NEW VISION

"Waves and still more waves have passed over the Spanish-speaking people, but they are still as firmly rooted in the Southwest as a forest of Joshua trees." So wrote Carey McWilliams admiringly in 1949. But by the late 1960s and early 1970s, McWilliams' forest was a little grove compared with what had come into existence. The forest had not only spread nationwide, but the trees were no longer bent and stunted by an oppressive environment -- at least psychologically. The Hispanic people recognized the uniqueness of their mestizo origin. "We are not merely transplanted Europeans, but truly a Mestizo people and as such a beautifully unique people," Father Virgil Elizondo proudly proclaimed at the First National Encuentro. "Recognizing our uniqueness, there is a growing determination to preserve, perpetuate, and share with our fellow citizens the substance of our culture and our language."

In pointing out the tremendous disproportion between the size of the Spanish-speaking population and the small number of Hispanic religious leaders, the conclusions committee of the First National Encuentro indicated that their criticism was not a racist act: It is deeply rooted in the conviction that every people has a right to self-determination and that the most effective instrumentality of development of a people is an indigenous leadership.

The hunger for liberation crystalized into a critical consciousness among the Spanish-speaking. In analyzing their place in the church, they found that no other minority was so deprived of leaders. Black Catholics, a tiny minority of eight hundred thousand and therefore a fifteenth as large a population as Hispano Catholics, had almost as many priests (185), almost three times as many Brothers (300) and forty more
nuns (1000). Blacks had one priest for every 4300 black Catholics. While that ratio is not good compared to that of the U.S. Catholic as a whole -- one priest for every 800 people -- it is much better than that of the Spanish-speaking -- one priest for every 61,000 Hispanic Catholics.

The Spanish-speaking also found that a minority of 8.2 million Catholics of Irish ancestry -- 17 percent of the total Catholic population -- held 56 percent of the episcopal posts. Furthermore, this minority was not disposed either locally or nationally to surrender any of its hegemony over the bishoprics. "The one characteristic of the present New York which does not seem likely to change during the next generation is its Irishness," wrote Glaser and Moynihan in 1970. Furthermore, when Mexican Americans in Brownsville, Texas, demanded in the late 1960s a Mexican American bishop for their almost totally Spanish-speaking diocese, an Irish bishop curtly told them they had to "wait."

The Spanish-speaking also asked whether their own religious leaders were being assigned to the Hispanic ministry. A survey of Spanish-speaking Brothers revealed that only 8 percent of the respondents were working full-time for their own people. Only 21 percent were in part-time ministry for the Spanish-speaking. In the survey, twenty-five listed their apostolate as the Spanish-speaking ministry, three as the migrant ministry, and one as the United Farm Workers. That means that only 3 percent were engaged in a full-time apostolate for the Hispanic people. Twelve others said they were in bi-lingual education. Perhaps some of the other Brothers -- the 351 teachers, 146 religious educators, and 118 administrators -- also had some involvement with the Spanish-speaking, but since only 5 percent of Hispanic children go to Catholic schools, it is doubtful that many could say they were in ministry to the Spanish-speaking.

Spanish-speaking priests who felt the resurgence of their culture and wanted to work for their own people encountered roadblocks. Bishop Flores recalled in an article in Serra magazine:

"I became a priest because I felt that the best way I could serve my people was by being a priest. I felt that I understood their language and culture, yet it was very difficult to understand the attitude of my superiors.

"For example, the only other Mexican-American priest in the history of our diocese was ordained nine years prior to me
and he had not yet been assigned to a Mexican-American parish. When I was ordained I was sent to a parish where I was asked not to use Spanish to communicate with people who did not understand English. In other areas, by the time in a Mexican-American priest's career when he is permitted to work with his own people, he has forgotten both the language and much of the cultural customs.”

Father Alberto Gallegos, a Servite assigned to Chicago, encountered the same kind of resistance when he and two other Hispanic priests asked if they could not work as a team in the Spanish-speaking community. The bishop's committee approved the proposal. "They were happy we wanted this," wrote Father Gallegos. "The personnel board of the archdiocese liked the idea and recommended it to the Cardinal. The Cardinal refused.”

It was the same story on the West Coast. Father Juan Romero, executive director of PADRES, recalled:

"In my first parish in Los Angeles I was not permitted to celebrate Mass or preach in Spanish, although 80 percent of my Confessions and about 90 percent of the parlos calls were in Spanish.”

The resistance to Hispanic culture in places approached the realm of the ridiculous. In Albuquerque's North Valley, an area with a parish more than 90 percent Spanish-speaking, a pastor of Polish background adamantly refused to offer any Mass in Spanish. But he obligingly had a Mass in Polish for the few people of that background who live in the Albuquerque area.

In another epoch such tactics might have discouraged the Spanish-speaking. But the 1960s and 1970s ushered in a new era. The proud proclamation of Father Elizondo seemed to capture the spirit at the First National Encuentro:

"We are not ashamed of what we are. On the contrary, we are proud of the heritage we have received from our parents and ancestors. We are proud to be descendents of our great Indian and European forefathers. We are proud of the fact that we are truly a "new people" and as such we will serve as a prophetic people to our fellow North American citizens who, for the most part are mostly transplanted Europeans and not truly a new people in the new world, as the mestizo indeed is. This growing consciousness is helping us to discover our self-identity. Rather than forgetting our past, there is a growing desire to preserve it
and share with the rest of America the best of our cultural traditions and language.”

The names "Chicano" and "Boriqua" become the badges of this new sense of identity for Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans. Many writers during this period speculated about the origin of the term "Chicano." However, the significance was not the origin of the word but its use by Mexican Americans themselves to proclaim their culture. By taking these poetic names, Hispanics were serving notice on the world that their culture was not for melting, as one headline put it.

This determination to share the Hispanic culture, to move it out from the barrios and colonias where it had always flourished, and to inject it into mainstream America -- this was the distinguishing mark of Hispanics entering this last historical period and of those who emerged from it. But all this would be not the way it had been in the past when the departure of the educated and the successful drained away vitality from the barrios. For at the same time counter institutions set their sights on returning their graduates to work in the barrios as well as on reorienting traditional institutions toward what Jorge Lara-Braud called "the larger pluralization of the entire national citizenry." Lara-Braud spoke about the Mexican-American, but his words could easily apply as well to every other Hispano:

"In words reminiscent of New Testament eschatology, the Mexican American is speaking of himself as a new man -- a man for whom there is no historical parallel, at least not in the experience of the United States. He speaks of his ethnic family as La Raza, a new family of man, the first fruits of a new humanity, where the color range of Mexican American skin, from the darkest to the fairest, will itself be the visible sign of a new age of fraternity."

1. Terromote is the author's home barrio, which in the early 1940s had some thirty families.
11. "Intercultural Competency for Teachers."
15. Ibid. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Planning Board has a more conservative statistic for the same period: 594,629 migrants to the United States.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
22. Ibid., 54.
26. Ibid., p. 68.
27. Ibid.


38. Ibid., p. 5.


40. Address given at Hispanic Convocation, Mexican America Cultural Center, December 1973.


42. Letter from a California reader dated 27 November 1975.


44. Rural Housing Alliance figure for 1970, quoted in Stephen Solis, Migrant Farm Workers and the Church (Washington, D.C., Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking), p. 5.


50. Solis, Migrant Workers and the Church, p. 5.

51. Ibid.


55. "Inconsistencies," Los Desarrraigados 2, no. 2 (Summer 1975): 5. (The issue of Commonweal from which the excerpt is taken is not given.)


57. Ibid., pp. 1-2.

58. "Chicano Bishops Criticize Church in Midwest Conference," news release from Centro de estudios Chicanos Investigaciones Sociales, South Bend, Ind., April 1975, p. 3.

59. Personal conversation with Bishop Flores, spring 1975.

60. Grebler et. al, Mexican American People, p. 514.


62. Ibid.

63. Personal interview with CASA official.


66. Ibid.


71. Ibid.


79. Ibid., p. 1 for figures on total priests, Sisters, and Brothers in the United States.

80. Rutilio J. del Riego, "Open Letter to a Bishop," San Antonio, texas 1975. (The letter was sent to a number of bishops in the United States by Father del Riego, director of the Office of Hispanic Vocations, Mexican American Cultural Center.)


82. Patricio Flores, address to Hispanic Convocation, Mexican American Cultural Center, December 1973.

83. Lupe Anguiano, personal interview with the author, February 1975.


93. Leo Grebler et al, Mexican American People, p. 470.
94. Ibid., p. 459.
95. McWilliams, North from Mexico, p. 222.
97. Donald Hessler, personal interview with the author.
100. Lara Braud, “Status of Religion Among Mexican Americans.”
101. Ibid.
102. McWilliams, North From Mexico, p. 9.
104. Glazer and Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot, p. 274.
107. PADRES Newsletter, p. 5.
108. Alberto Gallegos, undated letter to Ralph Ruiz, president of PADRES.
110. Ramon Aragón, PADRES, personal interview with the author, winter 1975.
THE CHURCH AND EL MOVIMIENTO

Moisés Sandoval

Movimiento is the Chicano word for the struggle for liberation. The term was coined in the turbulent 1960s, but the struggle is as old as the oppression of the Spanish-speaking. That oppression began with Texas’ independence in 1836 and with the takeover by the United States of the rest of the Southwest in 1846. On those dates the Hispanos found themselves a captured people. Their disillusion with the new regime was not long in coming. Historians say that soon afterward the incidence of “crime” began to rise. What that means is that the oppressed began to struggle with the only means left open to human beings—violence. “Without rights, these discriminated groups (Mexicans and Indians) had no recourse to law, and they had few champions to defend them against the violence and hostility of the whites,” wrote Robert F. Heizer and Alan F. Almquist.¹ Banditry (guerrilla fighting in the literature of the oppressed) became common. One such man was Chilean gold seeker Joaquin Murieta, who in the words of Chile’s Nobel Prize Winning poet Pablo Neruda, “never guessed that his nationality would be divided and his personality diminished.”² Murieta became a bandit—and a hero in the ballads and poetry of the oppressed—when vigilantes in the 1850s hunted Chileans down, and raped and killed Murieta’s wife. Murieta and men like Juan Nepumocena Cortina, the “Robin Hood of the Rio Grande,” carried on an armed struggle against injustice. In the same company belongs Padre Antonio Martínez of Taos. He refused to surrender his culture to the demands of the authoritative French bishop, Jean Baptiste Lamy, who came to New Mexico determined to implant a Christianity in a cultural mold foreign to its inhabitants.

Rebellion brought added repression. Murieta and other “bandits” were hanged or shot. Padre Martínez was excommunicated, but defiantly continued to minister to his parish until his death. Between 1865 and 1920 more Mexican Americans were lynched in the Southwest than blacks in the Southeast. The first person lynched in California was a Mexican.³ The historian Carey
McWilliams wrote that vast research would be required to arrive at an estimate of the Mexican lynchings between 1849 and 1890. "In the mining camps, every crime or reported crime was promptly blamed on some Mexican and lynching was the accepted penalty for crimes in which Mexicans were involved," McWilliams reported.4

In an article in World's Work in 1916, George Marvin reported that the "killing of Mexicans...through the border in these last four years is almost incredible...Some rangers have degenerated into common man-killers." He wrote that there was no penalty for killing because no jury along the border would ever convict a white man for shooting a Mexican. Marvin charged that reading Secret Service records made one feel almost as though there was an open season on Mexicans.5

According to McWilliams, on 12 July 1922 The Nation documented cases in Texas in which Mexicans had been brutally assaulted and sometimes murdered. Lawlessness became so widespread that a federal official warned the governor of Texas that some action would have to taken to protect Mexicans. McWilliams quoted a 18 November 1922 New York Times editorial: "The killing of Mexicans without provocation is so common as to pass almost unnoticed."6

Throughout the first dark century of oppression for the Spanish-speaking people, many struggles indeed passed unnoticed. Rare was the writer or historian who did not ignore, minimize, or twist the events of those bitter years. But though the harvest was suffering and death, there was always someone who would stand up. The history of California, for instance, abounds with strike after strike mostly by Mexican farm workers. Most of the strikes have failed, but the conflict continues.

World War II was a time of largely unopposed social and economic advances for the Spanish-speaking. The nation's problems abroad demanded amity at home. The end of the war found Hispanics unwilling to regress. Returning soldiers organized the G.I. Forum to protect their rights and enhance their welfare. Traditional organizations such as The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULACS) and Sociedades Mexicanas were also strengthened by the vitality of the veterans. But the time was not yet ripe for new advances. The Spanish-speaking were largely trying to consolidate their gains of the previous few years—holding on to good jobs won during the war and taking advantage of educational opportunities under the G.I. Bill. In
agriculture the continued importation of braceros (Mexican workers) placed domestic workers in a position of extreme disadvantage in confronting an exploitive system.

Meanwhile, pressures were building up elsewhere that had an impact on the Hispanic struggle. The landmark decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 declaring segregation in schools unconstitutional triggered the civil rights movement. The resulting desegregation of public places of entertainment, businesses, and institutions benefited Hispanics as well as blacks.

The Spanish-speaking had their own landmark event, which was the take-off point for the Movimiento, the latest surge in their century-old struggle for liberation. That was the decision of Congress in 1964 not to extend Public Law 78 under which hundreds of thousands of Mexican contract laborers (braceros) were brought into the country each year for seasonal agricultural work. The Hispanos had fought for more than twenty years against this arrangement, for the program not only kept wages in agriculture down and deprived domestic workers of jobs but it also made unionization of farm labor impossible.

The Movimiento is sometimes disparaged by critics because it came after the black civil rights movement and utilized many of the same tactics. But there are significant differences. The black movement originated in the churches and was headed by religious leaders. Martin Luther King, Jr. was a Baptist minister. So were many of his colleagues in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which spearheaded the struggle. In the Movimiento leadership in its various phases came from lay people. The farm workers' organizing drive, the struggle for land in northern New Mexico, the Crusade for Justice in Denver, the Chicano revolution in Crystal City, the Chicano Moratorium in Los Angeles—all were led by lay persons, although in some instances priests and religious were involved at an early state. It is only in the last few years that religious leaders came to the fore in the Movimiento—in the Farah strike in El Paso, Texas; in the fight for justice for immigrants without documents, and in an effort to make the Catholic church itself a more active participant in the quest for justice.

A major challenge of the Movimiento was to organize church support, which could not be taken for granted. Though Cesar Chávez, for instance, took the historic grape strike vote in a parish hall in Delano, California, many local pastors and even bishops opposed his unionizing and calls to strike. It was no easy
job to get the church to make a concrete commitment, without which there was little chance of success. Other aspects of the Movimiento faced the same problem.

Another element of the Movimiento was the necessity to confront the church itself as an oppressive institution. This phase included the campaign for more Hispanic bishops, the demand for special church institutions to serve the Spanish-speaking, the effort to make the church policultural and thus more respectful of the culture and religious traditions of the Spanish-speaking, and the reorientation of the educational system of the church, from the seminary to the grade schools, to fulfill the needs of Latinos.

The Farm Workers Movement

Historians Stan Steiner and Luis Valdez say that if historians were to put a date on La Causa, as the farm workers' struggle is called, it would be 16 September 1965. "On that day in Guadalupe Church hall, the campesinos of Cesar Chávez' National Farm Workers Association (NFWA) voted to join the Filipino grape pickers who were on strike."7 The hapless Spanish priest who had lent Chávez the use of the hall was heavily criticized by irate growers, and had to take a long vacation in Spain. But unwittingly or not, he had involved the church in a struggle that would demand more and more commitment as time went by.

Actually, the church had been drawn into the farm workers' cause much earlier. Back in June 1950, Fathers Thomas McCullough and Donald McDonnell asked Archbishop John J. Mitty of San Francisco to be relieved of ordinary parish assignments so they could function as "priests of the poor" throughout the diocese's thirteen northern California counties. Their argument was that the church was serving Italian and Portuguese growers, but was not doing much for tens of thousands of Spanish-speaking people, most of them farm workers.8 Archbishop Mitty approved the request, and Fathers McCullough and McDonnell together with Fathers John García and Ronald Burke were assigned to "the Spanish Mission Band," later called the Missionary Apostolate.

These four priests, all of them under thirty years of age at the time, went forth to minister to a population of a hundred thousand rural poor plus the thirty-five to forty thousand braceros who followed in a few years. Their work soon took them to other areas, and before long they were raising the growers'
hallenges all up and down California. While pastoral care has been their first thought, the priests were soon involved with social justice. Very early they became aware of the fact that the conditions they saw were the result of injustice. So they did not stop at preaching social justice, but took action to advance it. The missioners went to union meetings, where they explained the social teachings of the church regarding the right to organize.9

The growers’ response was to challenge the Mission Band’s authority to speak for the Catholic church. In 1958 and 1959 many growers in the Stockton area sent the local bishop a signed statement to the effect that unless he pulled the priests out, “the church should be registered as a lobbyist and denied tax-free status.”10 Another confrontation occurred in Imperial County in San Diego diocese. Bishop Charles Buddy informed Archbishop Mitty that he was opposed to the Mission Band’s involvement in agricultural organizing and other efforts at social justice. So after twelve years, the Mission Band was ended by the chancellor of the San Francisco Archdiocese, who was filling in for the terminally ill Archbishop Mitty.11 The priests were ordered to avoid further involvement with agricultural labor.

But the Mission Band had made its impact. One historical highlight describes how Father McDonnell, who had a passion for labor history, met a young labor leader by the name of Cesar Chávez and spent night after night discussing with the eager farm worker the social doctrines of the church and the papal encyclicals. “I began going to the bracero camps with him to help with Mass; to the city jail with him to talk to the prisoners—anything to be with him so that he could tell me more about the farm labor movement,” Chávez said.12

The Mission Band set a pattern of involvement by the clergy that was not be broken by grower pressure or ecclesiastical censure. At that time many priests, especially in Kern County, followed the line that union organization of field workers was a “Communist plot.” Several times they then Bishop Aloysius J. Willinger of Fresno issued a statement of the church’s social principles, and at the same time denounced Chávez and his followers as “leftist” and “followers of the Communist line.”13

Catholic priests and Protestant ministers who worked alongside farm workers were transferred, silenced, or forced to leave the ministry. Among those criticized were Father Keith Kenny in Sacramento and Father Victor Salandini in Delano. The latter was arrested in Borrego Springs, California, along with Cesar Chávez,
eight strikers, and the Reverend Chris Hartmire, director of the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches. With the temperature at 110 degrees, they were handcuffed and locked in a steaming truck for hours. The life of Father Salandini was threatened, but he replied, "I am not afraid, my faith is in God."14

Some priests, however, were out of the range of local censure. One was Father James L. Vizzard, S.J., executive secretary of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. He came to Delano in December 1965—three months after the historic grape-pickers strike began—with a committee of religious concern consisting of eleven prominent Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergy. At the conclusion of the visit, the committee issued a statement urging the strikers to continue their walkout until their just demands were met. The committee also criticized growers, local clergy, and community leaders who failed to appear at a scheduled meeting. Father Vizzard had his own statement:

"Church authorities often are frozen with fear that if they take a stand with the workers the growers will punish them in the pocketbook...Church institutions do not exist for their own sake. Nor does the Church itself exist solely for the comfortable, affluent, and powerful who support those institutions. Christ had a word to say about the shepherd who, out of fear and because the sheep weren’t his, abandoned the sheep when they were under attack.”15

Though the bishop of Monterey-Fresno rebutted the priest’s statement, Father Vizzard’s national post insulated him from the fate suffered by other priests. Another priest in a national role who was able to commit considerable influence to the farm workers’ cause with impunity was Monsignor George Higgins, secretary of research for the U.S. Catholic Conference.

The pattern in Texas was the same as in California. When farm worker organizing activity began in the Rio Grande Valley in the spring of 1966, two “outside” priests came to assist the workers: Father William Killian, executive editor of the San Antonio archdiocesan weekly, and Father Sherrill Smith, social action director for the San Antonio Archdiocese. As in California, local pastors opposed the activities of the visiting priests, calling them “intruders who did not speak for the Church.”16 As pressures built up, the new prelate of the Brownsville diocese, Bishop Humberto Medeiros, asked Archbishop Robert E. Lucey of San Antonio to withdraw Fathers Killian and Smith. They were
accused of outright labor organizing. As great a champion of social justice as Archbishop Lucey had been through the years, he too buckled to the pressure and ordered his priests to stay out of the trouble area. And when Fathers Killian and Smith visited the area in January 1967, Archbishop Lucey ordered them to go to New Mexico for a mandatory retreat and suspended four other priests who protested his action publicly.17

All during that time, the bishops were trying to steer the church clear of any alliances. A California bishop said the church supported the theories and concepts of social justice, but did not align itself with "a particular union, owner organization, or other secular enterprise."18 Bishop Medeiros defended union organization, but in the same breath spoke of the right of "any other group of men who need to unite in order to protect and defend (themselves) against the unjust demands of management or labor." He said the role of priests was "to preach the justice and charity of the Gospel and urge both sides to listen to the voice of reason and faith and adjust their differences in a friendly way for the good of all."19

That view could not prevail because forces were moving that were beyond the control of the bishops. First, the pervasive spirit of Vatican II had lured the church out of the spiritual cocoon where it had concentrated most of its energies. Priests in many areas were beginning to speak out against oppression and to take a hand in struggling against it. Second, the Protestants were already committed heavily to the farm worker.

Cesar Chávez wrote that the California Migrant Ministry was the first church presence in the camps and fields after the 1965 strike began. The Mission Band was suspended in 1962, and the few other priests had left. The workers were at first suspicious of the Migrant Ministry, but when they found it was there to serve and not to use them, they began working side-by-side with the ministers. But the farm workers asked, "Why do the Protestants come out here and help the people, demand nothing and give all their time to serving the farm workers while our own parish priests stay in their churches, where a few people come and usually feel uncomfortable?"20

To such queries the local bishops said nothing, but the pressures built up until Father Mark Day was named the union's chaplain by then Bishop Timothy Manning, now a cardinal. Throughout his long struggle Chávez has never opposed the church. Rather he has insisted that the church must be with the
poor and not just with the rich. He was called on Mexican American groups "to stop ignoring this source of power. It is not just our right to appeal to the Church to use its power effectively for the poor, it is our duty to do so." Chávez issued this powerful challenge to the church:

"What do we want the Church to do? We don't ask for more cathedrals. We don't ask for bigger churches or fine gifts. We ask for its presence with us, beside us, as Christ among us. We ask the Church to sacrifice with the people for social change, for justice, and for love of brother. We don't ask for words. We ask for deeds. We don't ask for paternalism. We ask for servanthood." 21

Even when local clergy or a bishop criticized him unjustly, Chávez refused to consider the church as an adversary. He steadfastly refused to let his workers picket unfriendly bishops. Further, he was very patient and understanding with the slow response:

"You won't see us blaming the Church when we fail. If we can't get organized, then it's our fault, not theirs. The Church is very cooperative. We're beggars and they give us just a little bit. That's fine. We have our philosophy. We know how the Church works. We don't confuse the issue. A man may be good, but politically he can't do what he likes to do. He needs time to work himself out. And this happens to bishops. We understand because it happens to us. The Church is no opposition. We have no complaints." 22

Considering the tremendous pressures brought to bear in the strike, only a super Christian could have won the support of the churches, for Chávez won support not only from Catholics but from Protestants and Jews as well. And that Chávez was. Simultaneously Chávez followed two great ideals. One was the nonviolence of Jesus—a principle that was rediscovered by a non-Christian, Gandhi. The other was the spirit of St. Francis of Assisi, the ideal that the poor can be more powerful than the wealthy because there is nothing anyone can take from the poor.

The result was that Chávez made a tremendous impression on open-minded people. Bishop Gilbert Chávez of San Diego said Cesar Chávez is a man who comes along only once in many generations. Struggle exhausts others and they drop out, but Cesar Chávez—said the bishop—continues to bear disappointments and suffering without losing heart. 23 A young journalist remarked that Chávez seemed more Christian than any bishop or priest she had met. A nun working as Chávez's secretary at
United Farm Workers headquarters in La Paz, California, said she found more authentic Christianity there than in the church.

Chávez made powerful religious statements, both in the way he lived his life as well in the thoughts he expressed. In the spring of 1968, he made a twenty-five day fast for peace and nonviolence, during which he lost thirty-five pounds. Except for a few ounces of bouillon and a few mouthfuls of unsweetened grapefruit juice, he had nothing but water during that time. At the end he was almost too weak to talk or walk. In February 1969, he got up from a sickbed and said to several hundred union members and friends:

"It is for God, not us, to know what is going to be the eventual outcome of what we are doing. All we can be sure of is what we are doing right now, today. There is no such thing as means and ends. Everything that we do is an end, in itself, that we can never erase. That is why we must make all our actions the kind we would like to be judged on, as though they might be our last—which they might well be, who knows? That is why we will not let ourselves be provoked by our adversaries into behaving hatefully."\(^{24}\)

Chávez lived simply. While other union leaders received a six-figure salary, he lived on $5 a week and expenses, just like any other member of the United Farm Workers Union, from the lowest to the highest. He refused to be enticed away from his cause by the prospect of personal gain. The government once offered him a $22,000 job. When he turned it down, the recruiter said in amazement, "Nobody turns that kind of money down."\(^{25}\)

Thus Chávez made sacrifice a reality in his own life. He emphasized that when people sacrifices, they force others to sacrifice. People want to share the experience when one fasts or goes to jail for a good cause. "You can't buy that with money. That doesn't have a price in terms of dollars," he said. His thoughts were profoundly Christian:

"When we are really honest with ourselves we must admit that our lives are all that really belong to us. So, it is how we use our lives that determines what kind of men we are. It is my deepest belief that only by giving our lives do we find life. I am convinced that the truest act of courage, the strongest act of manliness is to sacrifice ourselves for others in totally non-violent struggle for justice. To be a man is to suffer for others. God help us to be men."\(^{26}\)
Such appeals to Christian ideals gradually won a following among younger clergy and religious. When a strike began in the fall of 1965, only the Migrant Ministry remained with the farm workers. But the climate began to change when Bishop Willinger retired as head of the Fresno Diocese in 1967 and Bishop Timothy Manning succeeded him. In 1968 Bishop Manning made fact-finding visits to the strike area, including one to Chávez after the twenty-five day fast. In 1969, with an international grape boycott in effect, efforts were made at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to get a vote backing the boycott. But the bishops instead established an Ad Hoc Committee on Farm Labor. Its members were Auxiliary Bishop Joseph F. Donnelly of Hartford, Connecticut, chairman; Bishop Humberto Medeiros of Brownsville, Texas; Bishop Hugh Donohue of Fresno, California; and Bishop Walter Curtis of Bridgeport, Connecticut. Monsignor George Higgins was named committee consultant, and Monsignor Roger Mahony of Fresno its secretary.27

The Bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee immediately offered to mediate the dispute, and within six months nearly a hundred contracts were signed between growers and the United Farm Workers. However, difficulties developed in the Salinas Valley, where lettuce growers signed with the Teamsters. The Bishops’ Committee again mediated, and the Teamsters agreed to stop organizing field workers and to hand over the contracts to the United Farm Workers. But the growers and Teamster locals refused to abide by the agreements. To that impasse was added a bigger problem in 1973: The grape growers signed with the Teamsters when their three-year contracts with the United Workers expired.

From its creation in 1969 to 1973, the Bishops’ Committee on Farm Labor underwent a transformation from mediator to advocate in behalf of farm workers. In 1973, after the growers and Teamsters signed grape contracts in the Coachella Valley, Bishop Donnelly and Monsignor Higgins stood on the picket line with the strikers. Several important events influenced the change from neutrality to sympathy for the farm workers. First, the bishops became very well acquainted with the problem, visiting up and down California immediately after the committee was established. Second, the California Supreme Court ruled on 29 December 1972 that the Teamsters Union had in effect been in collusion with the lettuce growers to stop the United Farm Workers from organizing the lettuce pickers in 1970.28 Third, the
bishops parted company with the growers on the issue of Proposition 22, a November 1972 ballot proposal to restrict unionizing activities of farm laborers and outlaw secondary boycotts of agricultural products. Father Eugene Boyle, director of the peace and justice division of the National Federation of Priests’ Councils, said the proposition was “extremely disenfranchising of the poor—the poorest and the weakest workers in the state.” The Catholic bishops of California asked the voters to reject Proposition 22.

The United Farm Workers strike resulting from the loss of grape contracts in 1973 brought religious leaders of all faiths, including some bishops to picket with Chávez’s strikers. One group consisted of members of the Roman Catholic National Conference of Major Superiors of Men. “We believe,” the leaders of religious orders said in a statement, “that the current farm labor dispute in California is basically a question of man’s right to self-determination; in this instance, the right of farm workers to exercise freely—without coercion— their choice as to who will represent them in their struggle for a more equitable share of the fruits of their labor.”

The state was thus set for the National Conference of Bishops to make a commitment, especially after another agreement between top Teamster and American Federation of Labor as to jurisdiction was repudiated by the Teamsters. In a historic vote the bishops voted to support the farm workers’ grape and lettuce boycotts and ask for secret, free elections in the farm dispute in California. The bishops’ vote had the effect of committing many other church groups in support of the farm workers. Chávez said endorsement of the boycott would be of great help:

“It has the effect of permitting those religious persons in the Church who wanted to help us in the beginning, but weren’t quite sure what they should do. It offers tremendous leadership to those people. Also, the moral pressure that the bishops represent in the United States is going to be extremely valuable.”

Chávez pointed out that because most of the farm workers are Catholic Chicanos, Filipinos, and Puerto Ricans, “This is a dream come true—that the Church is supporting them in their just demands for a better life. The effect of this endorsement has many ramifications and this may well make the difference between our winning or losing the struggle,” he said.

The bishops’ actions also introduced divisions in the church. When the bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee on Farm Labor started
mediating in 1970, Father Michael Cross of Sacred Heart Parish, Salinas, California, charged: “To outward appearances, it now appears that the Catholic Church has either become a tool of a labor union or the labor union has become a tool of the Catholic Church.” He later crossed United Farm Workers picket lines to help pick lettuce.32 Another priest who came to be known as “the house cleric of the growers”—Father Richard Humphrys, pastor of Our Lady of Soledad church in Coachella, California—took part in a national advertising campaign to build up public opinion against church support of the boycott. In Arvin, California, a bishop and thirty representatives of major religious orders had to meet in a Protestant church when they came to walk the picket line with the United Farm Workers because the local Catholic pastor did not want them in the Catholic church.

Dolores Huerta, vice president of the United Farm Workers Union, said that frequently the local California priest is “scared to death to come out for the farm workers because he is dependent on local growers for big contributions.” She criticized taking a “Pontious Pilate neutral position.” “How can you be neutral when you see innocent people being hungry, and going to jail? If we’re neutral, it’s wrong.”33

Passage of the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act in June 1975 further enmeshed the Church in the destiny of the farm workers. The Agricultural Labor Relations Board established by the Act is headed by Bishop Roger Mahony, the auxiliary bishop of Fresno, in 1975. Yet, such is the massive opposition of the billion-dollar agricultural industry that the board encountered great difficulty in assuring farm workers a free choice of union representation. In September 1972, religious leaders from eighteen states went to California to assess the results. Their report said, “We have seen enough to be disillusioned and angry about the way the law is being administered.”34

In 1975 the outcome of the farm labor struggle remained in doubt, but not the church’s commitment. It was inextricably involved. Not only because many priests, religious, and bishops had spoken up, walked the picket lines and, in some cases, gone to jail with the strikers. But, more important, because the people had cast their own vote by boycotting grapes and lettuce. Powerful as the institutional church was, the aroused conscience of the nation had bigger clout. It was the boycott that forced the growers to join the first grape contracts, and it would be the people who would eventually win or lose the long struggle.
The farm workers struggle had one other far-reaching consequence. Its appeal was ecumenical. The struggle against oppression submerged denominational and ethnic differences. At the Chávez headquarters in La Paz one could find Catholics, Protestants, and Jews working side by side. People seeking a worthy cause in which to invest their idealism found it in the lonely struggle of the farm workers. What remained was only one division—between those who were with the poor and those who sided with the powerful agricultural interests seeking to continue the exploitive system of the past.

The United Farm Workers Union began organizing activity in Florida in the summer of 1971. In February 1972, a three-year contract was signed with the Minute Maid division of the Coca-Cola Co., Florida’s largest citrus grower. H.P. Hood, another citrus grower, also signed a contract. The Catholic church and the Florida Christian Migrant Ministry supported the union’s organizing efforts and opposed proposed right-to-work laws that would have nullified the contracts and made additional organizing impossible.35

In Arizona efforts to organize melon workers were frustrated by the passage of a repressive right-to-work law. This led to efforts by the union in 1972 to impeach the governor—a move that failed. There, as in Texas, the United Farm Workers Union and the churches failed to mount a successful campaign to end the brutal peonage. The struggle of the union for survival in California left little leadership and few resources for the tremendous sacrifice still to be made in Texas. The Midwest and Northeast achieved a few organizing and collective bargaining successes, but the strife and the victories were overshadowed by events in California and Texas.

**The Farah Strike**

Unlike the farm workers, the strikers at Farah Manufacturing Co. had church leadership from the very beginning. When the strike began on 10 May 1972, the largely Mexican American workers went to Bishop Sidney Metzger of the Diocese of El Paso to ask his counsel. From that point on, he was one of the central figures in the long and bitter dispute. Another was a Mexican-born priest, Father Jesse Muñoz who, in the words of Bishop Metzger, supported the strike “body and soul.”36

At the time Farah was one of the largest manufacturers of men’s slacks in the United States, with plants in El Paso; Albuquerque and Las Cruces, New Mexico; Victoria and San
Antonio, Texas. The company had 10,400 employees, 85 percent of whom were Mexican American women. The average weekly salary when the strike began was $69 a week. The struggle was over union representation. William Farah, president of the clothing firm, would not recognize the union the workers had chosen to represent them—the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

As in the farm workers’ strike, a nationwide boycott of Farah slacks tipped the balance in favor of the strikes. Farah sales in 1972 fell by $10 million, and in 1973 they went down another $10 million. The value of a share of stock declined from $30 to $8. Bishop Metzger wrote a letter to every Catholic bishop in the country, expressing his support of the strike and endorsing the boycott of Farah pants and jeans. The letter was prompted by a query from Bishop Joseph L. Hogan of Rochester, who wanted firsthand information from a trusted source to guide his decision on whether to request a local retail outlet not to reorder Farah products.

Father Muñoz’s parish, Our Lady of Light, became headquarters for the strike. On Tuesday afternoons the weekly strike meeting was held in the church. His parish hall was where the $30 weekly strike benefits and special Juárez relief checks were passed out. The distress committee met in his office. “There was unrest over dismissals, over the rebuke of workers for union sympathies—a police state atmosphere with informers going to management with tales of who was pro-union,” Father Muñoz said.

Both Bishop Metzger and Father Muñoz were continually villified for their involvement. The Chamber of Commerce, the business community, and the local press spoke against the strike. Some of the local Protestant clergy campaigned actively for Farah. One minister authored a booklet for national distribution that purported to contain the facts about the strike. But Catholic bishops and numerous church groups were with the workers. Father Donald Bauer worked full-time with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America in the unionizing effort. The Texas Conference of Churches endorsed the boycott and called on the National Labor Relations Board, the Farah firm, and the striking workers to schedule free elections.

The strike cost Farah and the labor union millions of dollars. The pressures were tremendous. Lawsuits and countersuits were filed. Workers claimed their names were used without authoriza-
tion in advertisements depicting happy nonstriking Farah employees. Father Muñoz kept getting letters and phone calls from people who said they were ashamed and embarrassed that their names were being used "to insult the bishop." For his part, Father Muñoz said:

"I don't care about Mr. Farah's shining walls or even if his toilet bowls have 14-carat tops; it is a living wage my people need. But the people are afraid. People can get used to anything if they have no choice. They are afraid Farah will sell out and leave them. 'Where will they go? What are we going to do?' As long as they are afraid, they will not stand up. And Farah pretends he is like the Great White Father: 'You owe everything to me,' he said; 'look how much I have done for you.' But it is not so."41

Farah closed plants. There were wholesale dismissals. But after twenty-one months the firm agreed to recognize the union. A month previous to the company's surrender, an administrative judge of the National Labor Relations Board accused Farah of violating the rights of its employees and ordered the company to allow unions to operate freely in his factories. William Farah finally agreed that "it was the legal thing to do."42

The Church's Role in Other Movements

Church involvement in other important events of the Movimiento was not as strong, open, or widespread as its commitment to the farm workers' struggle and the Farah strikers. The movements themselves—Crusade for Justice in Denver, the Chicano Moratorium in Los Angeles, the Chicano revolution in Crystal City, Texas, and the Centro de Acción Social Autónomo (CASA)—did not set out to organize the church as deliberately as Cesar Chávez had done. The church support that surfaced was, for the most part, the result of individual decisions of priests and religious rather than of institutional policy. When an institution took part, its support was not widely publicized. In some of the movements, the church found actions or philosophical grounds justifying its nonsupport.

Crusade for Justice was founded in 1965 by a former high-ranking boxer turned politician, poet and ultimately, barrio leader—Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzáles. Its struggle was against the dehumanization of urban life—schools having the atmosphere of jails, policemen who brutalized Mexican Americans, businesses in the barrio owned by exploitative outsiders, and inequality and discrimination. The Crusade for Justice supported Chi-
canos who rioted at a high school to protest the insults of a
teacher who said Mexicans were stupid. The riots, which
occurred in 1965, brought on a violent confrontation with the
police. In 1973 police attacked the Crusade for Justice head-
quarters and an adjoining building and killed a young Chicano.
Unlike Chávez, Rodolfo González refused to proclaim non-
violence. That gave the church an out in not providing wide
support. Still the movement was so influential that Archbishop
James Casey of Denver once came to the Easter Mexican dinner
of the Crusade for Justice without prior invitation. He donated
$100 to the crusade's building fund and urged those present to
cherish their history and culture. The archdiocese also aided
the Crusade's Tlaltelolco School, which sought to instill in
Chicano children an appreciation for their values and culture
that was being denigrated in the city's schools. Such support
triggered a backlash of Anglo criticism against the archbishop.

Outside the small role in Crusade for Justice, the church as
institution was not involved in other movements in a decisive
way. In the Chicano Moratorium—a protest against the dispro-
portionate number of Chicanos serving and dying in Vietnam—the
only church presence was that of Chicano priests and Bishop
Patrick Flores, who coincidentally happened to arrive in Los
Angeles on 29 August 1970, when the first of two major
confrontations erupted between Chicanos and police. Accounts
of how Chicanos won control of local government in Crystal City,
Texas, a city in which they are an overwhelming majority, make
little mention of church involvement. The same is true of the
confrontations of Alianza Federal de Pueblos Libres with state
and federal officials in 1967. Headed by a Protestant minister
named Reis Tijerina, the Alianza sought to recover land grants
taken away from Spanish-speaking people in New Mexico and
Colorado in violation of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.
Individual priests have participated in the activities of Centro de
Accion Social Autonomo (Center of Autonomous Social Action,
or CASA), an important organization working for reforms in
immigration law and for an end to violations of the civil rights of
immigrants by immigration authorities. Though the church is
heavily committed both nationally and locally to bettering the
conditions of immigrants, it has remained aloof from CASA. A
Los Angeles priest said that CASA's Marxist orientation scares the
church. The church's superpatriotism — a hangover from the
days when it was trying to impress an unfriendly national majority
that it was a good citizen—precluded any official sympathy for
the Chicano Moratorium.
THE STRUGGLE WITHIN THE CHURCH

Confronting oppression in the church was a traumatic step for Hispanics. For them the church has always been an institution to love, respect, and perhaps even fear. Former priest David F. Gómez says that many Chicanos grew up in fear and trembling of the church and church officials. Certainly the church has been an institution which a Hispano seldom rejects. Religious leaders have always been held in awe. Even a junkie in New York respects the priest, said a Puerto Rican leader. In Mexico the humble people still kiss the hand of the priest when he comes to visit. Historian Rodolfo Acuña wrote:

"Catholicism was important to Mexicans. In the small villages and cities from which they came, the Church followed them from the cradle to the grave. In the morning, Mexicans could hear the church bells and, in time of stress, could find some solace within the confines of the church building."

However, the Chicanos’ growing awareness of oppression and disillusion with community institutions eventually focused their attention of the Church in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. The militants, a generation which had largely grown up in city ghettos away from the well-ordered rural society of their parents where the church held such strong sway, did not like what they saw.

Alberto Alurista, one of a number of Chicano writers who have attacked the church, said that the Catholic church is the strongest and richest institution in the world. He claimed that in Los Angeles alone, the Church had $1 billion in assets. “Compare such wealth to the creator of Christianity, Jesus Christ, who was born in a manger, died for poor people, washed their feet — in short, truly loved the poor — and you realize that the Catholic Church is not even Christian,” concluded Alurista. Another writer, Dolores del Grito, charged that the church too often played the role of powerful patron, but was not involved and interested in the social conditions of the world. “It seems to serve as a pacifier,” wrote del Grito. “It talks of a way of life completely contrary to the society we live in. Yet it does nothing about our human needs; it only rakes in the gold to add to its bricks of the impenetrable tower.”

“The churches, especially the Catholic Church, have helped the Anglo American to rob us of our pride,” wrote Armando Rendón in his Chicano Manifesto. “They have told us, ‘Have patience, mi hijo’ (and don’t forget to put something in the
He said the money spent for buildings was "tainted with racist attitudes" when these structures were used to house the "glittering ceremonies for the middle-class and upper-class" while blacks and Chicanos would up with "financially failing parish plants, ill-financed schools, shabby churches and mediocre pastors who can't finagle anything better for themselves..." He said the church did not need preachers but "a Hidalgo and a Camilo Torres." Further, Rendón counseled:

"Chicanos have to liberate themselves from guilt feelings or fears about telling the Church where it stands now. When Chicanos deliberate about taking over institutions, they should not forget the churches. The churches belong to us, the people, so do the school buildings and the diocesan newspaper. The church bureaucrats can no longer operate their fiefs without regard for the needs of the poor."  

What disappointed these writers was that the church was no different than the secular institutions that had abandoned or neglected the Hispanic people. They saw the church as being "almost totally devoid of any idealism." As a corporation, the church was perceived by Chicanos as one in business for profit, more interested in an uninterrupted flow of contributions than in the pursuit of justice.

The upshot was that Chicanos began using on the church the same tactics tried on other institutions. Blacks demanded reparations. The Puerto Rican Youth Lords of Harlem took over a church for a community center. The United Mexican-American students in Denver picketed the chancery because the archbishop refused their demands for Chicano scholarships. In Mission, Texas, about a hundred young Mexican Americans painted a statue of the Virgin brown with spray paint. In Brighton, Colorado, the Brown Berets surrounded the parish church one spring weekday in 1973, and refused to let anyone enter until the pastor agreed to negotiate on the Berets' demands that there be a weekly Mass in Spanish, and that a church recreation center be reopened. The center had been closed because of vandalism blamed on Chicanos. Almost in amazement, David F. Gómez wrote that "no lightning came down" when the Hispanics "stood their ground, challenged the Church and made their demands known."

A group that at one time had great impact was Católicos por La Raza (Catholics for the People), with chapters in Los Angeles and San Diego. Its membership consisted mainly of young
college students with no qualms about confrontation. In an open letter to the people of the barrios, Católicos por La Raza (CPLR) asked:

“How many churches, let alone million-dollar churches, did Christ build? ... All of us are members of the Catholic Church, nonetheless no Chicanos are able to participate in decisions within the Church, which are not purely religious in nature ... It is our fault if the Catholic Church in the Southwest is no longer a Church of blood, a Church of struggle, a Church of sacrifice. It is our fault because we have not raised our voices as Catholics and as poor people for the love of Christ. We cannot love our people without demanding better housing, education, health, and so many other needs we share in common.”

What stirred the ire of CPLR, which was organized in the fall of 1969, was the closing of a barrio high school -- Our Lady Queen of Girls -- for lack of funds while the church built a $3.5 million cathedral, which was seen as a memorial to eighty-three year-old James Francis Cardinal McIntyre of Los Angeles. CPLR researched the Church’s holdings, ranging from the expected churches and schools to the unexpected slum property in the Pico-Union area to exclusive high-rise apartments in Beverly Hills and West Los Angeles. “The Church is filthy wealthy,” said one of the CPLR militants. The total came to more than $1 billion.

Young militants held two meetings with Cardinal McIntyre, both of which accomplished nothing. Once they had to brush past priest secretaries because the cardinal refused to see them. The prelate’s response to deeper church involvement was that Chicanos were receiving Christmas and Easter baskets.

The culmination of CPLR’s brief but turbulent history was a 1969 Christmas Eve demonstration at the controversial $3.5 million cathedral of St. Basil. The picketing was peaceful and orderly until the demonstrators attempted to enter the church for midnight Mass. Those who got in were expelled by club-swinging deputy sheriffs posing as ushers. Los Angeles police entered the melee and arrested twenty-one persons, twenty of whom stood trial when the church insisted on pressing charges. The leader of the picketers, a Loyola University law student named Ricardo Cruz, was convicted of a misdemeanor and sentenced to 120 days in jail. On the basis of that conviction, California Bar examiners refused to certify him as fit to practice law. Ironically the church then intervened to persuade exam-
iners to admit Cruz to the bar. By then, however, the Archdiocese of Los Angeles had an Hispanic auxiliary bishop. Juan Arzube, who was not afraid to champion the needs of Chicanos.

CPLR faded quickly from the limelight, but there was one other important confrontation. It took the form of an occupation of Camp Oliver, a Sisters of Social Service Center near Descanso, California. In the ensuing negotiations CPLR militants demanded the appointment of a Chicano bishop in the Diocese of San Diego, in which 500,000 out of 800,000 Catholics are Spanish-speaking. It took the Church five years to act, but in 1974 Father Gilbert Chávez was elevated to the rank of bishop and appointed the auxiliary in the diocese. However, there was no victory celebration for CPLR, for the group was no longer active. A Chicano priest said the young people had lost interest in the church when they received no positive response.57

David F. Gómez credits Católicos por La Raza with forcing the retirement of the aging Cardinal McIntyre and the succession of Cardinal Timothy Manning, who has a better rapport with Chicanos. He also claims that CPLR influenced the church’s decision to establish the National Campaign for Human Development, to enter officially the arena of farm labor troubles by naming a Bishops’ Committee on Farm Labor. Perhaps some of the claims are far-fetched, but there is no doubt that CPLR increased Chicano critical awareness of the church.58

That heightened awareness led to two impulses. One, voiced by Father Luis Jaramillo, an activist Catholic priest from New Mexico, was that the churches should get out of the way of the Chicano movement.59 The other was for Chicano groups to disengage from the church, because, it was charged, it preaches passivity among Mexican Americans. “The emphasis the church places on misery and penance and suffering does nothing but buttress the condition we’re in -- and it’s one hell of a condition,” said José Angel Gutierrez, founder of the Mexican American Youth Organization (MAYO).60

Of those who rejected the church, some later changed their minds about going it alone. One of those was Gil Cano, a Los Angeles activist who was one of the organizers of the National Chicano Moratorium. He said he was totally opposed to the church because he felt that organized religion was not committed to the poor. But a few years later he came to the conclusion “that we had replaced the Church with the Movimiento.” In other words, La Causa became our God.” He
said it became evident that his new god only bound the activists together “from crisis to crisis, march to march and demonstration to demonstration. “We have been trying to cure physical, psychological and social ills without taking into consideration the spiritual side of man.” Cano turned back to try to bring the church into the struggle because he felt it would be the deciding factor on whether change would be violent and destructive or “true, profound, and orderly.”

Notwithstanding their point of view about noninvolvement, Hispanics within the Church as well as those outside made it a target of the Movimiento. Ricardo Parra, executive director of the Midwest Council of La Raza, made this statement at a workshop on Hispanic ministry at the annual meeting of the Catholic Committee on Urban Ministry:

“The Church...supports justice and propounds brotherhood, yet discriminates. The Church rallies to freedom and equality while its immobile structure suffocates creative initiative and blocks new avenues in the expression of the Christian message. Like political structures, it has practiced benign neglect towards the powerless masses ... In the sixties different Raza groups vigorously demanded that the Church direct attention to the problems of La Raza. And so the Church responds with a few token efforts.”

MOVIMIENTO WITHIN THE CHURCH

The activities of young lay militants has had a profound effect on Hispanic clergy and religious. Bishop Chávez credits such young people with having given new meaning to his priesthood. “The kids taught the rest of us that gains to be made in education or any other area may have to be made by Chicanos on the streets risking their own personal safety ...,” said former Paulist priest David F. Gómez. Hispanic priests saw that they would have to join the struggle of their leadership would be meaningless. Accordingly, the Movimiento from a very early stage began to draw Hispanic priests. While Catholics for the People was organizing for its confrontations with the church, a group of Mexican American priests was quietly meeting in San Antonio to begin their own Movimiento within the church. Their organization would be called PADRES, an acronym for Priests Associated for Religious, Educational and Social Rights.

PADRES’s first meeting was held 7-9 October 1969 in San Antonio, Texas. Fifty Mexican American priests from seven states and the District of Columbia were present. At the end of the
meeting, a press conference was called to announce the formation of the new national organization to transmit "the cry of our people" to the "decision-makers of the Catholic Church of America." The membership approved twenty seven resolutions for presentation at the National Council of Catholic Bishops' annual meeting the following month in Washington, D.C. Father Ralph Ruíz was elected national chairman, and Father Edmundo Rodríguez, S.J., was named national vice-regent.

In contrast to priests' organizations established mainly for the mutual benefit of the membership, PADRES' basic thrust was to become "the voice of the voiceless." In a 15 October 1969 letter to Archbishop Francis J. Furey of San Antonio, Father Ruíz said, "We feel that we have a unique role as spokesmen within the Church for Mexican American and Spanish-speaking Catholics of the United States because most of us share the same language, culture, social mores and religious values of our people."

Among the resolutions were the following: that native Hispanic bishops be named in areas with heavy concentrations of Spanish-speaking people; that native Spanish-speaking priests be appointed immediately as pastors in large Spanish-speaking communities; that consideration be given to subsidizing low-income parishes from a national Catholic source; that high priority be given to inner city projects involving priests more deeply in the day-to-day economic, social, and religious life of the people; that the church give more consideration to education in low-income areas of Hispanic communities; that the Catholic liturgy be better adapted to the needs of the Spanish-speaking culture; that the church use its influence on behalf of the striking California grape pickers; and that seminary recruitment and education be expanded to include programs adapted to the needs of Mexican American seminarians and parishioners.

PADRES wasted no time in making demands to top members of the hierarchy. One letter went to Cardinal John Dearden of Detroit, requesting an opportunity to present their resolutions at the annual meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops the following month. A letter dated 9 October 1969 to Archbishop Francis J. Furey of San Antonio asserted:

"We emphatically reject as myth that the Mexican American has not given himself in sufficient numbers to the priestly ministry in the Church. All of us present at this meeting experienced
during our seminary days the anxieties of many of our contemporaries who were forced out of the seminary in one way or another. Some of us experienced the systematic rejection of Mexican American applicants to the seminaries. We do not want to judge the motives of those who forced of kept them out, but we do know the fact that they were forced out or kept out.”

The Spanish-speaking priests demanded revisions in the seminary curricula so as to include not only a thorough knowledge of language but also the study of anthropology, history, and cultural heritage -- in short, everything which makes the Mexican American to be the individual that he is.”

A controversial feature of PADRES was that it limited full membership to Mexican American priests, a restriction that drew charges of reverse racism. The Reverend Keith B. Kenny of Our Lady of Guadalupe parish in Sacramento, California, charged that PADRES had constituted itself as a racist organization. “However well intentioned the founders of this organization may have been, they have been guilty of the same kind of paternalism and racism that they oppose in the Church,” he said. Exclusivity, however, was the only way for the tiny minority of Chicano priests to insure control of their organization.

Exclusion of Anglos raised fears that the Mexican Americans were aiming at a separatist rite. Such a topic did indeed come up at the first PADRES meeting. One resolution dealt “with the possible movement toward a distinct juridical rite for the Spanish-speaking modeled on the Maronite or Ukrainian rites,” Father Ruiz reported to Archbishop Furey. However, the resolution was “soundly defeated.” “It was the will of the participants to work within the present structure of the Church in the United States,” Father Ruiz wrote the archbishop. However, the issue would not go away. It surfaced again at the PADRES second national congress in Los Angeles 11-13 October 1971. In a low-key but well-developed presentation, Father Alberto Carillo of Whittier, California, concluded: “If solutions are to be found before it is too late, there can be only one: a national Chicano Church under the Propagation of the Faith in Rome.” Study of the proposal showed, however, that with only one bishop and fewer than two hundred priests, Chicanos were hardly in a position to go it alone. Further, Cesar Chavez was demonstrating that the solution of the manifold problems of the Spanish-speaking depended on organizing support within the
church as a whole. Nevertheless, the fact that the idea kept coming up may have made the church more responsive than it might otherwise have been.

Events moved swiftly for PADRES. Less than six months after the group organized, one of the members was elevated to the episcopacy. Father Patricio Flores, a former migrant worker and high-school dropout, was named auxiliary bishop of San Antonio on 18 March 1970 and consecrated on 5 May 1970, a great day in Mexican history. On that day in 1863, a rag-tag Mexican force defeated an invading French army in Puebla.

For a tiny organization PADRES seemed to be everywhere at once. In November 1969 it presented its resolutions to a bishops' committee which, in turn, passed them on to the body of bishops. In August 1970 PADRES ministered to the wounded in "police riot" resulting from the National Chicano Moratorium demonstration. On Labor Day of the same year, PADRES challenged the United States Catholic Conference's holiday statement, saying it "placed too great an emphasis on the problems of the white working class and obscured the desperate needs of the Black and Hispanic minorities." PADRES marched alongside the embattled strikers of Cesar Chávez' union in the continuing strife in the lettuce fields of California. At a retreat in Santa Fe, New Mexico, in February 1971, PADRES helped clarify the vision for the Mexican American Cultural Center. At the same meeting a resolution asked the hierarchy to fill the episcopal vacancy in the Diocese of Brownsville with a Mexican American bishop. At the Catholic Interamerican Cooperation Convention in Washington in early 1971, PADRES established contacts with CELAM which resulted in six Chicano priests attending the prestigious Instituto Pastoral Latino Americano in Quito, Ecuador.

From the very beginning Chicano concerns cut across denominational lines. At the first PADRES meeting in 1969, a major speaker was a Protestant minister -- Dr. Jorge Lara-Braud, director of the Hispanic Institute in Austin, Texas. The Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO), a Protestant churches' and community agency aiding the struggle of oppressed people for justice and self-determination, gave PADRES its first financial grant -- $7000 towards establishing a mobile team ministry in support of self-help programs in the barrios. Liaison was established with Hispanic American ministries of Protestant churches and with the Joint Strategy and Action Committee of the national mission boards of major
denominations. In the spring of 1971 the Reverend Jack O’Donnell, a Lutheran pastor, joined the staff of PADRES under a call for special ministry by the Texas-Louisiana Synod, Lutheran Church in America. The Reverend O’Donnell contacted many denominations seeking cooperation and funding for the mobile team ministry. In June 1971 PADRES took part in a pastoral symposium at Assumption Seminary in San Antonio in which five Protestant ministers and eighteen priests participated. The Luthern Church of America gave PADRES $15,000 in 1971. The same year PADRES became a cosponsor of the Lutheran American Institute, an advocate for the Mexican American people sponsored by eight Protestant denominations.71

Catholic church support began in April 1970, when the National Conference of Catholic Bishops approved a grant of $15,000. In the fall of 1971, the Campaign for Human Development granted PADRES $100,000 for program development, especially the mobile team ministry. Securing funds in subsequent years became more difficult. At the bishops’ annual meeting in 1973, Father Juan Romero, executive director of PADRES, said his organization had become a ping-pong ball in terms of funding. ‘The United States Catholic Conference says, ‘We are not a funding agency; this is a natural for the Campaign for Human Development,’ but the CHD says, ‘You are a clerical organization and the responsibility of USCC.’ ’’72

Texas, New Mexico, and California were PADRES strongholds because those states is where it had the most members and where the Movimiento, in general, was strongest. Members marched with Cesar Chávez, and some of them went to jail with strikers during the mass arrests of the summer of 1973. A PADRE, Father Juan Hurtado, headed the Padre Hidalgo Center, which was committed to the advancement of urban Spanish-speaking people in San Diego. Another, Gilbert Chávez, was elevated to bishop on 21 June 1974, and appointed auxiliary of the Diocese of San Diego. In Arizona Fathers Alberto Carillo and Vincent Soriano, both Redemptorists, took up the causes of inner-city Chicanos, among other things confronting the school system in efforts to make it more responsive to the needs of Mexican Americans. In New Mexico, another PADRE, Robert F. Sánchez, was consecrated archbishop of Santa Fe in July 1974, and became the first Chicano Ordinary in the nation. Perhaps the best-organized of PADRES regional groups, the New Mexican priests, took part in the marches and meetings of
Reies Tijerina’s Federal Alliance of Land Grants movement, played a key role in bringing better pay and working conditions for packing-house workers in Albuquerque, joined a Coalition of Concerned Citizens for Better Education and pushed for an end to discrimination in the judicial system in New Mexico. While in some areas the local PADRES organization was viewed with suspicion by the chancery, in New Mexico it became an important consultive body to the chancery.

Texas PADRES gave the organization much of its national image. Key members were Father Virgil Elizondo and Bishop Flores. Father Elizondo, president of the Mexican American Cultural Center in San Antonio, won a big following through his writings on theology and catechetics and through speaking engagements across the nation. Bishop Flores, who intensified his Movimiento activities when he was elevated to the episcopacy, made news with his actions as well as his blunt but loyal critiques of the church’s neglect of the Spanish-speaking.

“'We have been victims of oppression, discrimination, semi-slavery, poorly paid for our work,’” Bishop Flores said at the First National Encuentro, where he was one of the featured speakers along with Father Elizondo. “'We have lived in conditions sometimes worse than the animals in the zoo. And yet the church keeps silent.’”

Thanks to the support of Archbishop Furey, a strong PADRES supporter from the beginning, Bishop Flores was able to follow once again the familiar migrant trails of his youth, ministering to his beloved migrant workers. In some areas he had to meet them in Protestant churches, for they were not welcome in the local Catholic parish. Bishop Flores visited Cesar Chávez in a California jail during the nationwide lettuce boycott, personally intervened in police brutality complaints in San Antonio, pushed for better food for hungry illegal aliens in jails he visited along the border, and joined in public school boycott by Mexican-Americans in Uvalde, Texas. “'We cannot isolate ourselves and ignore the problems of the rest of the world,’” Bishop Flores declared. “'We cannot be neutral,’”

PADRES helped assure the success of the Mexican American Cultural Center through staffing and other services. It helped to establish a unique movement called Communities Organized for Public Service, which became the most potent political group in San Antonio. The movement, which goes under the acronym of COPS, has taken up the struggle of urban Chicanos. The successful Farah strike was a PADRES cause.
“How can we as religious, priests, and bishops accuse the layman of being unjust and exploiting our Mexican brothers when we are doing the same in the name of apostolic work?” asked Sisters Carmelita Espinoza and María de Jesús Ybarra of Las Hermanas national coordinating team. The Sisters further asked, “Is it necessary to profess vows to be a waitress or a house maid?” Las Hermanas found that in some seminaries Mexican nuns who had been working there twenty five years did not yet know English. “What kind of Christian communication is there in the seminary?” Sisters Carmelita and María de Jesús challenged.

Las Hermanas began a program of educating Mexican nuns for the possibility of apostolic service, but the congregations in Mexico were nervous about losing the support, little as it was, from their members in domestic service in the United States.

Paralleling and sharing in the same priorities as PADRES, Las Hermanas pushed hard for Hispanic bishops, and became deeply involved in the struggle of the United Farm Workers. When Bishop John J. Fitzpatrick was named the ordinary of the Diocese of Brownsville, which is more than 85 percent Mexican American, Sister Gloria Gallardo sent a telegram on behalf of Hermanas expressing regret that the choice was not a Mexican American. The Chicana Sister asked how long Mexican Americans had to wait before their leadership would be recognized.

Hermanas helped insure the success of the Mexican American Cultural Center in San Antonio by donating staff and faculty services requiring high academic qualifications and experience. Three Sisters took a five-month course at the Pastoral Institute for Latin America in Quito, Ecuador. Sisters from the Mexican American Cultural Center team, including Sylvia Sedillo, Dolorita Martinez, and Mario Barrón, gave leadership workshops for the Spanish-speaking in various parts of the country.

Las Hermanas received no large grants from the church’s funding agencies. Financial support came from various religious congregations. Nevertheless, the organization made up in dedication what it lacked in cash resources and, through its participation in other structures such as the Mexican American Cultural Center and in individual congregations, the members were an important element in the Movimiento. They became leading spokespersons across the nation on Hispanic concerns and liberation theology. Hermanas also took an active part in organizing grass-roots Christian communities (Comunidades de
CONCLUSION

The Movimiento is a struggle for power -- power that is never given, but instead has to be taken. Activist Ricardo Parra, who headed the Midwest Council of La Raza, compares the struggle to a war, with battles going on all the time. "The casualties on the side of El Movimiento are great," wrote Parra. Indeed, many priests and religious -- both Anglos and Hispanics -- who were active in the struggle, have left active ministry. Many of the original leaders of PADRES are not only no longer members of the organization but also have left the priesthood. The same despair has been seen among farm workers who see no end to the struggle for dignity.

Another problem has been the disorientation that results from a few initial successes. Many young leaders of the movement lost sight of their objectives once they had achieved some gains. Or else they were co-opted or bought out by the offer of a good job in a bureaucracy they were attacking. Parra wrote:

"We begin with the young, maybe not so young, vocal Chicano on the street who is now beginning to do some serious organizing, begins to speak up at public meetings, becomes a leader ...

"Soon thereafter he is employed in one of the social programs, OEO, Model Cities, HEW. It is not really a bad job; it is probably more money than he has been making ... Soon he will be the director, then he will buy a new car, a house, move to a better neighborhood, etc. Now it has become a career. He is not so vocal any more; he is concerned with meeting the monthly installments on the material items he has acquired."

In the 1960s confrontation was the main tactic of Movimiento groups. The struggle took place in the streets or at the portals of the institutions, both secular and religious, which the Hispanic people challenged. But as they won allies and support within the institutions and positions of power, the struggle went into quieter, less dramatic phases. The confrontations were now across conference tables rather than across barricades. But victory for the oppressed was still a distant dream. A few token changes had occurred in institutions, a few
individuals had achieved success, and a few organizations that were once “out” were now “in.” But the quest for liberation for the Hispanic people was still largely unfulfilled.

In Chicago, thanks to the presence of two influential PADRES, the organization made its presence felt in a significant way. The two priests were Alberto Gallegos, another New Mexican, and Victor López. They, along with a handful of other Hispanic priests, made news with their efforts to get an Hispanic bishop for the city’s 500,000 Spanish-speaking people. The campaign failed. As the 1970s gave way to the 1980s, there was no prospect of an Hispanic bishop in Chicago.

El Comité Guadalupano, which was organized in 1973, placed the issues squarely before John Cardinal Cody. Father Gallegos was one of the most articulate spokesmen, and he even volunteered for the post!74

In 1975 PADRES began to refocus its objectives and to broaden its membership. Under the national chairmanship of Bishop Flores from 1971 to 1975, the organization devoted much of its energies to the farm labor struggle. When Father Roberto Peña, another Texan, was named national chairman in 1975, the focus shifted to the urban scene. Also, the membership at its national congress changed the PADRES by laws to admit to full membership other Hispanic priests ordeacons committed to the Spanish-speaking people. That action enabled Bishop Juan Arzube, an auxiliary in the Los Angeles Archdiocese of Ecuadorian heritage, to become a full member. Bishop Arzube was initially viewed with suspicion by Chicanos, but his ever-increasing commitment to the Movimiento erased all skepticism.

LAS HERMANAS

In the late 1960s and early 1970s when Chicano school walkouts were in vogue, a Chicana Victory Noll Sister from El Paso waged a lonely struggle in the Diocese of Abilene. In addition to opposing the usual cultural violence committed against the Spanish-speaking, she was fighting against the physical beatings sometimes meted out by racist teachers. The nun was Gregoria Ortega, a handsome woman with deep-brown eyes and jet-black hair framing the strong facial features of Mexican womankind. Almost alone, with little or no support from the clergy, this courageous nun faced down police, judges, school principals, and school boards, never backing down an inch from anyone. In the end she was transferred out of the diocese. Rodolfo Acuña wrote about her:
“This unselfish Sister traveled through the small towns, holding meetings and encouraging Chicanos to demand better education and working conditions. Priests attacked her from the pulpit.”

But Sister Gregoria was not discouraged or cowed. After she was asked to leave the Diocese of Abilene, she became co-founder of a militant group of Hispanic Sisters who established a national organization called Las Hermanas (the Sisters).

The other co-founder of Las Hermanas was no less impressive. Sister Gloria Gallardo worked as a community organizer and catechist in the misery of San Antonio’s inner city where Mexican Americans fought to maintain a sense of hope amidst the chronic unemployment, health problems, anemia, and even malnutrition that surrounded them. Seeing how poorly served the people were, Sister Gallardo resolved to dedicate herself to Mexican Americans and to help other Hispanic religious do likewise. It was not an easy task. She said that there were “innumerable cases of those who have asked their superiors to let them work among their own people [and] permission is denied.”

Nevertheless, concrete plans were begun in August 1970 to establish a national organization of Hispanic Sisters that would be “a source of power” for Spanish-speaking people. Unlike PADRES, this group would have a broader ethnic base, including Mexican Americans, Mexicans, Spaniards, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and other Latin American Sisters. On 2-4 April 1971, fifty nuns from eight states -- California, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, and Texas -- gathered in Houston for the first meeting of Las Hermanas. Representing twenty religious congregations, the Sisters decided that the sole purpose of their new organization would be “more effective and active service of the Hispanic people by using the expertise, knowledge, and experience of religious women in the fields of education, health, pastoral work, and sociology.” The assembly declared:

“Sisters throughout the country have seen a tremendous gap between the relevancy of our consecration and our service to the People of God, especially the poor. We have searched for ways of closing this gap and have felt the urgency to become more attuned to the needs of the community so as to render better service to our apostolate. We, as Spanish-speaking Sisters, are greatly concerned with the plight of La Raza
especially and are determined to better our efforts to meet their needs."

The new organization committed itself to active leadership among the laity to social change, to Hispanic cultural renaissance, educating congregations about the needs of the Spanish-speaking people. Sister Gloria Gallardo was elected president and Sister Gregoria Ortega was chosen vice president. Within a few months the membership grew to seven hundred nuns in twenty-one states, Mexico, and Bolivia. By 5 July 1971, there were state coordinators organizing in California, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. By then Las Hermanas had won the support of the United States Catholic Conference’s Division for the Spanish-speaking, PADRES, CELAM, the Conference of Major Superiors of Religious Women, the National Association of Women Religious, and several other influential groups.

As with PADRES, Las Hermanas would not be an organization simply for the protection and comfort of the members. One of its top priorities became leadership development in the barrio. Another was the liberation of Mexican nuns serving as domestics in the United States in a program in some ways similar to the importation of braceros by agribusiness. These Mexican nuns number about one thousand and live in 140 different houses in the United States working as cooks and maids in Catholic seminaries, retreat houses, old people’s homes, orphanages, colleges, and boarding schools. Las Hermanas was bluntly critical of this situation:

“Our Mexican Sisters who have come to this country to render an apostolic service in seminaries, retreat houses, or colleges are being exploited as cheap labor and being deprived of truly doing pastoral ministry among our own people. Every part of the country seems to have these Sisters doing simply domestic work in the institutions of the Church. In one of the places visited, [the institution] paid $250 per month for the labor of five Sisters.”

The meager pay received by Mexican Sisters goes to Mexico to support impoverished religious congregations that need every cent to survive. Though Las Hermanas found that about half of the Mexican nuns would rather be in a catechetical apostolate serving the Spanish-speaking, domestic service was the only option they had. Mexican nuns who came to do apostolic work received little or no pay and are not even registered in the religious census because they are not citizens.
“How can we as religious, priests, and bishops accuse the laymen of being unjust and exploiting our Mexican brothers when we are doing the same in the name of apostolic work?” asked Sisters Carmelita Espinoza and María de Jesús Ibarra of Las Hermanas national coordinating team. The Sisters further asked: “Is it necessary to profess vows to be a waitress or a house maid?” Las Hermanas found that in some seminaries Mexican nuns who had been working there twenty-five years did not yet know English. “What kind of Christian communications is there in the seminary?” Sisters Carmelita and María de Jesús challenged.79 Las Hermanas began a program of educating Mexican nuns for the possibility of apostolic service, but the congregations in Mexico were nervous about losing the support, little as it was, from their members in domestic service in the United States.

Paralleling and sharing in the same priorities as PADRES, Las Hermanas pushed hard for Hispanic bishops, and became deeply involved in the struggle of the United Farm Workers. When Bishop John J. Fitzpatrick was named ordinary of the Diocese of Brownsville, which is more than 85 percent Mexican American, Sister Gloria Gallardo sent a telegram in behalf of Hermanas expressing regret that the choice was not a Mexican American. The Chicana Sister asked how long Mexican Americans had to wait before their leadership would be recognized.

Hermanas helped insure the success of the Mexican American Cultural Center in San Antonio by donating staff and faculty services requiring high academic qualifications and experience. Three Sisters took a five-month course at the Pastoral Institute for Latin America in Quito, Ecuador. Sisters from the Mexican American Cultural Center team, including Sylvia Sedillo, Dolores Martinez, and Mario Barrón, gave leadership workshops for the Spanish-speaking in various parts of the country.

Las Hermanas received no large grants from the church’s funding agencies. Financial support came from various religious congregations. Nevertheless, the organization made up in dedication what it lacked in cash resources and, through its participation in other structures such as the Mexican American Cultural Center and in individual congregations, the members were an important element in the Movimiento. They became leading spokespersons across the nation on Hispanic concerns and liberation theology. Hermanas also took an active part in organizing grass-roots Christian communities (Comunidades de base). Hermana Irene Muñoz, a migrant worker nurse for the
CONCLUSION

The Movimiento is a struggle for power -- power that is never given, but instead has to be taken. Activist Ricardo Parra, who headed the Midwest Council of La Raza, compares the struggle to a war, with battles going on all the time. "The casualties on the side of El Movimiento are great," wrote Parra. Indeed, many priests and religious -- both Anglos and Hispanos -- who were active in the struggle, have left active ministry. Many of the original leaders of PADRES are not only no longer members of the organization but also have left the priesthood. The same despair has been seen among farm workers who see no end to the struggle for dignity.

Another problem has been the disorientation that results from a few initial successes. Many young leaders of the movement lost sight of their objectives once they had achieved some gains. Or else they were co-opted or bought out by the offer of a good job in a bureaucracy they were attacking, Parra wrote:

"We begin with the young, maybe not so young, vocal Chicano on the street who is now beginning to do some serious organizing, begins to speak up at public meetings, becomes a leader ...

"Soon thereafter he is employed in one of the social programs, OEO, Model Cities, HEW. It is not really a bad job; it is probably more money than he has been making ... Soon he will be the director, then he will buy a new car, a house, move to a better neighborhood, etc. Now it has become a career. He is not so vocal any more; he is concerned with meeting the monthly installments on the material items he has acquired." 

In the 1960's confrontation was the main tactic of Movimiento groups. The struggle took place in the streets or at the portals of the institutions, both secular and religious, which the Hispanic people challenged. But as they won allies and support within the institutions and positions of power, the struggle went into quieter, less dramatic phases. The confrontations were now across conference tables rather than across barricades. But victory for the oppressed was still a distant dream. A few token changes had occurred in institutions, a few individuals had
achieved success, and a few organizations that were once "out" were now "in." But the quest for liberation for the Hispanic people was still largely unfulfilled.
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CHURCH STRUCTURES FOR THE HISPANICS

Moisés Sandoval

Hispanics were under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Catholic hierarchy for nearly a hundred years before the church began creating special structures to meet the needs of the Hispanic peoples. The first step was taken in San Antonio, Texas, at a 1944 Seminar for the Spanish-speaking sponsored by Archbishop Robert E. Lucey. About fifty delegates from western and southwestern dioceses met for three days to discuss all aspects of the church's work among the Hispanic people. A second seminar was held in Denver, Colorado, in October 1944 at the request of Archbishop Urban J. Vehr. Delegates from California, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Oklahoma, and Texas attended.¹

Out of those beginnings evolved the Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking, which were established in many western and southwestern dioceses and later spread to dioceses along the migrant stream. But it was not until 1945 that the councils achieved official status. On January 10-12 of that year fourteen members of the hierarchy met in Oklahoma City, and established the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish-speaking. The American Board of Catholic Missions agreed to provide financing, and the committee began an intensive program of social and spiritual welfare in four provinces - - Los Angeles, Santa Fe, Denver, and San Antonio. The first part of the program included the construction of clinics, settlement houses, community and catechetical centers. The second consisted of services for migrant workers, maternal and child care, and the improvement of recreational and educational opportunities. In that first year $15,000 was allotted for the operation of the regional office as well as $180,000 for the construction of welfare centers.²

The short-term targets of the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish-speaking were bad housing, malnutrition, infant and maternal mortality, and delinquency. Immediate steps were to be taken to improve the religious education of Mexican children of all ages. The long-term goals were to make the Mexican
American people, especially men and boys, better Catholics, to improve education and economic opportunities, and to eliminate discrimination and prejudice.

The motivation for the formation of special structures with programs directed specifically at the Spanish-speaking seems to have been, at least in part, fear of the inroads of Protestantism. The program stressed the need to take "immediate steps to counteract the widespread influences of proselytism."3 Almost every progress report by the committee in subsequent years mentioned progress made in that area. The 1946 report pointed out that "Somos Católicos" (We are Catholics) stickers had been printed and distributed to the Spanish-speaking. The report further added, 'Pastors will urge members of their flock to display these stickers on their front doors as means of discouraging Jehovah’s Witnesses and other house-to-house proselytizers.’4

However, a more important influence in the formation of the committee was a growing awareness among the hierarchy of the oppression of the Hispanic people. Archbishop Lucey became well acquainted with the depths of human exploitation in the 1930s. At that time pecan shellers in San Antonio were earning an average of $2 a week. Their efforts to unionize and win higher wages and better working conditions were met by mass arrests and police violence. Archbishop Lucey campaigned for better wages.5 Another key person was Archbishop Stritch of Chicago, head of the American Board of Catholic Missions. During a visit to Texas, he "was horrified at the kind of life most of the Mexicans lived. Their condition seemed to him a southerner by birth and rearing, worse than that of Negroes of the old South," wrote the Reverend Raymond McGowan.6 The archbishop offered to ask the American Board of Catholic Missions for financial help "to attack these fundamental ignominies.” That proposal hastened the formation of the Bishops’ Committee and the Councils for the Spanish-speaking.

Though work was undertaken throughout the four provinces, the Bishops’ Committee concentrated its work in Texas, the office moving from San Antonio to Corpus Christi, Austin, Galveston, and back to San Antonio, where the Santa Maria Maternity Hospital for underprivileged Mexican mothers was constructed in the first year of the committee’s work. The staff founded Catholic War Veterans posts in many parishes, campaigned for the elimination of pit privies, for the paving of streets, and for the installation of utilities in the barrios. It assisted
pastors in establishing organizations for the Spanish-speaking, opened up employment bureaus for Mexican Americans, organized parish recreation leagues, conducted naturalization classes, and prepared programs for "Mexican Hour" radio broadcasts.

In 1949 the office was moved to Corpus Christi. At the behest of Bishop Mariano S. Garriga, it became deeply involved in "the care of thousands of cotton pickers, principally Spanish-speaking people, who swarm the streets of the city from July until December during the cotton-picking season." Thus began a commitment that would grow more and more as time went by. In 1950 the Bishops' Committee staff sought to improve low farm wages by consulting with Catholic landowners in the Rio Grande Valley. Landowners, according to the staff, were "ready and willing to work out a just wage system." There was optimism that the example and influence of Catholic growers would serve "to counteract the pressure of organized growers to keep the laboring masses in wage slavery." In the end both the Bishops' Committee and the Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking were engulfed in the problems of domestic migrants and of the ever increasing number of braceros.

In Austin, where the office moved in 1951, the Bishops' Committee continued basically the same work as it had carried on in other cities. New services included sponsorship of an x-ray campaign to detect tuberculosis. The tests revealed "that many hundreds need medical and hospital care." When the incidence of polio reached epidemic proportions, the committee staff demanded that city and county officials install proper drains and sewers, and that landlords improve 10,200 substandard dwellings. The committee also published a newspaper (top circulation 30,000) urging migrant cotton pickers to observe their religious obligations.

In 1950-51 the committee began efforts to recruit Mexican Americans for the priesthood and religious life. Father Richard P. Lynch, a priest on loan from the San Diego Diocese, interviewed hundreds of young people. Ten young women entered the seminary. Though no one entered the seminary, he expressed the opinion that "the prospects for seminarians in the near future are good." Another campaign was conducted by the Sisters of John Bosco in Austin. A character-guidance program drew more than nine hundred participants. The 1952 Progress Report of the Bishops' Committee summed up the main problem facing the Spanish-speaking.
The economic position of the Spanish-speaking citizens continues to be unquestionably disadvantageous to them. So many of the measures advocated in the past have been thwarted by powerful interests that the chief hope of securing equitable treatment for the Mexican people seems to be in increasing their voting power. The regional office has spent much effort in instructing the Spanish-speaking in matters of civil rights and appropriate civic action.\textsuperscript{12}

As the Bishops' Committee was drawn more and more into the problems of farm workers, the regional office began alerting pastors or local directors of the Catholic Rural Life Conference in forty-five states as to when and where migrants were likely to appear in their areas. "These letters emphasized the spiritual needs of the Catholic migrants," wrote Father Matthew H. Kelly, "and suggested means whereby the laborers and their families might be encouraged to continue the practice of their faith as they wander from place to place."\textsuperscript{13} In such small ways the Bishops' Committee evolved from a regional to a national entity.

In 1953 the Bishops' Committee undertook a novel idea: bringing Mexican priests to minister to the hundreds of thousands of braceros who came across the border each year to work as farm laborers. Twenty-four Mexican priests came to the United States on temporary assignment to work in dioceses with heavy concentrations of braceros. The program was continued for several years afterward. Dioceses benefitting from the program expressed satisfaction with the arrangement.\textsuperscript{14} Mexican priests served as far north as Michigan and Idaho.

Ever so gradually the regional office of the Bishops' Committee began to be drawn into a more activist stance. "Since collective bargaining can help Mexican American laborers to secure better wages and working conditions, the regional office has carried on a campaign to encourage them to join good unions," wrote the executive secretary in his March 1954 report. However, those were the days of the anti-Communist campaign of U.S. Senator Joseph McCarthy, and the regional office felt constrained to send a list of 239 Communist-front organizations to diocesan representatives. The executive secretary remarked there was a "Communist tint undeniably present in a few unions," and urged diocesan officials to "maintain a healthy skepticism toward any civil rights group until it is clearly evident that the group does not advocate the Communist party line as a remedy for discrimination and poverty."\textsuperscript{15}

Church interest in farm worker unionizing activity led to
opposition to the bracero program, for the authorities saw that no organizing effort could be successful while growers had a plentiful supply of cheap labor from across the border. However, the regional office also opposed the bracero program because domestic farm workers were forced into the migrant stream by the inflow from Mexico. Thus a hundred thousand domestic migrants had to leave Texas each year to work in the Midwest and mountain states.

In 1961 another Bishops’ committee came into being, this one in Chicago. It was called the Bishops’ Committee for Migrant Workers. Its role was to assume some of the burdens of the Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking and of the Catholic Councils for the Spanish-speaking. In 1964, however, the American hierarchy, meeting in Rome for their annual meeting, created a new committee to supervise the work of both offices, and designated the one in San Antonio as the National Office for the Spanish-speaking.

**CATHOLIC COUNCILS FOR THE SPANISH-SPEAKING**

When the Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking was formed in 1945, members of Seminars for the Spanish-speaking were invited to act in an advisory and cooperative capacity, serving with the jurisdiction and by appointment of the Bishops’ Committee. The Bishops’ Committee was a regional structure with jurisdiction in the four southwestern provinces, but the Catholic Councils, from the very beginning, had a national potential. Before long, other states outside the provinces encompassed by the Bishops’ Committee had their own councils.

The councils were made up of individuals and representatives of organizations that could work and consult together. A council might consist of a representative of the local bishop, representatives of Catholic Action, Men’s, Women’s, and Youth Councils, the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Sisters, school officials, the director of Catholic Charities, representatives of lawyers’ and doctors’ guilds, priests, laymen and women not associated with organizations. Some dioceses had no formal Council but rather “an informal group of friends (who) could head up and do the work.”

As time went on, councils were organized in Missouri, the upper Pacific Coast, Montana, and the upper Midwest — coinciding with the cresting of the migrant stream into these areas. By the 1960s the East also began to figure in the councils’
programs as Puerto Ricans flooded into New York and westward to Ohio, Michigan, and Chicago.\textsuperscript{17}

Perhaps for the first time, the Councils for the Spanish-speaking brought Anglo and Hispanic-Catholic together to attack common problems. From the very beginning there was an effort to include the Spanish-speaking as members of the councils. A Doctor Oretega of Santa Fe was among the groups that met in the second seminar in Denver in 1944. The Reverend Raymond McGowan of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference said that the idea of the councils was to include both Anglos and Latins.\textsuperscript{18}

The councils strongly opposed the inflow of wetbacks who took jobs from domestic workers. Father McGowan said:

"The Catholic Council fights this invasion. It fights also for laws and unions to protect domestic farm labor on the commercial farms. It fights for laws, federal and state, to protect unions, wages, hours, and security in non-factory jobs in cities—jobs which escape, usually the country over and prevailing in the Southwest, the protection of nearly all labor law."\textsuperscript{19}

However, the Catholic Councils performance did not match such fierce rhetoric. It fought with words and not actions. But it did provide a forum to begin building an awareness of the disadvantageous environment in which Hispanos had to live. The councils sponsored a series of conferences that drew an increasing number of participants. At the fourth meeting in Los Angeles in 1947, the councils went on record opposing the further "importation of alien workers to work for wages far below the minimum." A certified copy of the resolution was sent to the President of the United States and to congressional delegations of six states. The Fifth General Conference in 1948 urged an increase in the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour and the inclusion of domestic agricultural workers in the Social Security Act.

The Sixth Regional Conference in 1953 dealt with ways to eliminate juvenile delinquency among the Spanish-speaking. A nationwide focus was reflected for the first time at the Seventh Regional Conference in 1953. In line with that, the next meeting was held for the first time outside the region. The councils met in Grand Rapids, Michigan, on April 17-19, 1956. The 1958 conference in San Antonio stressed the need to work only in every diocese "but in every city, town, and community." The leadership called upon priests to organize doctors, lawyers, nurses, schoolteachers, and leaders in every field of life.
Additionally the conference concluded that "among those who are graduating from high school and college one will find a good number of Spanish names. These are needed and will be most helpful in the program."20

The Tenth Conference held at St. Louis in 1960 was billed as the first conference "held on a national level." For the first time, the problems of Puerto Ricans received attention. The Eleventh Conference at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, the 1962 drew representatives from twenty-six states, Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Cuba. A reorganization leading to the creation of a National Office for the Spanish-speaking in 1964 deprived the councils of a national role, but many continued to function at a diocesan level. Delegates to the Thirteenth Annual Latin American Conference at St. Mary's College in Moraga, California, in 1965 passed a resolution requesting the Archdiocese of San Francisco and the dioceses of Oakland, Stockton, Sacramento, and Santa Rosa to create a Catholic Council for the Spanish-speaking at the diocesan level.21

DIOCESAN APOSTOLATES

By the early 1960s seventy diocesan representatives throughout the United States were working in liaison with the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish-speaking. By then the Archdiocese of New York had established an Office for the Spanish-speaking. The Diocese of Miami had set up an Office for Latin American Affairs, and the Diocese of Cleveland had a Spanish Mission Office. Statewide organizations included the Wisconsin Bishops' migrant Commission and the Ohio Bishops' Conference for the Apostolate for the Spanish-speaking. Diocesan programs ranged from the Casa del Carmen in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia to the Denver Migrant Labor Project, the San Antonio Archdiocesan Spanish-speaking Apostolate, and the Spanish-speaking Missions in the cities of Norwalk and Bridgeport, Connecticut. The Diocese of Madison, Wisconsin, had its Our Lady of Guadalupe Center, and the Diocese of Baker, Oregon, its Migrant Apostolate.22

SPIRITUAL PROBLEMS

All agencies saw many problems in providing spiritual ministry to the Spanish-speaking. The Reverend Richard Gilsdorf, director of the Migrant Apostolate of the Diocese of Green Bay, Wisconsin, drew up a list of what seemed to be the major preoccupations of that time. The first was caring for large numbers of migrants in scattered camps, including their
integration into parishes. The second was the problem of proselytism, a worry that continued to plague the church. In the Diocese of Green Bay, a million and a half rosaries were sent to Our Lady of Guadalupe for the preservation and flowering of the faith of the migrants. There was a certain wariness about working with nondenominational institutions because of the risk that the results might be detrimental to the church. Apostolate directors were ambivalent on the challenge of working for social justice. Here is how Father Gilsdorf described the situation: Although they (the Catholic agencies) recognized the need to speak out unequivocally for social justice whenever conscience required, they urged moderation to keep the good will of the growers.23 Some directors complained that “too much kindness is being lavished on the migrants, that they are being ‘spoiled.’” Pastorally, the key problem was said to be invalid marriages, and much paperwork was devoted to trying to straighten out errant weddings. But the case load was described as enormous.

THE MIDWEST REGIONAL OFFICE

The need for a Midwest Regional Office for the Spanish-speaking was first broached at South Bend, Indiana, in 1965. At the time there was a national office of the Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking with headquarters in San Antonio, Texas. The Cardinal’s Committee for the Spanish-speaking in Chicago was considered a branch office of sorts, but priests meeting at South Bend voiced an urgent need for coordination and communication on a regional level among those working with the Spanish-speaking.

Archbishop Lucey, the most influential members of the Bishop’s Committee for the Spanish-speaking, had to be convinced of the need for regional offices. This Father John McCarthy, director of the National Office, proceeded to do, and a steering committee was formed to develop a plan, establish an office, and hire a director. The office was established in Lansing, Michigan, and Ruben Alfaro, a former migrant worker and barber, was named executive director. Priests of the Spanish-speaking apostolate in the region — Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and North Dakota — nominated members for a board of directors with the power to make policy and hire and fire the executive director. The board met for the first time in Lansing 11 November 1967.24

In 1968 the National Catholic Welfare Conference was reorganized, and as a result the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) came into being. The National Office of the
Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking became the Division for the Spanish-speaking in the USCC’s Department of Social Development. Under this reorganization power was centralized, and the Midwest Regional Office’s board of directors was stripped of its policy-making and hiring and firing powers. The change stirred opposition at the regional level, and after several months of controversy the board became an advisory committee after Washington agreed not to hire anyone without its approval. The executive director continued to bring all major projects to the advisory committee and to keep it informed of all new undertakings. The arrangement proved workable, and continued until the USCC divested itself of regional offices in 1973.

Since that time the Midwest Regional Office has been operated by dioceses in the eight states it serves. In range and depth of programs and in supporting diocesan structures, it is the most successful of all the regional structures for the Spanish-speaking. Diocesan departments of local structures were developed in the archdioceses of Chicago and Detroit, the dioceses of Toledo, Saginaw, Grand Rapids, South Bend, Fort Wayne, Gary and Des Moines. A tri-diocesan organization was developed for Peoria, Davenport, and Rockford, and a state coordinator was established in Wisconsin. Alfaro insisted that the diocesan departments be headed by members of the laity, preferably Spanish-speaking persons. The policy resulted in notable successes.

In 1970 the Diocese of Toledo had no separate office for the Spanish-speaking, although a number of Anglo priests fluent in Spanish were working in the Hispanic community, and trying to forge a strong link with the church. At that time Sylvester Durán developed a radio program, and expanded into community organizing. After a year on the job he convinced the bishop of the need for a Department for the Spanish-speaking. This department obtained a grant for a Mexican Curriculum Office to promote and develop curriculum materials relevant to the Hispanic heritage in public schools. It also encouraged universities to recruit Spanish-speaking college prospects. Durán supplemented nuns with lay people in the migrant summer program, which offered such services as child care and day care, clinics, translations, and transportation facilities that would enable migrants to make a better utilization of services provided by other agencies. Durán also started the Cristo Rey Center to minister to families who had not been welcomed in a particular community and felt excluded from their church.25

Another success story was that of Joe García in the Diocese
of Saginaw. Hired as Mexican American specialist in the Community Affairs Department of the diocese, he felt that the needs of the Hispanic community were not being met. After a few stormy months he finally went to the bishop and won his case. A separate Department of Latin American Affairs was created, with García as its head. “We have noted elsewhere a tendency on the part of agencies, organizations, and the community at large to forget the Spanish-speaking once they have moved out of farm labor to become part of the urban community,” García said. So he set out to remedy this situation. García established contacts with colleges and universities, and his department became the contact center for the Association of Chicanos for Chicanos for College Admissions, offered advice on Financial aid, and assisted students in emergency situations. A Spanish Advisory Committee was established to promote the hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers’ aides. An information center was established with a grant from the Model Cities Program. As a member of the executive committee of the Michigan League for Human Services, Durán was able to increase awareness of the needs of Hispanics and to obtain more support for migrants’ civil rights, bilingual education, and minority representation in local and state governments. The Department of Latin American Affairs became a place where Hispanic parolees from Jackson State Prison could find help in obtaining employment and housing, to say nothing of friendship and the sense of belonging so necessary to their readjustment. Migrant programs focuses on “settling out” — to escape the vicious circle of poverty by finding jobs and housing out of the migrant stream. Spiritual programs sought to show migrants that the Church was interested in them as persons. A team of local priests and lay people served migrants in seven counties.26

In Chicago the midwest Regional Office had a big challenge. First, there were two distinct Hispanic communities: Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans. Mexicans Americans had been there a long time, some of them having come as early as 1910. Puerto Ricans were relatively new, most of them arriving after World War II. The Cardinal’s committee for the Spanish-speaking was organized in 1955 and reorganized in 1962. An initial emphasis was on working with Puerto Ricans because of their lack of community. The aim was to establish community organizations such as the Caballeros de San Juan, which sponsors social and religious activities, including fiestas, leadership workshops, and credit unions. Another was the Hermanos en la Familia de Dios, a group of lay catechists.
For Hispanics in general the Cardinal’s Committee provided legal and employment aid, immigration services, information such as Spanish radio programs, and referral services. There, too the Midwest Regional Office was able to install Hispanic leadership. Since its inception the office had been headed by priests, but the leadership was finally entrusted to Mexican and Puerto Rican codirectors. Later Seferino Ochoa became the director. The committee has placed a high priority on education for the Spanish-speaking, and has encouraged the development of relevant college programs. Graduates returning to take leadership positions in their communities. The committee also made bilingual education a high priority. Although Illinois has the fifth largest Spanish-speaking population in the United States, the state’s per capita expenditure for bilingual education was minimal — less than $3 per student. 27 The committee has also offered social and recreational activities as well as spiritual retreats. It has provided training in Spanish and Hispanic acculturation for priests in fifty parishes serving the Spanish-speaking.

Alfaro traveled throughout the region, building awareness for the plight of the migrant workers. He spoke at colleges and universities. The office and its board of directors endorsed publicly the grape and lettuce boycotts of the United Farm Workers Union. Statements were sent to all representatives and senators of the Midwest confirming boycott support. Personnel of the regional office took a leading role in the Midwest Pastoral Encounter held at Chicago in January 1971 and attended by 150 diocesan representatives from the region. In-service training was provided by the regional office for the staff of diocesan departments. Alfaro commented, “We, as Church, can be only as effective as these coordinators are in finding a means to a better life and a greater voice for the Spanish-speaking communities in the Midwest.” 28

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL OFFICE

The establishment of a West Coast Regional Office for the Spanish-speaking was the end product of a process that began in 1952. For fifteen years leaders in northern California dioceses assembled annually for a Latin American Leadership Conference. The purpose of these meetings was to awaken the church to the needs of the Spanish-speaking. The conferences recommended the formation of diocesan structures for the Spanish-speaking, explored the church’s teachings on labor and social action, and aired the problems faced by Hispanics. In the
fifteenth year of these meetings, a decision was made to discontinue the conferences and to try, instead, to establish a regional office of the Bishops’ Committee for the Spanish-speaking. The American Board of Catholic Missions budgeted $90,000 for the national office for the Spanish-speaking and three regional offices, which were allocated $18,500 each. Thus in October 1967, a Bishops’ Committee advisory board consisting of members of the clergy and laity worked out a budget and hired Salvador Alvarez, a sociologist, as director of the office.  

The Board of Directors of the regional office consisted of a priest and two members of the laity from each of the dioceses of Oakland, San Francisco, Santa Rosa, Sacramento, Fresno, Monterey, and Stockton. The Lost Angeles Archdiocese expressed little interest in the regional office, although it permitted a representation from East Los Angeles.  

That did not happen, however, until the office had been in operation for a year. At that time, too, the Board of Directors added representatives from the San Diego Diocese to its membership. From the beginning the board took an active part in the conduct of the regional office’s affairs. Members not only defined the willingness of their bishops to work for the Spanish-speaking but also played a strong role in setting policy for the director. The director was responsible to the Board of Directors rather than to the national office. This arrangement led to difficulties at a later date.  

Between 1967 and 1968 the director concentrated his efforts in the Stockton Diocese, creating a model for the other dioceses. Working closely with members of the Board of Directors from the diocese and with Bishop Hugh Donohue, a proven friend of the Spanish-speaking, Alvarez succeeded in creating an independent diocesan office for the Spanish-speaking, directed by its own board and administered by a local director. This office, called the Council for the Spanish-speaking, began operation on 15 October 1968. Its main trust was to help the Spanish-speaking organize and attain social, economic, and educational advancement. The council established committees in fourteen separate parishes. Each consisted of ten to fifteen members, and met monthly to discuss social and economic problems. One group succeeded in changing hiring practices that had excluded Mexican Americans from General Mills plants.  

The success of the Stockton diocesan office encouraged other dioceses to begin the same process. Thus in 1969 the Sacramento Diocese Department of Mexican American Affairs was established, and a lay person was hired to run it. A third
The diocesan office was established at San Diego in August 1969. Called the Office of Ethnic Affairs, it, in turn, organized a Mexican American Commission to promote the welfare of Hispanic people in the diocese. The Oakland Diocese established a Bishop's Committee for the Spanish-speaking, and Bill Espinoza, who was on the staff of Catholic Charities, coordinated programs for Hispanics. Unfortunately, activity in the two archdioceses was not fruitful for Chicanos. The Los Angeles Archdiocese concentrated its efforts on Cuban programs funded by the county and federal government. In San Francisco the archbishop refused to consider an archdiocesan office for the Spanish-speaking; the relationship with Chicanos did not go beyond confrontation into dialogue and cooperation.\textsuperscript{32} The West Coast Cultural Institute for the Spanish-speaking was formed in November 1968 in the northwestern diocese. The institute held a leadership conference that laid the groundwork for the establishment of an Inter-diocesan Council for the Spanish-speaking for the other northwestern states in 1971.

Meanwhile, a serious conflict of authority developed with the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) in Washington. The USCC wanted to control the operation on behalf of the Spanish-speaking from Washington. But the regional office on the West Coast had all along relied heavily on the authority of its own Board of Directors in such matters as policy making and the hiring and firing of local employees. An added complication was the USCC's refusal to increase the budget for the West Coast office. The Board of Directors felt that the allocation of $20,000 was insufficient to serve 3 million Hispanics scattered among fifteen dioceses. Grievances were aired back and forth, and Chicanos confronted the bishops at their San Francisco national meeting in 1970. Meanwhile, Alvarez resigned in the fall of 1969. The office closed because of the difficulties with Washington, and did not reopen until Father Reynaldo Flores was hired as the new director in August 1970. Flores had to resign in March 1972, because he had decided to become a layman and USCC policy did not permit ex-priests on its staff. The next director, Robert González, was not hired until November 1972 because of continued difficulties between the Board of Directors and the USCC. González served until the office was closed in December 1973.\textsuperscript{33}

The bishops of West Coast dioceses did not reestablish the Regional Office for the Spanish-speaking after national support ceased, perhaps because of a lack of enthusiasm in the archdioceses of Los Angeles and San Francisco. A Regional
Commission for the Spanish-speaking was established, but it had no budget and thus could not fill the role of an active regional office. Furthermore, the diocesan representatives were priests, which effectively eliminated Chicanos, as few of them are among the clergy on the West Coast.

There were several other noteworthy accomplishments by the West Coast Regional Office. It initiated work leading to the development of a graduate school of social work for the Spanish-speaking at San Jose State University. An employment and career opportunities project was carried out. The regional office was developed educational opportunities program at northern California Catholic universities, and succeeded in increasing United Funds' allocations for Chicano projects from $50,000 to $2 million out of the $50 million raised annually in the region.34

The National Office for the Spanish-Speaking

Though the National Office for the Spanish-speaking was established in 1964, it did not come under Hispanic leadership until 1967. At that time, reacting to pressure from Mexican American organizations in the Southwest and Midwest, a Mexican American layman -- Antonio Tinajéro -- was hired. However, he eventually became a casualty of the transitional difficulties between national and regional offices after the USCC came into being. Not until 1971 did the Division for the Spanish-speaking begin to play a strong role under the leadership of Paul Sedillo. It was then that the national office was moved to Washington.

Sedillo came to the USCC from California, where he had been director of the Tulare and Kings Counties Catholic Social Services. He previously worked in the criminal justice system, in youth programs, and in the Office of Economic Opportunity programs. He was also at one time associate director of Social Services and Catholic Charities for the Diocese of Fresno. More important, Sedillo had the drive and political awareness required to bring the concerns of the Hispanics to the forefront of the USCC agenda.

When he came to Washington, Sedillo had no staff. There was little opportunity to give information on Hispanic needs to other agencies of the USCC. The Division for the Spanish-speaking was part of the Department of Social Development and World Peace, and had no official contact with other departments except through the department director. "It was really very ridiculous," Sedillo said. "There were 101 crises constantly coming up. While I was traveling throughout the United States
going from one crisis to another, policy was being made in Washington.” Lacking official contacts with the USCC’s top management, Sedillo achieved influence unofficially. An outgoing and gregarious young man, he made his presence known everywhere -- from the luncheon room to conference rooms.

As Sedillo won budget approval to hire a staff, four other professionals joined the division. Colombian Father Edgard Beltrán, who had been with CELAM (the Latin American Episcopal Conference), journeyed throughout the country, giving workshops to help establish grassroots Christian communities among Hispanos. Sister Mary Mahoney, an educator, assumed responsibility for communications. Francisco Diana, an Argentinian with long experience in religious education, assumed responsibility for Hispanic programs in the Northeast. Stephen Solis, specialist on the problems of migrants, took charge of research and advocacy for migrant workers. Additionally, Sedillo was able to secure the services of USCC legislative consultants to push programs of benefit to Hispanos on Capitol Hill. Thus Sedillo was able to lobby not only in the USCC but in Congress as well.

However, the division was still limited because it did not have direct input into the work of other USCC divisions and departments, which had no Hispanos on their staffs. The First National Encuentro (encuentro means “encounter”) in 1972 recommended that the division be elevated to a full department, but the Bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee on the Spanish-speaking rejected this demand. It did not see significant benefit accruing from the change, even though the bishops admitted “more needs to be done internally to relate the concerns of the Division to other departments, divisions, and offices of the Conference.”

Notwithstanding the bishops’ statement, an effort was made early in 1974 to downgrade the division. Sedillo was presented with a plan that would have made the division a desk in another another department. He adamantly refused to accept that fate and, for a time there was talk of bringing ten to fifteen thousand Hispanos to march upon the USCC. In the end it was decided to elevate the division to the position of secretariat, the highest departmental status. This change was approved by the bishops at their annual meeting in 1974. The Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking functions both in the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and in the USCC. Thus the Church finally accepted the
idea of advocacy that Sedillo saw as the chief feature of his role.

Steady progress has been made in establishing diocesan structures for the Spanish-speaking. By mid-1974, 96 of the then 156 dioceses of the United States had some kind of an office for the Spanish-speaking apostolate.

Sedillo was not alone any more. By 1975 there were five Hispanic bishops to facilitate the programs of the Secretariat in the body of bishops. Gradually, more and more token Hispanics were gaining positions in church councils and boards. Sedillo himself was a board member of the National Catholic Conference on Interracial Justice and of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. He was one of two Hispanics selected for important committees of the 41st International Eucharistic Congress held in Philadelphia in August 1976. (The other member was Archbishop Robert Sánchez of Santa Fe.) Sedillo was also a board member of the Joint Strategy and Action Committee, a consortium of home mission boards of various denominations, and of the Mexican American Cultural Center.

Perhaps the most important accomplishment of the Division/Secretariat was initiation of the encuentro movement, which brought the church and Hispanics into a dialogue on the problems of the Spanish-speaking and on how the church both locally and nationally can best serve them. However, the range of the secretariat's concerns spanned all the interests of the Spanish-speaking from assisting immigrants without documents to pushing for bilingual and bicultural education, from assuring a Hispanic input into the national catechetical directory and into the 1976 bicentennial conference to supporting farm workers in their quest for a better life.

The Encuentro Movement

The purpose of the encuentro movement was to bring the leadership of the church face to face with Spanish-speaking people all across the nation. The resulting dialogue could build not only awareness but promote teamwork in attacking the problems surfacing in the discussions. The idea first came up at a meeting in September 1971. Father Robert Stern, then director of the Spanish-speaking Apostolate in the Archdiocese of New York, invited local and New England Hispanic leaders to participate with Father Edgard Beltrán of the Latin American Episcopal Conference (CELAM) in discussing the development of a pastoral plan for Hispanic people in the New York Archdiocese.
During one of the discussions, Father Beltrán proposed a national encuentro for Spanish-speaking leaders of the church in the United States. The idea was enthusiastically received and presented as a recommendation to the Inter-Diocesan Coordinating Committee for the Spanish-speaking of the New York metropolitan region. After discussing the proposal with Paul Sedillo of the Division for the Spanish-speaking, more than a hundred Spanish-speaking delegates attending the Congress of Religious Educators in Miami in October 1971, drew up a declaration addressed to the leaders of the Congress and of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. The encuentro proposal received endorsement from Bishop Joseph L. Bernardin, general secretary of the United States Catholic Conference in January 1972.

The encuentro which was held in June 1972 at Trinity College in Washington, D.C., drew several hundred participants from across the nation. Father Virgil Elizondo summed up in one question by the concerns of the Hispanics. He asked why the image of the Spanish-speaking North American could not be elevated "so that he may be known by his brother citizens as one who might be different, yet equal in every way." But John Cardinal Krol, president of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, was not ready to concede pluralism:

"While in God's providence there are people of many different racial, ethnic, and national origins in our Church in the United States, and while each group has something distinctive and very precious to offer to the life of the total community out of its respective heritage, in the final analysis there is among us neither Jew nor Greek, neither Irishman nor Pole, nor German, nor Italian, nor Anglo, nor Spanish-speaking, nor Black, nor White -- but all of us are one in Christ Jesus, all are descendants of Abraham."38

The Hispanic delegates disagreed, contending not only that the divisions existed but also that they figured very strongly in the selection of bishops and in the attitudes and actions of the church toward the Spanish-speaking. Accordingly the encuentro's seventy-four conclusions demanded a greater participation of the Spanish-speaking in leadership and decision making at all levels within the American church.

Some bishops were enthusiastic about the conclusions of the encuentro. Archbishop Furey of San Antonio characterized them as the Magna Carta of Hispanic Catholics in the United States. But the Bishops' Ad Hoc Committee for the Spanish-speaking was defensive in its official response to the conclusions.
Sedillo did not see the national meeting or the regional and diocesan encuentros that came afterward in the same historic light as Archbishop Furey. “We do not see the encuentros as a panacea,” Sedillo said. “The whole idea is to create an awareness of where the Spanish-speaking are in relation to the local church and to show that the church has in many instances neglected the needs of the Spanish-speaking.”

The plan to repeat the national process on a regional and diocesan level fell short of expectations. Two years after the national encuentro, only three out of twelve episcopal regions and fifteen out of 156 dioceses had held their own encuentros. Only one other meeting of consequence was held since then -- the Northeast Regional encuentro, held at Springfield, Massachusetts, in December 1974. The local meetings aired grievances smoldering a long time. In Brooklyn, Hispanics rejected the agenda prepared by the chancery and made up their own. In Denver, the confrontation that occurred in the encuentro between the hierarchy and Chicanos was not understood by Anglo-Catholics. Archbishop James V. Casey found it necessary to explain in the Denver Catholic Register that the archdiocese had not been pressured into holding the meeting:

“I want all of our people to understand that the questions raised at St. Thomas Seminary and the ensuing dialogue have happened because the Archdiocese of Denver issued the invitation for this to happen.

“The facilities of St. Thomas Seminary were gladly made available for the Encuentro for a two-day period. Bishop George Evans, Martin Work, Father Hanifen, and I went willingly to St. Thomas to listen and to learn, because the Church of Denver is concerned.

“We were not besieged by the Chicano people nor were we forced in any way to have these two days of dialogue, but rather the Chicano people were there because we invited them to express openly their ideas, thoughts, and frustrations.”

The encuentro ideal envisions grassroots Christian communities determining their concerns and priorities and choosing leaders to present them at a local, a regional, and finally a national encuentro. According to Sedillo, the process was reversed because Hispanics did not have the structures to provide the needed input and there was no time to develop them. The Spanish-speaking leaders felt that time was slipping away. Relationships between the Spanish-speaking and the church had reached a critical stage. The Second National
Encuentro scheduled for 1976 would have better input from the grassroots. One concrete result of the first encuentros was the naming of committees of Hispanic leaders to represent their people before the hierarchy.

While Sedillo, in his most enthusiastic declaration, saw the encuentro unfolding "what history may recognize as the flowering of the faith not only among the Spanish-speaking Catholics, but of the whole American church," he did not expect the conclusions or demands to be fulfilled in his lifetime. The bishops said that they agreed in principle, but were very slow in initiating changes. Some bishops felt threatened. Sedillo believed they were afraid that the Hispanics would establish their own church. A full two years after the national encuentro, Sedillo stated that very few of its conclusions had been implemented.

Perhaps the most far-reaching value of the encuentros is that they have institutionalized the movimiento. They provide a mechanism whereby Hispanics can come face to face with the top levels of authority in the church to express their frustrations and demands for equality and opportunity in the community of believers. The encuentros have legitimized protest and demonstrated the Church's willingness to listen to the oppressed.

The Mexican American Cultural Center

No institution created to serve the Spanish-speaking approaches the impact, significance, and promise of the Mexican American Cultural Center (MACC) of San Antonio, Texas. It has in its brief four year history become the national center for the development of liturgy for the Spanish-speaking, for research on Hispanic vocations, for the creation of materials of religious education in Spanish, for training missionaries going to Latin America, and for acculturating Anglos and Hispanics alike to minister more effectively to the Spanish-speaking in the United States. Additionally, the Mexican American Cultural Center adapted the highly acclaimed Nueva Biblia Española (The New Spanish Bible) into a lectionary that uses the Spanish language of the people of the United States. The center has also coordinated the preparation of the volume on the history of the church of the Hispanics of which this article is a part.

Bishop James Rausch, secretary general of the National
Conference of Catholic Bishops, described MACC as “the most effective thing we have going in this country right now ... It addressed the total problem: economics, social integration, and other areas and it does it on a positive concept. This is culturally and ecclesiastically speaking the capital of the Spanish-speaking community in the Southwest.” The apostolic delegate in the United States, top leaders of the American hierarchy, and U.S. senators have been among the many who pass through the center’s portals to see for themselves. They have all been deeply impressed. At a liturgy commemorating MACC’s second birthday, Bishop Rausch said:

“Honestly, I have not felt so humble for a long time in my life ... because I see here people with a dedication that goes so deep; that with so little encouragement and, many times with so little help, they are willing to continue to fight the battle. Day after day they are willing to continue. They are not going to be discouraged, they are not going to be left out. And above all, they are going to continue to love even those of us who, in our own way, have had a hand in the injustice -- have had roles in the snobbery we have often dealt out to our brothers and sisters in the church of Christ.”

The Mexican American Cultural Center began in 1971 as a language institute because the promotion of the study of the Spanish language was the most critical need at the time. But it soon expanded into seven institutes. The other six are concerned with research and publications, higher education, culture, mass media, art, and leadership development. More than nine hundred students from thirty-seven states and sixteen countries have studied at the center, which has become a vital link among the Hispanic peoples of the Americas. Not only do some of Latin America’s top theologians teach at the center, but also students from Puerto Rico, Santo Domingo, Cuba, Colombia, Bolivia, and El Salvador have come to San Antonio. “A new dialogue is being established between people of different cultures and through this a deeper understanding ... which forms a universal bond of learning,” MACC’s newspaper announced.

MACC soon became a major liturgical and pastoral institution in the church. It had a staff of fifty employees, a good third of whom were professionals. Its annual budget was about $500,000. One could find lecturing in its classrooms some of the best theologians, historians, liturgists, and scriptural scholars from Spain, Holland, and South America as well as grassroots
leaders from the barrios and well-educated, highly motivated Chicano priests, religious, and lay persons.

The individual most responsible for the success of the Mexican American Cultural Center is its youthful president, Father Virgil Elizondo. In 1967, when he was Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) director for the Archdiocese of San Antonio, he attended the East Asian Pastoral Institute in Manila, which became the model for MACC. Three years later, while teaching at the Incarnate Word Pastoral Institute in San Antonio, Father Elizondo became convinced that the Hispanic people of the United States needed an institute of their own. At the first PADRES retreat in Santa Fe in February 1971, the concept crystalized. In September of the same year, the Texas Catholic Conference gave unanimous approval to a motion of vocation directors favoring the creation of the Mexican American Cultural Center. Archbishop Francis Furey of San Antonio was the chairman of a steering committee of bishops, priests, Sisters, and lay persons who worked out the details of making the dream a reality. The archdiocese made available buildings needed for classrooms and housing on the campus of Assumption Seminary at an annual rent of $1. Bishop Patricio Flores was elected chairman of the first board of directors, and it is only through his untiring efforts that MACC has been able to survive financially.

Elizondo has credited MACC’s success to the strong role of Archbishop Furey, who became one of the best public relations persons for the Center. The archbishop has enthusiastically endorsed the institute’s programs and maintained a keen interest in its activities. According to Elizondo, “We give him regular reports of what we are doing.”46 Also worthy of praise are the self-sacrificing members of PADRES and Hermanas who have contributed their professional services without remuneration, aside from a small stipend and living expenses. Elizondo commented, “Without these contributive services we would not be opening.”

Financing has always been a problem. The Bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee for the Spanish-speaking gave negative reaction when the First National Encuentro requested support in 1972. It replied, with regard to funding, the Conference is not a funding agency and has no money available for this purpose.”47 Although the center still has no steady sources of funding, the bishops have been more sympathetic in recent years. Aid comes from the American Board of Catholic Missions, religious orders, foundations, Our Sunday Visitor, the Extension Society, and
Still the dedicated priests, religious, and laity who came to MACC in 1971 with only a hope and a vision, and who lacked even the assurance that their living expenses would be provided have been wary of losing touch with the grassroots. "The goal of the Center," declares the MACC newspaper, "is to alleviate the sufferings of the poor and to work at the roots of problems, to seek ways to eliminate injustices, and to seek the meaning of the Gospel in today's world." MACC sees itself as more than buildings and classrooms. It is a movement based on the needs and aspirations of the bilingual and bicultural peoples of the Americas. Indeed, teams from MACC go out to barrios across the country to give workshops in leadership, the liturgy, and the pastoral ministry. In addition, the center has been the site of important meetings such as the Convention on the Hispanic Agenda of 1973, a conference on Hispanic vocations in 1975, a festival of poetry and literature in 1973, and a symposium of historians in 1976. But Father Elizondo wants MACC to be more than that, for in addition to being a site for work and study, the center is also a place for friendships and fiestas. MACC should become a gathering spot where those who share the ideals of the institute can come simply to be with their friends.

The Southwest Office Regional for the Spanish-Speaking

Back in 1945 a Regional Office for the Spanish-speaking was first established. In 1971 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops ended their support for all regional offices and moved the National Office for the Spanish-speaking from San Antonio to Washington, D.C. Finally in 1973 the bishops of the Southwest voted to reestablish the Southwest Regional Office for the Spanish-speaking (SWROSS). Its director is Lupe Anguiano.

SWROSS served all the dioceses of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Arkansas as well as the Archdiocese of Denver and the Diocese of Pueblo, Colorado. In nine of those dioceses -- Amarillo, Brownsville, Corpus Christi, El Paso, San Angelo, San Antonio, Gallup and Tucson -- the Spanish-speaking are between 72 and 86 percent of the faithful. Notwithstanding the large constituency, SWROSS was in 1976 a one-woman operation on a $35,000 annual budget funded by the American Board of Catholic Missions. In a letter dated 9 January 1976 to Bishop James S. Rausch, chairman of the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish-speaking, Anguiano pleaded for additional funds to hire secretary and an assistant.
The Southwest Regional Office has focused some of its organizational energy on forming diocesan Spanish-speaking councils to help develop programs for the Hispano people. Another program seeks to help women on welfare to develop their skills with good job potential. More than five hundred women had completed various educational and training programs by November 1975. Another project was a comprehensive survey of how well the Santa Fe Archdiocese was fulfilling the Hispanic people’s aspirations for the liturgy in Spanish. Anguiano works on a Mexican American Cultural Center team that gives workshops on leadership and community organization. She also publishes a newsletter and is active in many *movimiento* causes. In 1975 she was a delegate of the Raza *Unida* part to the United Nations’ International Women’s Year Conference in Mexico City.

### Other Structures

In the East one of the most important church structures for the Spanish-speaking was the Institute of Cultural Communication which was founded by Ivan Illich at Catholic University in Ponce, Puerto Rico, in 1957. The role of the Institute was to give summer courses in language and culture to New York priests slated to work with the Spanish-speaking, principally Puerto Ricans. In fourteen years more than two thousand persons were trained at the institute.

In Miami the Centro *Hispano Catolico*, which was opened by Bishop Coleman F. Carroll of the Diocese of Miami in the late 1950s, assisted thousands of Cuban refugees to begin a new life in the United States. The center gave courses in English, U.S. history, church history, Christian doctrine, marriage and pre-marriage counseling.

The Commission for Mexican-American Affairs of the Archdiocese of San Antonio was founded as a social action agency in 1970 by Archbishop Furey in cooperation with Bishop Patricio Flores and others. In San Diego El Padre Hidalgo Center was opened in the early 1970s to work with the poor of the barrios, developing leaders and training them to be a bridge between pastors and the community. It also offers professional counseling in many areas. In Yonkers, New York, the Spanish Community Progress Foundation seeks social, economic, educational, cultural, and recreational advancement of the city’s growing Hispanic population. Finally, in New York at the end of 1975, steps were taken to establish a regional pastoral center for the fourteen states of the Northeast. The center was to be established in Manhattan. The initial budget was to be $100,000
and its program was to include pastoral training for priests, religious, and laity working with the Spanish-speaking and the development of Christian leadership.

Despite the multiplicity of services of all these structures, the Spanish-speaking have remained an oppressed people. Paul Sedillo has pointed out that the concerns voiced by the Spanish-speaking in 1945 were the same as those listed as demands twenty-seven years later at the Primer Encuentro Hispano de Pastoral. In Sedillo’s opinion, “We made no progress in all that time.”

Father Juan Romero, executive director of PADRES, has expressed the view that at the highest levels of the church there has been a real responsiveness. But this change of attitude has not reached the grassroots:

“On the middle level, i.e., most parishes and many dioceses in the country, there is as little sympathy as ever. The rhetoric is right, but the deed has a long way to go to catch up with the rhetoric. There has been very little change of attitude at the level at which most Chicanos relate to the church -- the parish.”
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THE LATINIZATION PROCESS
Moisés Sandoval

Introduction

Recent years have seen the beginning of a process in the Catholic church that might be called “Latinization.” It is marked by the decline of the melting-pot mystique and the rebirth of ethnicity. It can be seen in the vitality brought to the church by such movements as the Cursillo and Marriage Encounter, both exports from Spain. A more recent manifestation is the growth of the liberation theology in the United States, an import from South America.

Latinization is also marked by the church’s token acknowledgement of Hispanic leadership. The Colorado beet growers’ idea that Hispanics were unfit for anything but common labor had its own corollary in the church: that the Spanish-speaking could be sheep of the flock of Christ but not shepherds. The idea began to die just before the beginning of this last period in the history of the church in the United States. But to become shepherds, Hispanic persons had to be willing to give up their culture. Implicit in that conception was the judgment that Hispanic culture was inferior. Grudgingly that final concession has now come: There can be worthy Hispanic leaders who do not reject their language, customs, and traditions.

Many token changes came between 1970 and the early 1980s. Most notable was the naming of five Hispanic bishops. There were also token structures and token gestures. Sixty percent of the dioceses acquired special offices for the Spanish-speaking apostolate. John Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia made headlines by writing, according to a newspaper, one of the first pastoral letters in Spanish ever written by an Anglo.1 Two prominent Hispanics were named to top posts for the 41st International Eucharistic Congress. Canonization was proposed for Father Eusebio Kino (c. 1644-1711), a Jesuit from the Austrian Tyrol who was a missionary explorer of the Southwest. The Los Angeles archdiocesan schools started handing out bilingual report cards in 1975. A Catholic publisher started a weekly in Spanish El Visitante Dominical, Huntington, Ind. Bishop John J.
Fitzpatrick of Brownsville began following some of the tens of thousands of migrant workers from his diocese who trek up the migrant stream each year as they follow the harvest. Encarnación Armas, a long-time leader among the Spanish-speaking, became the first Puerto Rican woman to receive an honorary doctorate in Humane Letters from Fordham University. Many churches began offering Mass in Spanish.

Such changes could create the illusion that the church was indeed Latinized -- that the Spanish-speaking had won their rightful role. But there was other evidence that made such a conclusion implausible. Bishop Fitzpatrick said that many of the migrants from his diocese had never seen a priest in the Rio Grande Valley.² In Salinas, California, twenty-thousand Mexican Americans in three parishes were being served by a single Spanish-speaking priest in charge of a mission.³ The Archdiocese of San Francisco had eight hundred thousand Spanish-speaking people but only one Mexican American priest. The estimated 2.6 million Puerto Ricans on the mainland had only three native, Puerto Rican priests.⁴ Of ninety-six Spanish apostolate offices in the nation, only fifteen were deemed effective by the executive secretary for the Spanish-speaking of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. As for bilingual report cards in Los Angeles, only one third⁵ of the Catholic schools' enrollment was Spanish-speaking — a disproportionate ratio considering that 55 to 60 percent of the faithful was Hispanic. As for the Catholic press, it was only beginning to reflect the presence and concerns of the Spanish-speaking. Thus a truly poli-cultural church lay beyond the appearance of token changes. Yet there was no denying that changes had been made — changes that had forever altered the relationship between the Spanish-speaking and their church.

**Hispanic Bishops**

In the hagiography of the Spanish-speaking, Archbishop Francis J. Furey of San Antonio will not only be included but will have a very high place. The chief reason is that he was the first ordinary to do what no other bishop had dared do before him — to choose a Mexican-American as his auxiliary and to insist on his choice when it was questioned. Legend has it that when Archbishop Furey recommended Father Patricio Flores as his auxiliary, the apostolic delegate asked for more names, and that the archbishop responded by writing in Patricio Flores as his first, second and third choices. In a personal interview Archbishop Furey confirmed that he was indeed asked for more names, and that he replied: “If I had three Mexican Americans who were
equally qualified, I would put them all down. To get an auxiliary bishop in Texas, we don’t want to go to California. The auxiliary should be a native.”

Archbishop Furey said he had no difficulty selling the apostolic delegate, Archbishop Luigi Raimondi, on his choice. Over the years he had gotten to know the delegate well and the two had become good friends. “I had an in with him,” smiled Furey. “I told him we should have a Mexican American here because of the fact that we have so many here.” But the apostolic delegate had to make a report to Rome “and they would ask who started this and does he know what he is doing,” Archbishop Furey said. “So of course I had to do a lot of pushing because as you can imagine a breakthrough in the Catholic church is not easy.” When he was reminded that he had never had a Mexican American bishop, Furey said, “That is an argument for me, not against me.”

Archbishop Furey did all these things without first meeting the then Father Patricio Flores. He acted on the basis of a recommendation made by priests in the archdiocese who met every other year to suggest candidates for bishop. Also, Furey learned from his fellow Texas bishops that they regarded Flores very highly. A third factor was that Flores was born in the archdiocese although he had been ordained for the Diocese of Houston. Flores and Furey did not meet until after Rome announced the choice. The date was 18 March 1970.

Archbishop Furey fitted the stereotype of the typical Texan: tall, broad-shouldered, blunt, outgoing, and gregarious. In moments of levity he was not adverse to whipping out his clerical frock and showing off his wide, heavy, buckled belt with the word “Texas” sculptured on it. But he was not really a Texan, and has none of the prejudice so often ingrained in Texas character against Mexican-Americans. He came from Pennsylvania, where he was an auxiliary bishop in Philadelphia. Then he was promoted to coadjutor of San Diego in 1963 and became the ordinary in 1966. He was promoted to the Archdiocese of San Antonio on 4 June 1969, and a few months later began his quest for a Mexican American bishop. In his six years in San Diego, Furey had gotten to know and love the Mexican American people. He liked to stand in the back of churches he visited, and talk to the people in their native tongue. “I am not fluent in Spanish, but I get along,” he said. He was very much interested in all aspects of Latin culture and felt the church should do everything in its power to make it thrive. His support of the Mexican Ameri-
can struggle for justice and dignity made him, in the eyes of the Spanish-speaking, a Chicano de corazón. It took such a man to get the Mexican Americans their first bishop.

Furey’s choice could not have been more fortunate, for Bishop Flores has won the love and respect of people of good will across the nation. When Time magazine selected “200 faces of the future” — a portfolio of young leaders published on 15 July 1974 — Flores was one of the two bishops chosen. (The other was also a Mexican American: Archbishop Robert F. Sánchez of Santa Fe.) When Bishop James S. Rausch, general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, visited San Antonio to commemorate the second anniversary of the Mexican American Cultural Center, he said of Flores, “If you want prophets, there is your prophet: a man with such a deep sense of pastoral mission, a deep commitment of bringing Christ and His love into the lives of all the people he touches.”

Bishop Flores is a man with a special charisma for the poor from whom he came. Education did not take away his common touch. Monsignor George Higgins, director of research for the United States Catholic Conference, describes an incident in the vineyards of California in 1973. Flores and Bishop Juan Arzube, auxiliary of Los Angeles, both spoke to the farm workers. “Both spoke Spanish and Arzube no doubt had better command of the language,” reports Higgins. “He is, after all, an educated man from an upper-class Ecuadorian family. But the man who touched the hearts of the farm workers was Flores, who spoke their language, understood their patois, and had been a farm worker himself.”

Patricio Flores was born in Ganado, Texas, the eighth of nine children of a migrant family. As a boy he worked in endless rows of crops. He knew the pain of trying to stand erect after stooping long hours in the fields. He has felt the sting of discrimination, the gnawing of hunger, the debilitation of defeat. He remembers that on one farm, his family had to live in a barn normally used to house cows. By the time he was fourteen, he had dropped out of school to help his family. This is the way Bishop Flores capsules the odyssey of his vocation:

“Listen as I tell you about a little boy who toddled behind his father following the harvest north, the young son of a Mexican American farm laborer. He lived in the sheds — sometimes with water and sometimes without. He knew the dull stare of hunger. He saw family-learned prejudice grow in the eyes of his class-
mates. By the tenth grade, this boy was defeated, and, like 40 percent of all Mexican American children, he dropped out of high school.

"The end? No, someone came along. First there was a Sister, then a priest, and later some Christian friends who helped this boy, showed him the way, encouraged him, opened doors for him as if he were their own son and brother. The boy not only finished high school but college, too ... I am the boy in that story." 10

When the young Flores first went to a priest to express his desire to enter the priesthood, he was sent home to pray. When he returned, the same thing happened. The young migrant worker finally got the message: He was not wanted. Luckily, a nun took him to the bishop, and the prelate sent Flores back to high school and made certain the young man got his wish to enter the seminary. There Flores had to shine his classmates' shoes to earn money for books, clothing, and incidentals.

As an assistant pastor, Flores knew the frustrations of a Chicano priest trying to minister to his own people without being permitted to speak to them in his own language. 11 But after seven years he was able to set his own style, for by then he was a pastor. He dedicated himself to the poorest and the most oppressed — the migrant workers, the immigrants without documents, the victims of policy brutality, the imprisoned.

When he was nominated for bishop, Father Flores was summoned for an interview with the apostolic delegate. Bishop Flores did not consider the meeting unusual. But Archbishop Raimondi questioned him about his views on a number of important church issues, including celibacy. At the end of the interview, Raimondi, who had apparently checked very closely on the details of Bishop Flores' life, said, "I understand you've been seen dancing in public." Flores said that was true, adding, "It's when you dance in private that there's reason to worry." 12 Nevertheless, the apostolic delegate made Flores promise he would not dance any more. At the Kansas encuentro several years later, Bishop Flores danced again. Then, remembering, he told Father Juan Romero with a smile that perhaps the promise no longer held because Raimondi was not the apostolic delegate any more. 13

Bishop Flores was not awed into silence by his new role, or into being less of a champion for the Spanish-speaking. Cesar Chávez gave one of the readings at the episcopal ordination,
which had to be held in the San Antonio Convention Center to accommodate the ten thousand people who came to witness it. As a bishop, Flores was in demand all over the country. He visited Chávez in jail, stood on the picket lines with farm workers in California, visited migrants in Michigan. In some places he was welcomed, and in others he had to meet his people in Protestant churches or halls. One time he was invited to the Diocese of Fresno by the Chicano population to preach on Our Lady of Guadalupe. The local bishop told him to make the homily short — right in front of the congregation. He said he hated long sermons. Bishop Flores consulted the people. “Well, you heard the order. Do you want it long or short?” “Long,” shouted the congregation. So Bishop Flores obliged them and when he finished, the local bishop was gone.

It is that kind of independence that has endeared Bishop Flores to his people. When Mexican President Luis Echeverría declared that no U.S. aid would be accepted for victims of the 1973 earthquake, Flores went to Mexico and personally distributed twenty thousand dollars he had raised. When, by coincidence, he found himself in Los Angeles during the bloody police riot during the Chicano Moratorium, he met with Chicano leaders and incurred the wrath of the Los Angeles hierarchy, who were having nothing to do with Chicanos. The incident was reported to the apostolic delegate, and the latter wrote to Flores about it. Bishop Flores has not been daunted by such problems. “It is the duty of religion,” he said, “to speak in behalf of those without spokesmen.” In such ways Bishop Flores has offered his presence and helping hand in many areas across the nation. His role before other Hispanic bishops were named was tantamount to that of bishop of all the Mexican American people in the country.

Archbishop Robert F. Sánchez of Santa Fe quickly established himself as a man of the same mold as Bishop Flores as soon as he was named the first native Spanish-speaking ordinary in the nation in 1974. He called on all pastors to take up a special collection for the United Farm Workers and to urge their congregations to boycott farm products picked by non union labor. Not all pastors went along, but the offering was still the largest in the history of the archdiocese. He became a leader in the movement to reform seminary education so it does not destroy the culture of the Hispanics. Further, he set out to make his see a model for other dioceses to follow — fomenting an
ambience that respects not only Spanish and Anglo cultures but that of the Indians as well.

Father Robert F. Sánchez was born in Socorro, New Mexico, the son of a self-made lawyer and civil engineer. He father was a great influence in young Robert’s life. The archbishop remembers how his father provided legal and engineering services to people at no charge or for whatever they wanted to pay, sometimes a few chickens, fruit, or other produce. He was instrumental in bringing the Rural Electrification Association to New Mexico and served as its first president for a number of years at no pay.

Robert F. Sánchez was educated in Catholic schools in New Mexico and Arizona. While in the seminary, he was invited to go to Rome’s Gregorian University for his philosophical and theological studies. There he received his licentiate in theology in 1960 and was ordained in December 1959. Back in the United States he earned a degree in canon law at Catholic University. He also studied guidance and counseling at night in Albuquerque.

A throng of thirteen thousand — Hispanics, Anglos, Indians, and blacks—attended the ordination of Archbishop Sánchez, which was held in a public arena, in the greatest display of joy and affection ever seen at an episcopal consecration in the United States. Soon other audiences across the nation could see why he was so well regarded back home. He preached the values of the people of New Mexico’s villages — people who are not only close to the soil and their neighbors but to God. He saw present-day society as one where only the strong can succeed. “Our society is not for weak people,” he said. “The weak and the voiceless are left behind. I think the church must provide a voice for those who do not have a voice and do not have the strength to speak loudly. We must become representatives of the people.”

Bishop Gilbert Chávez, auxiliary bishop of San Diego, is the son of a farm worker who picked grapes, oranges, potatoes, and other vegetables in San Bernardino, California. When Gilbert was fourteen, his father was killed in an auto-train crash. To support himself, Gilbert worked as a busboy in restaurants, as a packer in grocery stores, and as a laborer in the fields. He had to help support his family as well as pay his way through Catholic high school.

As a priest, Father Chávez was chaplain for four years at the State Rehabilitation Center for drug addicts at Norco, California. In a border parish he became well versed in the difficulties
encountered by immigrant and Hispanic citizens alike as the U.S. Immigration Service became more radical and arbitrary in its enforcement efforts.

Consecrated on 21 June 1974, Bishop Chávez said, “I recognize that I am a tool to reach not only my own people but people of all colors.” In an interview with the San Diego Evening Tribune, he declared, “I have accepted the challenge to serve the poor, the Spanish-speaking, the Indians, blacks and other minorities.”

Like Flores, Bishop Chávez experienced the deprivation of the farm workers. He remembered the struggles of his parents for food and shelter. He said he was not socially accepted in a Catholic high school. “The first time I was invited into the home of an Anglo was after entering the seminary,” he said. He has seen the despair of the imprisoned and of those who are victimized by drugs. But he declared that the biggest problem facing Americans of Mexican descent is to be stereotyped as inferior and not recognized as being worthy of respect as people. He chose the priesthood precisely because it “gives me participation in their pains, joys, sorrows and provides a forum to assist these people in their daily necessities.”

There was no rejoicing among Mexican Americans in Los Angeles when Juan Arzube was ordained as auxiliary bishop in 1971. The reason was that Arzube was Ecuadorian and upper class at that. The Chicanos felt that they had been cheated out of having their own bishop in the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Bishop Arzube said he understood their disappointment and set out to prove that he could be a worthy shepherd of the Spanish-speaking.

When the U.S. Immigration Service was accused of violating the civil rights of Spanish-speaking people during mass arrests of suspected illegal aliens during the summer of 1973, Bishop Arzube investigated the allegations, and then met with the district director of the agency to express his concern. Through the diocesan paper the bishop made the Spanish-speaking aware of their rights. The abuses diminished.

When the authorities arrested hundreds of farm workers and their sympathizers in the vineyards, Bishop Arzube visited those in jail. He was one of several bishops to offer a funeral Mass for a striker shot and killed from a passing vehicle as he picketed alongside a road. Of the priests who went to jail with the strikers, the Bishop said:
"I believe their presence has meant a great deal to the workers and has brought the Church to them in a much more efficacious way than if priests from the outside were merely visiting them and not sharing their troubles. I see Christ’s mode of work. He was with those who needed Him.”

In 1973 Bishop Arzube backed a young activist lawyer named Ricardo Cruz who had been convicted of a misdemeanor as a result of a demonstration at St. Basil’s Cathedral in 1969. The State Bar Association had withheld accreditation because of the conviction. The bishop spoke before the Bar examiners. “I believe that since Ricardo Cruz is well informed about many of the problems which beset the Mexican-American people in this country, his services are very badly needed to represent the interests of that ethnic group,” he said. “I do not believe he should be barred from future practice.”

The fifth Hispanic bishop were René Gracida, an auxiliary in Miami until late 1975, when he was named to head the smaller diocese of Pensacola-Tallahassee. He took part in the Hispanic Convocation at the Mexican American Cultural Center in 1973—a meeting at which the Spanish-speaking at which the Spanish speaking sought the educate the heads of church organizations and religious orders to their priorities. However, Bishop Gracida was not as visible or as controversial as other Hispanic bishops. Miami had succeeded in organizing a bicultural seminary by 1974, but it was uncertain what role Bishop Gracida had played. He was active, however, in working to improve seminary education for the Spanish-speaking and in insuring adequate Hispanic input into the catechetical directory.

Clergy

Over an NBC television show in February 1976, Bishop Flores said that the way to build a Spanish-speaking clergy was to name more Hispanic bishops. He said Christ went that route, naming bishops who in turn developed into a clergy. The wisdom of that observation can be demonstrated in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe. Archbishop Sánchez reported that enrollment at the Santa Fe seminary had increased by 30 percent. The good turnout was being spurred by the creation of a tricultural seminary — Anglo, Spanish, and Indian — and no doubt by the enthusiasm the Hispanic people experienced when one of their own was named the ordinary for the first time in history. In other areas — and in the nation as a whole — the vocation crisis continues, and for Hispanics it is particularly acute. As a result, a series of meetings
of bishops, clergy, and lay leaders has tried to develop new programs to make seminary education more respectful of Hispanic culture. Surveys have shown that Hispanics suffered various kinds of alienation, including social and cultural alienation. A 1974 survey showed that while 60 percent of Hispanics entered the seminary with the ideal of serving their own people, the seminary did not prepare 80 percent of them to fulfill that aspiration. More than half experienced economic bias, and 74 percent felt cultural alienation. Another survey revealed similar sentiments: “The Anglo approach makes Mexicans uncomfortable, lonely, introverted,” one priest said.

Latinization of the clergy was promoted by the Mexican American Cultural Center of San Antonio. Development of a Latin clergy was also a top priority of a new pastoral center for the Northeast that opened 1 March 1976 in Manhattan in New York City. The Institute of Cultural Communication sponsored by the New York Archdiocese has continued since its founding in 1957 to impart to New York clergy at least a smattering of information about the culture and language of Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, and Colombia. As a result, three hundred priests in the New York Archdiocese speak Spanish in addition to the 110 of Hispanic origins — 90 Spaniards, two Filipinos, and the rest Latin Americans. Research by Father Rutilio del Riego of the Mexican American Cultural Center indicated there were over 7,000 Spanish-speaking priests in the United States. Even so, the total is only a small percentage of the Hispanic priests needed to provide meaningful service to the Spanish-speaking. And with Hispanic seminarians in college being only 3.7 percent of the total U.S. seminary enrollment, the prospects for the future are not bright. That is why Hispanic leaders are not sanguine about developing new ministries.

The Permanent Diaconate

The diaconate has been seen as at least part of the answer to the critical need for Hispanic leadership in the church. A three-year program was launched in the Diocese of Kalamazoo, Michigan, in 1975. Father Eugene A. Sears, its director, said that the Spanish-speaking deacons would minister to an estimated five to ten thousand Hispanic people in a nine-county area. In Toledo, Ohio, 18 deacons were ordained in late 1975, five of whom were Mexican Americans. Eight Chicano deacons were ordained in the San Francisco Archdiocese on 12 December 1974. They were the first Chicano deacons in California. The Diocese
of Dallas began a permanent deacon program for Spanish-speaking men in March 1975; twenty-three Mexican Americans enrolled.\textsuperscript{30} Msgr. Ernest J. Fiedler, executive director of the U.S. Bishops' Committee on the Permanent Diaconate, said in 1975 that there would soon be one thousand permanent deacons.\textsuperscript{31} If a good proportion of them were to be Hispanic, that could solve some of the leadership problem.

However, some dioceses have been slow in starting diaconate programs. The New York Archdiocese, which has one million Hispanics, did not have any native Spanish-speaking deacons in 1975. Its first deacons — a class of seven representing Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, and Spaniards — was scheduled for ordination on 19 June 1976. New York is a city with 1.3 million Puerto Ricans and not a single native Puerto Rican diocesan priest!\textsuperscript{32}

Father Al Benavides, pastor of St. Timothy's parish in San Antonio, expressed fears in a talk to permanent diaconate directors in Denver, Colorado, in 1974 that the diaconate program might become another institution from which Mexican American would be excluded.

It seems that we have run into a brick wall. The difficulties have seemed to be so demoralizing that few programs have made a real effort to reach the Mexican American. There are the common complaints of recruitment difficulty. It also seems that there have been Mexican American dropouts from diaconate programs around the country. In a word, this phase of the Permanent Diaconate program has regressed more than progressed.\textsuperscript{33}

Thus the question as to whether the permanent diaconate would be an answer to the crying need for more Hispanic leadership in the church is still an open debate. Some of the figures are encouraging. But beyond ordination lies utilization. In 1974 the Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph had one permanent Hispanic deacon for the thirty thousand Mexican Americans in the diocese. But instead of working with the Hispanic people in some sort of ministry, he was functioning as the bishop's secretary.\textsuperscript{34} A second deacon was in the missions in Central America.

**Liturgy**

Recent years have brought increasing demands from the Spanish-speaking for a liturgy in their own language. Some progress has been made. In the New York Archdiocese, there are religious services in Spanish in 105 of the 404 parishes. The
Diocese of Brownsville offers Sunday Masses in Spanish in 57 of its 61 parishes. The Archdiocese of Santa Fe, as might be expected, has a Spanish liturgy in many parishes.\footnote{35}

News stories tell of other advances. In Tucson a new rite of marriage was published in both Spanish and English in 1973, and Bishop Francis J. Green said, "The Spanish-speaking people have a need to express their customs and language in a meaningful way in worship, especially in such an intimate time as marriage."\footnote{36} The Diocese of Brownsville published the new rite of penance in a bilingual edition "to best serve the needs of our people," said a diocesan official.\footnote{37}

All this spells progress for a people who not long ago experienced disdain in the churches. Encarnación Armas, a woman from Puerto Rico, said that when her people first started coming to New York in large numbers, they were given Mass in the basement of the churches and had to file through the alley to get there.\footnote{38} But the picture looks less rosy on closer investigation. First, the demand for a Spanish liturgy is simply not being met, and understandably so: There are not enough priests who are acquainted with the language and culture. Second, it is not just a question of translating the services into Spanish. Music, mode of expression, pace, and even length of the homily are important elements, to say nothing of a culture's religious traditions. Much remains to be done. In the Archdiocese of Santa Fe, officials found that they had to create new music and write new liturgical materials.

In addition, there is outright opposition in some areas to a Spanish liturgy. A controversial survey made by the Southwest Regional Office for the Spanish-speaking showed that, despite the strong urging of the archbishop, some pastors in the Santa Fe Archdiocese were either refusing to offer Spanish Masses or scheduling them at such inconvenient times that the parishioners were unhappy. The archbishop has acknowledged the foot-dragging, but does not see it as a defiance of his wishes. "I don't think it is resistance so much as maybe the feeling 'Yo no puedo,' (I can't do it). So they just don't bother." He had previously offered pastors assistance in initiating liturgy in Spanish. "If you need missals, prayer books, music — whatever — we will help you." If language was the problem, he offered to send a Spanish-speaking priest to provide the service on a regular basis.\footnote{39} Unfortunately, as in other areas, there still prevailed the attitude voiced by a pastor in a New York suburb. "Let them learn English," he said adamantly.\footnote{40}
Thus while there are showcase fiestas, such as the New York San Juan observance and the special services honoring Our Lady of Guadalupe in many parts of the country, much remains to be done in the area of liturgy. Significant changes cannot come until prevailing attitudes are modified in favor of a multicultural church.

The most comprehensive liturgical reforms have been initiated in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe. Besides strongly urging pastors in parishes with large Spanish-speaking congregations to celebrate the Mass in Spanish, the youthful Archbishop Sánchez has revived many of the religious traditions of the Hispanics who settled and evangelized New Mexico. He established a pastoral center to teach language and culture to priests not prepared to minister to the Spanish-speaking. The seminary received a trilingual focus. The archdiocese stopped accepting priests who moved to New Mexico and could not minister to the Hispanics. (In the past, because of a shortage of clergy, the archdiocesan had accepted newcomers without qualification.) The archbishop also reversed the trend to abandon small chapels in outlying villages in favor of building larger parishes. The result of all this has been a renaissance of faith. "When you have the Spanish with the music, the joy, the celebration — the Mass is a little more alive than many of our English Masses," Archbishop Sánchez said. "In the Spanish Mass our people immediately recognize that distinctive quality, and they are filling our churches." 41

Cursillo Movement

Perhaps no other movement has done more to Latinize the Church in the U.S. than the Cursillo. The movement started in Spain in 1947. Brought to the United States in 1957, it has influenced many leaders and developed others. Cesar Chávez and others prominent in the Movimiento are cursillistas. Father José Alvarez, who has long been active in the Spanish apostolate in New York, credits the Cursillo movement with saving the faith of the Hispanic people of New York at a time when they were getting little attention in the church. 42 Leo Grebler wrote that the movement "has provided definite impetus to social involvement." 43

Aside from its benefits for the Hispanic people, the Cursillo has been one of the most dynamic movements among U.S. Catholics as a whole. Gerald Hughes, national coordinator of the movement, reported in 1974 that three hundred thousand persons had made the Cursillo in the United States. Included in
that number were fifty to sixty bishops and approximately seven thousand priests and religious. The Cursillo is active in about 120 dioceses of the 156 in the nation.\textsuperscript{44} Besides encouraging a life of active Christianity, the movement has done much to establish goodwill and cooperation between Hispanic and Anglo cultures.

The Cursillo, a once-in-a-lifetime experience, consists of a three-day series of talks and other activities aimed at achieving an encounter with Christ and renewal in the church. The movement was brought to the United States by two Spanish airmen. Working with a Franciscan priest in Waco, Texas, where the airmen were on temporary assignment, they introduced the first Cursillo on 27 May 1957. The movement spread quickly, and in 1959 Bishop Louis J. Reicher, ordinary of the Austin Diocese, became the first bishop in the United States to give his official approval to the Cursillo as a diocesan movement.\textsuperscript{44}

Rome, however, was notoriously slow in giving its stamp of approval. It was not until December 1963 that Pope Paul VI approved the movement and named St. Paul as its official patron.\textsuperscript{46}

The Cursillo had its first session in New York in 1958 with 17 participants. By 1976 a total of fourteen thousand persons had attended Cursillos given in Spanish. Including the borough of Brooklyn, which is a separate diocese, twenty thousand have participated. Quick to recognize the value of the movement, Cardinal Francis J. Spellman gave the movement a place to hold its meetings. Cursillos have been held continuously in Spanish from the beginning. The English Cursillo was discontinued for a time but had resumed again in 1974. By 1976 a total of 164 Cursillos had been held for men and 125 for women, both in Spanish. The movement had apparently not lost its appeal; Cursillos were begun in the Diocese of Rockville Centre on Long Island in 1974, and by 1976 eight had been held.\textsuperscript{47}

In 1976 only 39 dioceses were listed as having a secretariat for Cursillos in Spanish, and the directors were unhappy, feeling that many of their ideas, initiatives, and apostolic concerns clashed with those of the English secretariats.\textsuperscript{48} In a meeting in San Antonio in early summer, the Spanish secretariats voted to establish their own national secretariat. The split was headed off after meetings with Bishop James Rausch, general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Only time will tell whether the two groups can work together on the basis of mutual respect and equality.
Marriage Encounter and Other Movements

Marriage Encounter was founded by Father Gabriel Calvo in Spain, and brought to the United States from Mexico by Maryknoll Father Donald Hessler and a Mexican couple, Alfonzo and Mercedes Gómez in 1967. They gave the first marriage encounter at Notre Dame University. By 1973 more than seventeen thousand couples had experienced the weekend sessions and by 1975 the movement had grown to seventy-seven thousand couples. An estimated sixty thousand people from Marriage Encounter groups throughout the nation converged on Philadelphia’s Veterans Stadium on 2 August 1976 for an evening liturgy during the Eucharistic Congress. However, as with the Cursillo, cultural tensions have intruded and there are two divergent groups — one incorporated in New York, and another represented by Father Calvo and supported by the Christian Family Movement. The New York group focuses on only one of the encounters designed by Father Calvo; between marriage partners (husband and wife). Hispanos support the original movement that seeks to strengthen not only the husband and wife relationships but those of the entire family as well.

Another movement that has drawn Hispanos together is the Movimiento Familiar Cristiano, which originated some thirty years ago in Uruguay. It is the Latin version of the Christian Family Movement, which started in the United States a little before Movimiento Familiar Cristiano (MFC) came into being. MFC is active in many areas of the United States, including New York. In 1973 MFC had three thousand couples and was gaining popularity.

MFC seeks to develop stronger families and better communities where the people can live in harmony. It focuses first on marriage, then on the family and the community. Aside from the benefits it brings members, on the national level it brings Hispanos in the United States into contact with Latins in other nations, thus promoting intercultural exchange.

Potentially more significant than any other single movement in itself are grassroots Christian communities (Comunidades de Base) being developed by Father Edgard Beltrán of the National Secretariat for the Spanish-speaking. More than ten thousand persons have participated in workshops directed by Father Beltrán throughout the nation between 1973 and 1975. The aim of the workshops is to create an awareness that helps
Hispanos to grow as a people, discover their destiny, analyze the situation in which they live, and unite their efforts to make history.51

The grassroots Christian communities are modeled after successful Latin American groupings. The concrete result of Father Beltrán’s work is the formation of teams in every part of the country to promote the growth of these communities. The entire process leads to a profound renewal of the church.

The Latin Connection

In 1961 Ivan Illich established a language school in Cuernavaca, Mexico. His intent was to persuade missionaries who came there to study in preparation for going to Latin America to return home and leave the Latin Americans alone. He felt that the foreigners, despite good intentions, would delay the growth of an autonomous faith in South America.52 Such fears were gratuitous, for Latin Americans made unique advances in Catholic fervor despite the missionaries who went down there in large numbers. Now the tables are turned. North Americans are looking south not for targets for evangelization but to receive new theological insights and profit from experiences (such as Comunidades de Base) from a church deeply involved in the people’s struggle against oppression. But the interchange is not just one way. Father Juan Romero, executive director of PADRES, wrote:

“The lasos which we have made with the Latin American church have influenced our own understanding of ourselves. I think many of us do see ourselves as part of a worldwide struggle, particularly as it is going on in the American continent. Our Mexican brothers in the priesthood, at least their avant-garde, are strong on rhetoric and theory, while weak in practical, long-term change. Our strengths and weaknesses are opposite to those. At a recent meeting of Sacerdotes para El Pueblo (which nows calls itself Iglesia Solidaria) the presence of five Chicanos was a strength and inspiration for them. They got a sense that we were not only making an impact in our own church but were actually pushing the Mexican hierarchy and church to become more committed in pastoral service to the Mexican people who are north of the Rio Bravo, e.g. the whole immigration ques-

Interchange is going on at many levels. Bishop Flores has financed, through the National Foundation for Mexican American Vocations, the seminary studies of seven Mexican semi-
narians who were ordained for ministry in the United States. Besides San Antonio, several other dioceses have accepted Mexican priests, including San Diego and one in the state of Washington. Mexican priests and seminarians, in turn, have studied at the Mexican American Cultural Center. Several PADRES and Hermanas studied at Institute Pastoral para Latin America in the early 1970s.

The most visible symbol of the continuing and growing dialogue between Latin Christians in the Americas is the Mexican American Cultural Center, where one can find eminent theologians, historians, and other scholars articulating their vision of solidarity among the oppressed. The program regularly features men such as Gustavo, Gutiérrez, Enrique Dussel, and Juan Luis Segundo. Of course, there is also a Spanish connection featuring Casiano Floristan, director of the Pastoral Institute in Madrid, and an Asian connection represented by Alfonso Nebreda, director of the East Asian Pastoral Institute.

Another very important medium of interchange is Orbis Books, which has established itself as the prime source of liberation theology literature, bringing to the U.S. reading public the works of Gutiérrez, Segundo, Dussel, José Miranda, and others. The Maryknoll Fathers, to whom Orbis belongs, helped sponsor an international conference on the theology of liberation in Detroit in August 1975. Some two hundred theologians, social scientists, representatives of many church organizations, and spokespersons for minorities were in attendance.

Such interchanges have raised hopes that the church in the Americas will be better able to analyze the reality in which it finds itself, so that Christians everywhere can better confront the age-old problems that deny to rich and poor alike the realization of the peace, love, and fulfillment which Jesus Christ, the Liberator, came to unveil to men and women of goodwill.

4. Paul Sedillo, in proceedings of San Antonio hearing held by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Committee for the Bicentennial, p. 17.
6. Francis J. Furey, interviewed by author.
10. PADRES promotion brochure.
12. The details of this incident were related by members of PADRES and confirmed in their essence by Bishop Flores in a personal interview with the author in July 1975.
34. Personal conversation with the deacon, a Mr. Falcón, who was working in Bishop Helmsing's office in the spring of 1974.
38. NC News, June 1972 (pre-Encuentro feature.)


42. José Alvarez, interviewed by author on 26 February 1976.


44. Gerald Hughes, letter to author dated 10 January 1974.


47. José Alvarez, interviewed by author in February 1976.


From a historical perspective, there has been no radical change since the history of the last period was written in 1976. During those seven years, Hispanics continued to increase at a rapid rate. Their consciousness as a people continued to grow, adding to their determination to create their own unique history rather than to disappear into the fabled melting pot of United States society. At the same time, the burden of discrimination was not lifted off their shoulders; in fact, a new national Administration came into office in 1981 that tried to reverse the progress they had made in the past. In the Church, despite some gains, they continued to serve only as a symbolic presence in leadership positions. The perception underpinning the Church’s ministry toward Hispanics continued to be that their faith was weak, that they were a people largely “unchurched.” The Movimiento, that prophetic confrontation born in the 1960s, had been interred by the end of the 1970s. Yet, latinization in society and in the Church continued.

The Hispanic population of the United States jumped from 9.1 million in 1970 to 14.5 million in 1980, an increase of 60 percent, without taking into account the millions of undocumented immigrants. With them added to the total, the Hispanic population of the United States stood somewhere over 20 million in 1983.

No change is expected in that trend in the next 20 years. Between 1980 and 2000, the Hispanic population is expected to increase by 58 percent, to 23 million, not counting the undocumented. During that period, Hispanics will contribute 25 percent of the nation’s population growth, owing not only to immigration but also to a higher birth rate and a relatively younger population, with a median age of 20 compared with 29 for the population as a whole.

That does not make allowance for unpredictable population shifts such as the exodus of 124,000 Cubans who came to Miami in a flotilla of makeshift boats in 1980. The continuation of U. S.
policies seeking to maintain historic hegemony in Latin America through force of arms will bring even more. By 1983 for instance, 10 percent (500,000 persons) in El Salvador’s inhabitants had come to the United States as refugees. A deepening world recession and new outbreaks of revolution, on top of the endemic poverty of the region, will increase the pressure on the border where, despite one million apprehensions annually by the Border Patrol, the immigrants find ways to get in.

Economically, Hispanics continued to be mired in disadvantage in 1983. As the poor increased from 11.3 percent of the total population in 1973 to 15 percent in 1983, Hispanics were disproportionately represented. Twenty-six percent of all Hispanics were poor as compared to 11.1 percent for the white majority. They continued to lag several years in educational achievement. Politically, aside from electing Mexican American mayors in San Antonio and Denver, Hispanics maintained only a token presence in local governments, state legislatures and Congress, though the number of Hispanic Congressmen increased from five to nine in the 1982 election. During the administration of President Ronald Reagan, beginning in 1981, many of the previous gains in civil rights, affirmative action and bilingual education were nullified.

The position of Hispanics in the Church largely paralleled that in society, with the exception that there was no backlash seeking to nullify past gains. Though 15 Hispanic bishops had been ordained in 15 years (see page 464), their presence in the body of U.S. bishops was largely symbolic. The same observation could be made about lay persons, religious or clergy in chanceries, seminaries, universities or in the United States Catholic Conference.

Despite an encouraging increase in vocations in dioceses with Hispanic ordinaries, the number of native born Hispanic priests had decreased from an estimated 200 in 1975 to 180 in 1983. Adding the Hispanic clergy born in other countries increased the total to only 1,500, a figure that represented only two percent of the total priests in the United States. The picture was no better among religious Sisters or Brothers. There had been a dramatic increase in the number of ordinations of permanent Hispanic deacons, but many of them were little more than super altar boys.

One encouraging sign was the increase in Hispanic ordinaries, from one in 1976 to six in the past seven years.
Another was the clout of the two Hispanic archbishops, Patricio Flores and Roberto Sanchez, in the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. Flores headed the Latin American Bureau, which maintains links with the churches of Latin America, Sanchez the Bishops' Committee for Hispanic Affairs and the American Board of Catholic Missions.

The Church's structures to serve Hispanics continued to follow models established in the 1940s: the highly visible but relatively powerless special offices for the Hispanics. These had proliferated in recent years. Many dioceses had special offices for the Hispanic apostolate and regional offices or commissions had been established in every section of the country. Often handicapped by low budgets, these offices also lacked the authority to make policy for other diocesan or national structures. Their role was one of advocacy — and trying with limited funds to fulfill a multiplicity of aspirations.

The Church's policies toward Hispanic ministry was still based on the misperception that their faith is weak and that they are poorly evangelized. Popular religiosity was seen as deviance rather than as the bedrock of faith. Though Spanish liturgies were increasing, there was still a hope that all that would pass and that Hispanics would one day enter the melting-pot in the Church.

As in the 1940s, the big meeting — the media event — was still in vogue. The First National Encuentro in 1972 was followed by the Second National Encuentro in 1977. That one drew 1,200 delegates and 34 bishops, culminating a grassroots consultation that involved 100,000 persons. A Third National Encuentro, bigger and presumably better than the other two, was being planned for 1985. Yet, for a huge proportion of the Hispanic population, these national meetings had no impact. A study of Hispanics in the Archdiocese of New York in 1983 revealed that two thirds had not heard of the Second Encuentro. The encuentros provided an opportunity for dialogue, which is salutary, but they also led to grandiose posturing and expectations that remained largely unfulfilled.

What was needed, in the view of scholars, was not so much the evanescent euphoria of the big meeting but a long-range, well financed program of leadership development: scripture scholars, liturgists, theologians, experts in popular religiosity, ecclesiologists, and historians — and other disciplines.

Though much of the Church's efforts in behalf of Hispanics was still motivated by fear they would succumb to the blandish-
ments of proselytizing by other churches, the vast majority of Hispanics professed Catholicism in 1983. This is not to say that many had not left the Church. A Gallup survey in 1978 revealed that 14.8 percent were no longer Catholics. In the barrios in every part of the country, many churches of other denominations had gone up in recent years. While there were no reliable numbers on how many Hispanics had joined other churches, the estimates ranged into the millions.

Time had confirmed in 1983 what in 1975 was just becoming apparent. The Movimiento — that phenomenon that began in the 1960s and saw Hispanics confront the church and society with prophetic anger demanding justice — had ended. Some of the prophets had burned out, become discouraged or co-opted. But the movement had succeeded in building a new consciousness that enabled Hispanics to become a historical people. They realized for the first time that their disadvantage was not the result of inferiority but of oppression — economic, social, political, cultural and even religious. The Movimiento also enabled the Hispanics to shed their illusion that by merely learning English and putting on other trappings of assimilation they would be accepted as equals. They realized that equality would be a consequence not of societal magnanimity but of the acquisition of power. They discovered, too, that their language and culture were assets and not liabilities and their best hope for winning their rights lay in making common cause among themselves and with other poor peoples both within the United States and abroad.

In the new struggle that followed, San Antonio became a model. It was there that, with generous start-up financing from the U.S. bishops’ Campaign for Human Development and the Archdiocese of San Antonio, Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) came into being. This federation of parishes and Protestant churches, bringing together brown, black and white poor people, changed the power equation in the nation’s 10th largest city. Power for the poor led to the revitalization of the barrios, the election of a mayor representing the majority Mexican American population and to a renaissance of the Church. COPS became a model for similarly successful organizations in East Los Angeles, Houston and other Southwest cities. Together with the foundation-supported work of the Southwest Voter Education Project headed by Willie Velasquez, such efforts are bringing to the Mexican American the power that will liberate them from generations as a conquered people.
Owing to the success of the Mexican American Cultural Center (MACC), San Antonio became a crossroads where the best of Latin America’s religious thinkers shared their insights not only with Hispanics but also with Anglos studying Hispanic ministry there. By 1983, more than 9,000 clergy, religious and lay persons had completed the long and short programs of MACC and had taken ministry positions not only across the United States but in many countries in Latin America.

Similar training took place at other pastoral centers throughout the nation, especially the Hispanic pastoral centers in the Northeast and Midwest. Through a workshop process borrowed from the Latin American Confederation of Religious (CLAR), the Committee of Religious in Hispanic Ministry (CORHIM) was helping both Anglo and Hispanic religious in Hispanic ministry to develop new perspectives and priorities. Mobile teams from the West Coast Regional Office for Hispanics were upgrading the quality of service offered by parishes. The Jesuits were trying to reorient their efforts, previously focused largely on serving the middle class, so as to serve the poor, especially the Hispanics. For the first time, one of the provincials was a Mexican American, Father Edmundo Rodriguez, elected in 1983.

Many diocesan newspapers had begun columns or sections in Spanish. Maryknoll, the Catholic Foreign Mission Society, started a bilingual mission magazine in 1980.

Thus there were signs of hope even though it would take generations for Hispanic bishops, priests, Sisters and Brothers to approach the numbers and power they should have in the U.S. Church. But at least now it was recognized, even if only dimly and reluctantly, that Hispanics were not simply objects of evangelization but its subjects, having something to offer not only to their own people, but to the Church at large.

In 1983, there was no “affirmative action” program in place or on the horizon that would correct past discrimination in employment in chanceries or in the United States Catholic Conference. Neither was there a big drive to increase the proportion of Hispanics in the Catholic schools, where they were only nine percent of the enrollment nationally.

Yet, there was a more optimistic yardstick of the latinization of the U.S. Church. Much of the creativity, many of the good ideas, certainly the great challenges — these were coming from the Latin Church. The movements that had made great impact among American Catholics since the 1960s had been the Cursillo
and Marriage Encounter. Now it was the Theology of Liberation and Comunidades de Base, both products from Latin America. Together with the insights of Medellin and of Puebla and, perhaps most important, the witness of the martyrs of Latin America, these developments seem destined to mark the 1980s as the time when the Church of the poor, the Church of Latin America, would become firmly established in the United States.

---

**HISPANIC BISHOPS IN THE UNITED STATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishop</th>
<th>Episcopal Ordination</th>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricio F. Flores</td>
<td>May 5, 1970</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan A. Arzube</td>
<td>March 25, 1971</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene H. Gracida</td>
<td>January 25, 1972</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert E. Chavez</td>
<td>June 21, 1974</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto F. Sanchez</td>
<td>July 25, 1974</td>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymundo J. Peña</td>
<td>December 13, 1976</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel D. Moreno</td>
<td>February 19, 1977</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Garmendia</td>
<td>June 29, 1977</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agustin Roman</td>
<td>March 24, 1979</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph A. Madera</td>
<td>March 4, 1980</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo N. Tafoya</td>
<td>September 10, 1980</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rene Valero</td>
<td>November 24, 1980</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonso Gallego</td>
<td>November 4, 1981</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricardo Ramírez</td>
<td>December 6, 1981</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Arias</td>
<td>April 7, 1983</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

464
EPILOGUE

This general history of the church in Latin America is a work that is conscious of its limitations. It is an open quarry in the rock of Latin American reality from which at this moment we have removed only a few stones. The future volumes of this general history will mold the material, rich in possibilities, which we now begin to present. There is no one as aware as the authors of what must still be done to improve our work. Nevertheless, what has been done testifies to the modest team work realized in a scientific spirit of Christianity and poverty, if one considers the limited material resources and the generosity of the authors who have carried out the task without remuneration.

This history of the church reconstitutes the life of the church in accord with historical method. It is a scientific task. But at the same time the history of the church includes as the constitutive moment of the reconstruction of historical facts their interpretation in the light of faith. It is also a theological task. The history of the church in Latin America is theologically understood as the history of the sacramental institution of communion, of mission, of conversion as the prophetic word that judges and saves, as the church of the poor. Although all these aspects are living expressions of one Body, it appears more convenient for evangelical and historical focus. In Latin America the church has always found itself facing the task of evangelizing the poor -- the indigenous, the blacks, the mestizos, the criollos, the workers, the peasants, the people.

This CEHILA (Commission of the History of the Church in Latin America) project is being carried out in an ecumenical spirit with the participation of Catholics and Protestants. Because all the ecclesial realities of Latin America will be taken into account without regard to language or cultural or racial diversity of the regions studied, the presence of the church among Latin Americans in the United States is included. This presence in the Philippines up to the nineteenth century will likewise be included because of historical unity.
The work is not intended only for historians but rather also for all contemporary Christians with a faith commitment to the church: laymen and laywomen, students, teachers, managers, farmers, workers, priests, pastors, and members of religious orders -- in short, for all who are concerned about the life of the church. For this reason CEHILA works as a team; it includes experts in disciplines other than history, and fosters a dialogue of disciplinary integration.

CEHILA is a juridically autonomous, academically free commission. The commitments it undertakes are undertaken freely and as a service to the truth, to the people, and to the poor. The general history will not only include all of Latin America but will reconstruct church activities from 1492 up to our own day.

The criteria defined by CEHILA in the meetings at Quito (1973), Chiapas (1974), Santo Domingo (1975) and Panama (1976) have guided the works of the authors within a framework of tolerance toward different options evident in the writings brought together in this volume. A homogenous school of church historians with similar critical methodology has not yet been born. But we would like to sponsor such a development. For this reason we must work in the future on the basis of a theoretical framework in order to achieve greater coherence.

At a time when Latin America is becoming conscious of its existence as a culture dominated by others -- a culture whose people are suffering from a historical injustice -- the church is slowly assuming its responsibility before history. In this work we wish to recount the life of the church, recalling both gestures in favor of the poor and past acts of complicity with the powerful. We will exalt the church’s merits without hiding its sins. We wish to be critical and not apologetic. May these writings help in the immense task of illuminating the valiant efforts of our people to achieve their historical and eschatological liberation.

Enrique Dussel
President
CEHILA (Comisión de Estudios de Historia de la Iglesia en America Latina)
Mexico City
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