

## The Creation of an Internal Colony

*Santa Barbara, a City Divided against Itself*

### WALLING OFF OTHERS

If we were to take wing at Friendship Park and fly eastward above the U.S.-Mexico border, the triple wall would come into view. This part of the wall shares its design with the Berlin Wall, creating paved lanes between walls that the Border Patrol can oversee and police. Migrants may succeed in scaling the first wall, but they are slowed down by subsequent barriers and thus easier to apprehend. The once rugged and rural terrain has been turned into a highly militarized zone, with surveillance and control as the primary aims.

As we rise and fly northward, past the stretch of forbidding walls, we are awed by the beauty of one of the few remaining estuaries along the Pacific coast, the Tijuana Estuary. Here there is a meeting of an altogether different sort, where the worlds of freshwater and ocean water freely meet and mingle, and the creatures and vegetation that thrive in this hybrid environment grace a gentle landscape. In the natural world, this meeting place between two ecologies, ocean and river, spawns a third that gives rise to new species and plants and to a remarkable fertility and capacity for regeneration. How ironic and sad that our effort to halt the borderlands' human culture that has developed at La Frontera mortally threatens this estuarine preserve as well (see chapter 3).

Borders forcibly imposed in one domain have their echoes and effects in others. The natural flows that happen at edges—between people, animals, earth, and water—give rise to great creativity. Assault on them reverberates across species. This is the case at the border.

When we look straight down at the wall between San Diego County and Tijuana, we cannot help but be struck by the disjunction between the heavy urban sprawl of Tijuana and the relatively bucolic aspect of southern San Diego County. Looking south, we see Tijuana, at a population over 1.5 million, with densely packed buildings. Further east we see a vast complex

## The Creation of an Internal Colony

### Santa Barbara A City Divided against Itself

By Mary Watkins





Figure 13. Looking at the “triple wall” from Tijuana, Mexico. Photo by Lily Rosenthal.

of maquiladoras, industrial plants whose owners have taken advantage of the free-trade zone. Unfortunately, these plants largely assemble parts that are brought from elsewhere and create products primarily destined for export. Neither the manufacturing of constituent parts nor the finished items themselves offer any significant support to economic life in Mexico. Rather, through the low-paid labor of primarily young women, corporate factory owners are able to make sizable profits. As Mexicans and Central Americans move northward to cross the border, the wall and U.S. securitization of the border make passage extremely difficult and costly, often marooning migrants south of the border in this free-trade zone. They need jobs and take what is available: almost always low-wage nonunion jobs with poor working and safety conditions. If we were to swoop down at a change of shift, we would see thousands of Mexicans pouring in and out of these windowless factories.

Looking next to these industrial zones, we see what Mexicans call “pigeon housing,” echoing, at the intimate level of the family, the border wall’s containment of the population. Such housing crowds whole families of maquiladora workers, side by side, into one-room living spaces. You will not see any playgrounds or central community gathering areas (*zócalos*)

in pigeon housing areas. The residences are not formally called slave dwellings, but their form and function suggest just this. Close by these quarters, you can look down and see acre upon acre of tractor-trailer units, all of them ready to take the finished products to market, primarily in the United States. The poor quality of housing construction contrasts sharply with the sophisticated infrastructure for transportation: toll roads, ports, and railways that have been built for the movement not of people but of consumer goods.

Each U.S. city along the border has its twin, its Mexican counterpart. Ambos Nogales was explored in chapter 2. In every case, the latter is more swollen with population, more densely settled, less green because it has less water available, and profoundly poorer. While the paired cities are twins, sharing a bioregion and a borderlands culture, they are far from identical.

This tale of two cities echoes metaphorically within my own city of Santa Barbara, California, a little more than two hundred miles from the U.S.-Mexico border. Here, however, the proportions are reversed: the smaller “city” is the one of Mexican descent. What remains the same is that the relative poverty and the precariousness of daily life, the sheer difficulties of making ends meet, lie predominantly on the Mexican side of town. This is also the case in other cities throughout the southwestern United States, such as Tucson, Phoenix, San Antonio, and Los Angeles.

Just as the U.S. wall at La Frontera attempts to divide a nation of great relative wealth from a much poorer one, a metaphorical set of walls in my city of Santa Barbara divides those with legendary financial resources from those with few. These “walls” abruptly and decisively curtail the potential human estuary where these communities could intermingle, giving rise to new forms of conviviality and civic imagination.

Santa Barbara, not Los Angeles, was the center of power in Spanish, and then Mexican, Alta California, so it is a good place to begin our understanding of the history between communities of Anglo-American and Mexican descent. It is a comparatively small city, where two populations—Mexican and Anglo—came into contact 150 years ago. Rather than develop an estuary teeming with new life-forms—borderlands at their best—one life-form overpowers another, eventually surrounding it, containing it, and reducing it. This is a possibility at any edge where two sets of life-forms meet, but it is not preferable or inevitable. How did this happen? Santa Barbara’s small size, as well as its repetitive process of extruding difference, makes its dynamics easier to discern than those in a megalopolis such as Los Angeles, eighty miles to the south. It thus can serve as an exemplar of the dynamics of internal colonization, one response to the meeting between cultures. Using it as a starting point will prepare the ground for chapter 9,



which explores decolonizing alternatives that could give rise to a vitality and hybridity rivaling that of estuaries.

### WALLING OFF THE PAST

Americans have been criticized for living almost solely in the present and the near future, rarely looking at either the present's deep roots in the past or the long-term consequences their present choices will have in the future. This historical amnesia can be understood in part as a defense against the largely unacknowledged and unclaimed darkness and destructiveness of Americans' own history. Without looking carefully at our history, we misconstrue the present, particularly the situation facing members of those groups that continue to carry the burdens of past insults and assaults. We are sorely in need of what Aurora Levins Morales (1999) calls "medicine history," as opposed to official or imperial history that supports efforts of domination. Medicine history retrieves extruded history from the margins, bringing to the table what has been unacknowledged and silenced. These restorative acts give us an opportunity not only to reconcile with the past but also to lay the foundation for undertaking processes of reconciliation with those of our neighbors who have been profoundly affected by these histories. In the absence of such a restorative history, we are unable to understand intimate details in our daily life that otherwise remain opaque.

Lacking knowledge of my new town's history, I found many things about it puzzling. If you go downtown early in the morning, the road is full of Mexicans on bikes. In certain parks and neighborhoods, there are many young Mexican men carrying backpacks. When you drive down Quinientos Street, the labor lines are long, and all those looking for work are Mexican. Why is this so?

Why aren't the Mexican teenagers I know taking driver's education? Why aren't they filling out their FAFSA financial aid forms so they can get federal loans to help them go to college?<sup>1</sup> Why are so few Latino students going on to four-year colleges? Why are young Mexican Americans who get accepted to Berkeley or Harvard unable to attend? Why is a very smart Mexican friend of my daughter still working in the back of a restaurant, as she has for ten years, since she was fifteen? When a member of a family dies in Mexico, why does the family drive to Tijuana and then fly to their home city instead of flying directly from Santa Barbara? Why are there so many Mexicans standing in concealed lines on the first of the month, paying landlords/slumlords with cash? Why are Mexican families afraid to have their teenage children go out at night? Why are the neighborhoods and the schools so segregated? Why are all the Mexicans to be found at the

back of most establishments (restaurants, supermarkets, clothing stores) and not at the front? Why are they working, always working? Why are 25 percent of Hispanics in our county living in poverty? Why do the gardeners at my workplace not want to speak Spanish with me? Why do small traffic accidents or violations seem to terrify my Mexican friends? Why doesn't Marguerite call the police when her husband is beating her in front of her children? Why do young people involved in gangs choose State Street, the main shopping corridor, as their dividing line? It is possible to live as an Anglo in Santa Barbara without thinking about these questions. To grapple with them, it is necessary to understand the history of our town. The same is true for your city or town. I offer Santa Barbara as an example.

### MAKING THE FIRST THE LAST

When you lay out the history of Santa Barbara, you begin to notice tragic patterns familiar from other parts of the world, *colonial patterns*: divestiture of earlier groups' claims to the land; cultural invasion; the outlawing of language; disfranchisement; the consolidation of political power by wresting power from indigenous groups; the erasure of local history and a substitution of the colonists' history; racism that derogates those who were here first, as though to justify the grab of land and economic and political power from an "inferior" people; and violence and threats of violence to force the dislocation of those with prior claims—claims based on a long history of inhabitation.

As we know from colonial processes elsewhere, the first become the last. Within impressively short periods of time, newcomers using excessive force can displace a native population, driving it onto ever-smaller parcels of land and reducing it to a labor pool for the control and profit of the occupying power.

This is also the story of Santa Barbara, and it is inseparable from pernicious forms of capitalism that feed on colonial arrangements. The Anglo-Latino relations we now see in this town largely resulted from events that began in 1847, just 167 years ago, and were mostly accomplished within the first forty years. The events left a history of a stark income divide between Latinos and Anglos, and patterns of social distance accrued through a history of racism and the exploitation of others for the accumulation of capital. The present situation has other tributaries as well, but it is the colonial one we hope to clarify here. The relegation of the native population to something like an internal colony would be breathtaking had it not been normalized through historical revisionism and the proscription of narratives that describe its actual practices.



*Displacement and Confinement of the First by the Last*

In 1782 King Carlos III of Spain ordered the establishment of the Presidio in Santa Barbara "to provide the benefits of government" for the inhabitants of the Santa Barbara Channel region of California. The inhabitants were Chumash people, the most populous indigenous groups in what we now call California. That was the pretext. The subtext was to secure Alta California from Russian and British encroachment and to protect the trade route between the Philippines and Mexico. Alta California, which Spain claimed as a province, included what is now California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, western Colorado, and southwestern Wyoming. Santa Barbara was well positioned to defend the central Pacific coast. The Presidio was built by soldiers as well as by Chumash people.

The Santa Barbara Mission was established four years later, up the hill to the north. The function of the Presidio (where the soldiers lived) was to deter invasions, protect settlers from Indian attacks, and provide governance. The manifest function of the mission was to convert Indians into Christians and loyal Spanish subjects.

When the Spanish and indigenous Mexicans from Sonora first arrived after a one-thousand-mile northward journey, some 15,000 to 17,000 Chumash lived in the area extending from Malibu to San Luis Obispo; 8,000 Chumash lived in the region that was soon to be named Santa Barbara. By the early 1800s, the three Chumash communities near Santa Barbara had ceased to function. By the time of the 1834 Secularization Proclamation, 2,500 Chumash remained; by the time of annexation, in 1848, a mere 1,150; by 1880, only a few dozen. Within one hundred years, a thriving population had been tragically decimated, removing the Chumash as a possible challenge to Spanish and then Mexican domination of the region.

By 1803, twenty-one years after the founding of the Presidio, the Chumash in the Santa Barbara region had been absorbed into the mission. Thirty-one years later, when the missions were secularized, the Chumash worked as laborers, servants, and vaqueros. In effect, the Chumash were "civilized" to death; 4,000 lie buried in a mass grave under what is now the mission garden and cemetery. Their claim to the land others came to call "home" was vitiated because they themselves and their culture were almost completely destroyed.

At issue here is a history of relations between Anglos and those of Mexican descent that echoes the themes of displacement and containment, both elements common to colonialism. We begin with those twenty-seven or so indigenous people who came to the Presidio from Mexico and who were later joined in Santa Barbara by many more Mexicans. Now, a century and

a half later, the city is 38 percent Latino, largely of Mexican descent. The story we are going to tell concerns how the first to arrive became "the last" as wealth was divested from one group and accumulated by another. We want the reader to become aware of the pattern of "disappearing" others that is foundational to American cities' histories.

In 1782 fifty-five men, along with some wives and children, arrived at this location to build the Presidio under the Spanish flag. Half of these men were Spanish. They and their flag provide the basis of Santa Barbara's celebration of its Spanish origins. The other half, now largely forgotten, consisted of people listed as "mestizo" (born to a Spanish man and an Indian woman), "coyote" (born to a mestizo and an Indian), or "Indian" (i.e., indigenous). The Spanish conquerors of Mexico created an extremely elaborate caste system based on skin color. Faced with an impressive array of developed cultures—Aztec, Maya, Chimu, Aymara, Inca, and Chibcha—the Spanish set about performing "the homogenizing task on which colonialism depended in order to abruptly disinherit a multitude of people from their specific cultures—their languages, customs, and achievements" (Quijano 2000, 551–552). The soldiers who came to Santa Barbara in 1782 were enlisted to extend the Spanish empire up the coast. The pueblo, or town, was established across the street from the Presidio. It housed Mexican settlers who helped supply food and secure the area for the benefit of the Spanish crown.<sup>2</sup>

In 1821, Mexico gained its independence from Spain, and all Alta California came under Mexican rule. Santa Barbara's claim to a Spanish history is thus limited to thirty-nine years and to a handful of men and families. Most of the residents during this period, including rancheros, were Native Americans and mestizos from Mexico.

While there were distinct social classes before the United States annexed Santa Barbara, there was also a marked "cohesiveness, solidarity, and common tradition" that was enhanced by baptism and the accompanying *compadrazgo* system of godparents (Camarillo 1996, 12). In the first half of the nineteenth century, many came north from Sonora, Mexico, to work in the California mines; before long, they were displaced by a law discriminating against nonwhites. Many then settled in the Santa Barbara area.

In 1848, after a short war used as a pretext for a massive land grab (see chapter 1), the United States bought from Mexico much of what is now California, New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and Texas. Many Mexicans were basically trapped in territory that now belonged to the United States, which explains why some Mexicans say, "We did not cross the border; the border crossed us."

Prominent figures including Emerson, Thoreau, Grant, and Lincoln



denounced the 1846–1848 war, but the annexation of formerly Mexican land continued apace. The aggressors' speculative greed for more land was fueled by the rhetoric of Manifest Destiny (and by the earlier Monroe Doctrine). This ideology acted like a magic wand, making the worst human aggressions appear a blessed part of some divine unfolding. The war was justified on the pretext of protecting Texans, but only a half-dozen of the Alamo's defenders had been in Texas for more than six years (Acuña 2000). The American soldiers were badly controlled by their commanders, and many committed atrocities with abandon. Among the acts of brutality were many fueled by outright prejudice against Catholics, including violence against nuns and priests. They were moved, it seems, not only by a sense of unbridled entitlement but also by a conjoined sense of superiority that forged the conquest. Scalping Mexicans, raping women, and murdering civilians of all ages and both genders occurred routinely, with the slaughter often constituting mass murder. Even Mexican allies of the United States "became disillusioned by the harsh reality of American rule," saying Mexicans were being treated "worse than brutes" (Rodríguez 2007, 105). While the infamous Texas Rangers were a particularly brutal and racist force that terrorized those of Mexican descent in Texas, the latter group fared little better in California, where they were commonly robbed, beaten, and even lynched in the mining camps by 1849 (Rodríguez 2007). In Texas and California alike, many Anglos made no differentiation between Mexicans with U.S. citizenship and those without it, treating all Mexicans as migrants, even if their families had antedated Anglo presence. This was also true in Santa Barbara.

American history in the Southwest gained gringos a highly dubious reputation: first, for the "stealing" of a half-million square miles of Mexican land (the federal government paid \$15 million for the present-day states of California, New Mexico, and Nevada and parts of Colorado, Arizona, Utah, and Oklahoma); and second, for the state-sponsored plan to empty Texas of Mexicans, which spawned a campaign of terrorization intended to force Mexicans southward. Anglos took land, rivers, gold, silver, zinc, copper, uranium, and ports on the Pacific.

Nicholas Trist was sent to Mexico in 1847 as a peace commissioner. Before Trist began peace negotiations, however, President James K. Polk ordered the commissioner back home, having decided he wanted more land from Mexico. He wanted to send a tougher negotiator than Trist. Trist, with the support of General Winfield Scott, decided to continue. "The negotiations were difficult for Trist. He was aware of Mexicans' humiliation and felt a strong sense of embarrassment. Trist himself knew that the war had been a pretext to seize Mexican land" (Acuña 2000, 51).

Trist wrote to a friend of the family upon his return: "If those Mexicans . . . had been able to look into my heart at that moment, they would have found that the sincere shame that I felt as a North American was stronger than theirs as Mexicans. Although I was unable to say it at the time, it was something that any North American should be ashamed of" (quoted in Acuña 2000, 52). In 1859, Juan Cortina, protesting the oppression of Mexicans in and around Brownsville, Texas, called Anglos "tyrants" and "flocks of vampires in the guise of men" (in Acuña 2000, 67). This history of usurpation, violent displacement, and terror is still being suppressed in the United States, most recently in Arizona, where books detailing this history have been banned from the public schools.

### *Denigration of the First by the Last*

While Santa Barbara was the "stronghold of Mexican socioeconomic and political influence in nineteenth-century southern California" (Camarillo 1996, 3), this stronghold was gradually dismantled. From 1847 to 1848, the United States Army occupied Santa Barbara. While no combat took place, there was "a pattern of racial conflict that became ingrained in Santa Barbara society" (ibid., 13). The main occupation force "created intense racial antagonisms" (ibid., 14). The Mexicans resented the soldiers' disrespectful behavior, their destruction of Mexican private property, and their punishment of the whole community for a crime that was presumed to be committed by a single Mexican, though never even proved as such. Some of these soldiers became private citizens and were believed to have contributed to racial enmity (Camarillo 1996).

In 1850, Anglos constituted 20 percent of the population. They did not care about the meticulous divisions the Spanish had made between those of Spanish descent, of Indian descent, and their commixture, the mestizos. The Spanish found themselves victims of an American version of their own racial misogyny. The Anglo newcomers were unable to imagine those who had settled before them—Spanish or Mexican—as part of the future of their newly claimed town. Indeed, before any actual encounters between potential neighbors could have occurred, Anglos already believed that they were bringing progress and that whatever they presumed to be Mexican would be in the way of it. Such was the hierarchical model of civilizations that gave kudos to Anglos even as it stripped other cultures of their unique strengths and modes of sophistication.

One of the new settlers, Charles Huse, editor of the *Santa Barbara Gazette*, referred to Mexicans in his diary: "[The] dregs of society are collected in this town. . . . The greatest part of the population is lazy, does not work, does not pay its debts, does not keep its word, is full of envy, of



ill will, of cunning, craft and fraud, falsehood and ignorance" (quoted in Camarillo 1996, 15). The gazette published Anglo attacks against Mexican society while it promoted the Americanization and anglicization of Santa Barbara. In 1855 the editors wrote that the Mexican residents were "habitually and universally opposed to all progress whatsoever, and they look with decided disfavor on every innovation." They considered Mexicans to be an "impediment to the development of the city as a desirable home for Anglos" (16). The editors joined the Know-Nothing Party and partook in its nativism. Aided by Frémont veterans, they called for vigilante violence against "Californios," Spanish speakers residing in California before 1848, all of whom were branded as public menaces (Chalquist 2008). This use of the newspaper to discredit the native population is familiar to us from other colonialist efforts to remove a preexisting group of people in order to seize control of the political, economic, and social life of a locale. Once a population is sufficiently maligned, unseemly and even cruel removal strategies are made to appear more justifiable.

During the 1850s, racial antipathies ran high. Neither Anglos nor Californios sitting on juries would punish defendants of their own ethnicity. The gazette emphasized any crimes committed by Mexicans. The editors were infuriated that there was little enforcement of the Vagrancy Act, known as the Greaser Law, an anti-Mexican law enacted in 1855 in California. The law defined vagrants as "all persons who are commonly known as 'Greasers' or the issue of Spanish and Indian blood . . . and who go armed and are not peaceable and quiet persons" (quoted in Bender 2003, xiii).

Mob lynching was not unknown. In 1859, in nearby Carpinteria, Francisco Baidillo was accused of stealing a horse. Not only was he hanged, but his son was lynched as well. The perpetrators were not convicted, while the Mexicans who had beat the main perpetrator were (Camarillo 1996, 21). "Troops from Fort Tejon briefly occupied the city to prevent more killing; an officer noted that intolerance of the Californios was 'exceeding' and 'almost a monomania'" (Chalquist 2008, 303). Contemporary Anglos are largely unaware of how mob lynching was used in the United States to control and forcibly displace not only African American communities in the South but also Mexican communities in the Southwest. From 1848 to 1928, white mobs lynched at least 597 Mexicans in the United States, and from 1848 to 1860, at least 163 Mexicans were lynched in California (Carigan 2003).

#### *Seizure of Economic and Political Power*

From 1863 to 1873, the balance of economic power between Anglos and Mexicans shifted as the cattle-ranching industry that had been the source

of Mexican rancheros' prosperity was undermined. American courts contested Californios' claims to their land. Fighting the dispossession of their lands was costly in legal expenses. Extended litigation often resulted in Anglo lawyers entrusted with these cases owning the land as payment for their legal fees. New land taxes forced many rancheros to sell their land cheaply. As the mining camps in the north disbanded, the need for beef diminished. In addition to a succession of floods and droughts that also weakened the cattle industry, Anglos began to import their beef from Texas, depriving their Mexican neighbors of income (Camarillo 1996). As a result, many rancheros had to mortgage their lands to Anglos. Anglos began to squat on many of the extensive tracts of land. When rancheros no longer had the economic means to pursue ranching, some simply left their ranches, yielding their land to Anglo squatters. Through these means Anglo agricultural interests replaced cattle and sheep ranches, undermining Mexican rancheros' livelihood. As a result, poverty and hunger set in for many, particularly during the floods and droughts of 1863–1865. Many were reduced to subsistence farming on rented land. As a result of these varied tactics, rancheros and landowners were converted into agricultural fieldworkers and railway construction workers. Mexicans were relegated to the lowest rungs of labor, where there was little possibility of moving into more skilled categories—a situation that still obtains today.

Anglo capital investment from northern California and the rest of the United States began to reach Santa Barbara after the Civil War, taking advantage of the weakened economic circumstances of the Californios (Camarillo 1996). Anglos also became merchants and made an inroad into the economics of the area. Anglos with capital accumulated from their businesses bought up Californio-owned lands. The ranches were split up and subdivided, luring other Anglos west to own a plot of land. Land speculation thrived. As Anglos entrenched themselves in the skilled labor market, they gained further assets to accumulate land and property, pushing more Californios into the lower economic rungs.

In 1873, the boom created by Anglos' westward migration to Santa Barbara ended. The downturn in the economy most affected those Mexicans who had sold their lands at a low point and then later tried to buy land at much higher prices. Now they were broke.

In 1878 the *Santa Barbara Daily Press* blamed Mexicans for hurting the economy by refusing to accept marginal work (Chalquist 2008). Anglos felt that Chicanos, given their destitution, should be willing to accept any job at a low wage. The victims of economic disfranchisement were now viewed as lazy and irresponsible. Those of Mexican descent wanted to remain in their traditional jobs. While some did seasonal work elsewhere herding cattle,



by 1880, 74.8 percent were unemployed. Their resistance had been strategically undermined. When the majority of Chinese workers were driven out of Santa Barbara in the 1870s, the Anglos turned to those of Mexican descent to fill these low-paid menial jobs. At first they resisted, but before long they realized they had no other options.

Joseph Johnson, the owner and editor of the *Santa Barbara Daily Press*, started the newspaper in order to promote three aims: the growth of tourism, the marketing of Santa Barbara as a place for white people to regain or further build their health, and the transformation of remaining ranches into agricultural tracts.<sup>3</sup> While immigrants from Sonora enlarged the Mexican community, the Anglo population was rising at a greater pace, fueling the takeover of both economic and political power.

Seizure of political power became the next battlefield for the newly arrived Anglos. As this fight ensued, racial conflict deepened in Santa Barbara. The editor Charles Huse lamented, "The Americans have very little influence in the elections, but in a few years they will have all the power and they won't consult the Californians [the Californios] about anything" (quoted in Camarillo 1996, 23).

Mexican politicians recognized the importance of keeping the political power that the Anglos were trying to seize. In an attempt to retain political power, Mexicans most often voted in a bloc. While Anglos split their vote between Republican and Democratic candidates, Mexicans voted Democratic. In order to defeat the Mexicans, an Anglo coalition across parties was created. In 1873, the election went Anglo, except for the county sheriff. Within twenty-five years of their arrival, Anglos had gained the reins of political power, and they still hold them today.

In 1874, the Anglos changed the voting and ward system so that the Californios could win only one seat on the city council. Thanks to the gerrymandering, there was never again a mayor of Mexican descent, and contenders for other positions were consistently defeated by the Anglos. This made it increasingly hard to rally the Mexican vote, for political involvement began to appear fruitless. In 1880, Mexicans were purged from county Democratic proceedings. They were locked out of political affairs, becoming, says Camarillo, foreigners in their own city. "Without political, judicial, or law enforcement representatives the Chicano people were defenseless against Anglo racism" (Camarillo 1996, 76). Chicanos were not placed on juries, and they received harsh sentences if convicted of a crime. Anglos who assaulted Mexicans were not prosecuted. Seventy percent of the arrests and convictions reported in the *Santa Barbara Daily Press* involved people with Spanish surnames.

In the late Mexican and early American period, from 1840 to the 1880s,

the Presidio and the area around it went from being "the heart of a Mexican pueblo to an antiquated neighborhood" (Schultz et al. 1993, 1). Mexican adobes were demolished to make way for wood structures. In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, Anglos thought that Mexicans were disappearing, but they were not leaving town. They were disappearing from sight as the area of their pueblo shrank. Camarillo describes Mexicans as a segregated minority confronted by a hostile outside world. Anglos rarely traveled the alleyways of the Pueblo Viejo. There was little commingling of the two communities. The "wall" between Anglos and those of Mexican descent was largely in place. Racial and ethnic differences were now conflated with a stark—and intentionally created—economic and class divide, a situation that still obtains.

The incorporation of Mexicans and Chicanos into the capitalist labor market had a profound effect on traditional family work roles and family structure. By the 1880s, their desperate economic situation forced women and children to become laborers for the first time, the former as domestic help and both as agricultural laborers. The children would miss much of the school year because of their involvement in agricultural labor. In the summer, families would go north to Goleta and sleep in the fields as they harvested walnuts. The mothers would forage to feed their children. The growers made sizable profits, for their labor costs were only 1 percent of their operating budgets.

#### *Racism and Economic Marginalization*

Albert Memmi (1991), in his classic study of the psychological dynamics of colonization, describes racism as a daily ingredient of colonial relations. Redefining "the other" as inferior legitimates all manner of abuses as understandable and necessary or even "helpful" and charitable to those harmed. This process of racist definition of the other is clear in Santa Barbara. The mestizos in Santa Barbara were no longer referred to as Californios or Californians, a term that described their families as part of the original settlers; now they were called "Mexicans." The Anglos saw even those with citizenship as interlopers. Some, in order to escape a racist net, attempted to emphasize or claim Spanish origins at a time when things Spanish struck a romantic chord with Anglos. The homogenizing logic that the Spaniards had first imposed on many different cultural groups in Mexico ended up being used against anyone of Spanish descent. Anglos gathered Spanish, Mexican, and indigenous into the same racist net.

Mexicans and Mexican Americans suffered from Anglo stereotypes of them as "an idle, indolent, sleepy set; an 'illiterate . . . wasteful people,' who were also 'shiftless and indigent, little caring for work, and not given



to progress' . . . unsanitary 'riffraff'" (quoted in Camarillo 1996, 77). The Anglos now viewed all Mexicans as foreigners, even though many of their families had been in Santa Barbara long before the arrival of Anglos. The Mexicans now saw themselves as residing within an Anglo society.

In the 1890s, the Ku Klux Klan established a small chapter in Santa Barbara. In the 1920s, it reemerged with great enthusiasm. Over four hundred Klansmen were initiated in Santa Barbara and Ventura in 1923. In Santa Barbara, the chapter boasted that its members were "of the highest standing, being composed of preachers, doctors, lawyers, bankers, merchants, in fact, men of every walk of life" (quoted in Camarillo 1996, 193). It also included policemen, business executives, and public officials. It took pride in members being 100 percent native born and Protestant. It wanted to eliminate "Jews, Negroes, and Catholics" from Santa Barbara (quoted in Camarillo 1996, 194). While there were few Jews and African Americans in Santa Barbara, most Chicanos were Catholic, and the Klan clearly sought to terrorize that population. The Anglo community was sufficiently open to the Klan that its members felt no need to hide their faces during their rallies down State Street, Santa Barbara's main boulevard.

From 1890 through the 1920s, migrants came to Santa Barbara from the Mexican states of Guanajuato, Zacatecas, and Michoacán. They settled mainly on the east side of Santa Barbara, in a racially segregated neighborhood, living near their workplaces, which included the railroad yard, lumberyard, and fruit-packing establishments. Some worked on the train line to San Francisco; many others worked in the agricultural sector. More Mexican immigrants came northward, fleeing the worsening economic conditions in Mexico and the destruction caused by the revolution of 1910. Many Mexican immigrants did not know that, having been radically restricted over the last half of the nineteenth century, their opportunities in Santa Barbara were far from wide. Little by little, extended family members migrated from Mexico to join their family members.

Mexican Americans born in this country often did not mix with the new Mexican immigrants, fearing that Anglos would see them as "dirty Mexicans." The newcomers felt put off and discriminated against by the old-timers, who were resentful that the new influx of Mexicans had made finding and keeping jobs even more difficult. Hostility arose between the Eastside barrio and the Pueblo Viejo, the latter populated largely by the original families of mestizos who settled Santa Barbara. Horizontal aggressions developed between members of different waves of immigration, a basis of gang violence today in youths who have no sense of how a long history of racism and disfranchisement has affected their own behavior to others of Mexican descent.

In the 1900s, Anglos distinguished between groups of "Mexicans" according to skin color, excluding darker "Mexicans" from the community swimming pool, Los Baños. Darker "Mexicans" were also segregated from Anglos in movie theaters. Local Baptists tried to convert the "Mexicans" to Protestantism, while simultaneously segregating their church services (Camarillo 1996).

Ninety percent of Santa Barbara's Chicanos lived in the Pueblo Viejo by 1890. The Anglo city that grew up around it was experienced as a foreign city (Camarillo 1996). By the 1890s, those of Mexican descent had dwindled to 20 percent of the overall Santa Barbara population. City resources were not shared equitably with the barrio. The barrio school was decrepit. There were no fire hydrants. The adobes were run down. Poverty was widespread, requiring the county to provide some assistance until charities were set up to address it, at least in part. A diphtheria outbreak struck the Mexican barrio.

Leonard Pitt (1970) succinctly described the process and the end result:

Yankee settlers then swept in by the tens of thousands, and in a matter of months and years overturned the old institutional framework, expropriated the land, imposed a new body of law, a new language, a new economy, and a new culture, and in the process exploited the labor of the local population whenever necessary. To certain members of the old ruling class these settlers awarded a token and symbolic prestige, at least temporarily; yet with that status went very little genuine authority. In the long run Americans simply pushed aside the earlier ruling elite as being irrelevant. (296)

By 1900, Chicanos were locked into occupational structures "that not only restricted their opportunities for advancement but perpetuated their poverty as well. Although they formed the largest single sector of the manual labor market that was indispensable in building the region's economic prosperity, they did not themselves benefit financially" (Camarillo 1996, 100).

The walnut growers in Goleta, as well as other businessmen, used seasonal child labor because it was cheaper. This practice, which began in the 1880s, meant that children missed school during certain periods, leading authorities to shut one school. In 1911, the California Labor Commission cited the walnut growers for violations of child-labor laws. The compromise decision permitted any family that could plead hardship to send their children to work the groves. Many families needed to plead such hardship. Not only had they been assigned to the lowest labor rung, but they were paid half what Anglos were paid for doing comparable work. Wage differentials and contract-labor arrangements made it impossible for Mexican



workers to ascend the ladder of economic viability. When assigned to the same job as white counterparts, they were given the more difficult tasks and then not promoted. Confined to the most menial of tasks and the lowest wages, Mexican families found it largely impossible to improve their living conditions.<sup>4</sup>

Mexicans were precluded from entering into certain professions, such as carpentry. Even if a man left the city and trained elsewhere, joining the relevant union, this did not ensure him a job and union membership on his return to Santa Barbara. Length of residence or number of years on a job made no difference; Chicano workers were not advanced in the workplace. They were consigned to a lowly socioeconomic position. The economic system that required a permanent low-paid laboring class perpetuated the patterns of Chicano employment far into the twentieth century (Camarillo 1996).

World War I introduced a labor shortage across the United States, one that lingered. New immigrant families came to Santa Barbara from Durango, Chihuahua, and Sonora. Mutual aid societies, or *mutualistas*, were created to support families and to provide sociality and help during difficult times. The need for Mexican workers increased in construction and agriculture, but the jobs open to them were unskilled or semiskilled, locking them into the bottom of the labor market. During the 1920s, the standard of living fell still further for those of Mexican descent, with infant mortality rising to five times that of white infants. Most Mexican families could not own their own houses, and many could not afford rents of ten to fifteen dollars a month, the average for housing on the East Side. This forced multiple families into single dwellings, sometimes with ten families sharing a toilet. Living conditions were unsanitary and overcrowded. Small children scavenged in refuse and garbage to find food and playthings. Even in the early part of the century, there was a labor line forming off Haley Street where the unemployed waited for daily work.

#### *From Social Exclusion to Extrusion and Deportation*

Once the wall of social, political, and economic exclusion was complete, the steps toward social extrusion were also largely complete. Indeed, in the last decade, we have again witnessed how quickly American society can turn on Mexicans, on whom they have relied for many essential services, as well as amenities. As long as social, economic, and political walls surround groups of our neighbors, the latter are at risk of removal, be it through deportation, detention, or imprisonment.

As poverty increased, Anglos began trying to rid the community of Mexicans and Mexican Americans. Poverty-based deportations began in 1926

and intensified during the Depression. The first included a mother and her four children. The rationale was that indigent Mexicans created a burden on the welfare lists, an argument that has been made down to the present day. The charge was untrue, according to Camarillo (1996). The percentage of Chicanos on the welfare list only slightly exceeded their percentage of the population. The elderly placed the greatest burden on the coffers.

Interpreters at the East Side Social Center aided immigration agents in their deportation efforts. They encouraged people to leave for Mexico, often painting a pretty but false picture of what would await them in Mexico and even lying to them by saying that southbound immigrants would be offered land and supplies in Baja California. Many of those who voluntarily left for Mexico later tried to return. Between 1926 and 1934, between one thousand and two thousand people—that is, 200 to 250 families—were deported. Mexican workers had worked for many years in the railway yard in Santa Barbara. Now they were to find themselves back in that yard being deported in a humiliating fashion. Mary Ortega, an interpreter at the East Side Social Center, recalled the scene: “[The immigration officials] put all the people that went in boxcars instead of inside the trains. . . . They sent a lot of people from around here too. A big exodus. . . . They were in here legally but the moral part of it, like separation and putting them in boxcars, . . . I’ll never forget as long as I live” (quoted in Camarillo 1996, 163). Many of those deported, particularly those who had been born here and were citizens, returned in the 1930s and 1940s. Tens of thousands of Mexicans and their U.S.-born children were deported from Southern California in the wake of the Depression, and over one million from the United States. These deportations weakened the Eastside Mexican community, separating people from their friends and families. It temporarily halted the growth of the Chicano community in Santa Barbara during a critical phase of its history. It certainly contributed to the community’s sense of itself as little respected and as ultimately expendable and discardable.

During World War II the United States facilitated the immigration of 4.5 million Mexicans to meet wartime labor shortages. Once servicemen returned to the domestic labor market, attempts were made to deport the Mexicans. Operation Wetback was a repatriation effort that modeled itself on the Mexican repatriation during the Depression. Throughout postwar America, agents searched neighborhoods for these immigrants, ultimately deporting over 1.1 million Mexicans, who were often taken into the interior of Mexico in an effort to hinder their return.

When Chicanos’ labor was needed, the status of their documents was ignored. When their labor was no longer needed, they were deemed a social threat (Camarillo 1996). Denying legal status allows employers to use work-



ers as they desire, without moral constraints. Until the 1960s, you could see signs throughout the Southwest that said "No dogs or Mexicans."

This is a shameful history. Unfortunately, it is not over.

### *Miseducation and the Transgenerational Perpetuation of Walls*

In 1933, Carter Woodson wrote *The Mis-Education of the Negro*, describing how American schools prepared Negroes to assume inferior positions in society. He could have been describing the situation for children of Mexican descent in the town of Carpinteria, the town next to Santa Barbara. The following account is drawn from research done by John McCafferty, author of *Aliso School: "For the Mexican Children."*<sup>5</sup>

Looking back on the opening in 1919 of Mexican-only classes at the Aliso School, an Anglo newspaper, the *Carpinteria Herald*, described it as "the first step on behalf of the Mexican population. . . . This gave those Mexican children who would find it difficult to keep apace with the American children an opportunity to receive more individual instruction" (quoted in McCafferty 2008, 19). These were ungraded classes, for, it was claimed, Mexican children were unable to make age-appropriate progress. By 1922, the Aliso School was completely segregated, with all Mexican students in two classrooms. Most of the children were in grades one to five. Not until 1931 did any Mexican child make it to high school in Carpinteria. The elementary school functioned as a funnel into work in the lemon groves. Poor education based on racist notions of the children's limitations created a cheap labor pool even as it yielded "proof" of the group's supposed inferiority.

In 1925, the Carpinteria school board directed the principal to arrange the schedule of the children so they could harvest walnuts in the afternoons during walnut-packing season. There was no such directive for the Anglo students at Main School. Anglos saw the Mexican neighborhoods as labor camps and the children as destined to move from part-time to full-time employment in the agricultural sector.

From 1920 to 1947, the Mexican children who did not speak English were educated apart from the Anglo children. At school they were required to speak only English, a language many did not know. If they were caught speaking Spanish, they were spanked or struck with rulers. Chicano students in Goleta, a nearby community, enjoyed an integrated school setting; when compared to this otherwise similar group, Aliso's pupils showed less English-language proficiency. They lived in a Spanish-speaking world where the only native speakers of English were their teachers, whereas Goleta's children had Anglo children in their classrooms. The segregation

was neither de facto (by location) or de jure (by law). It was one of the last racially segregated schools in California.

In the late 1920s, the Aliso School became progressively overcrowded. The class time of the younger students was cut to make room for the older students. In 1931, Assemblyman George R. Bliss, of Carpinteria, introduced a bill to the California legislature that would have legalized the segregation of Mexican and Mexican American students in all California primary and secondary public schools. Bliss, a school-board member, wanted the state to use the same logic that had been followed in establishing Carpinteria's segregated schools—namely, to think of Mexican and Mexican American children as Indians, whether born in the United States or not. Schools already had the power to segregate Indian children.

Mexican children were in fact called "Indians." One father, Joe Montoya, moved from Santa Barbara to Carpinteria and wanted his children to remain in integrated schooling. His children were assigned to Aliso. He protested to the state's attorney general, but the latter supported the prevailing arrangement. While the town awaited the verdict, the *Carpinteria Herald* reported: "[T]he action of Montoya has caused Carpinterians to pause and ponder over the multitudinous things that have been done for our Indian population[,] and it is likely there will be a reduction in the misplaced benevolence." The Anglo press responded to Montoya's legitimate objection with the threat of reprisals against the Mexican population.

When Mexican American servicemen returned from fighting in World War II, their consciousness of civil rights was heightened. Finally, in 1947, the district was pressed to integrate, as the winds of change were blowing in California for increased civil rights for Mexicans. The board decided this privately and never publicly discussed its rationale; it simply complied with a letter sent by the district attorney.<sup>6</sup> In a case tried in Orange County in 1947, a judge ruled that Mexican American students who were considered Caucasian could not be segregated. Until 1954, California law allowed the segregation of Indians, African Americans, and Asians.

### CONTEMPORARY EXPLOITATION AND CONTROL

In Santa Barbara today, the Anglos' presence, as well as their social, political, and economic control, has been so normalized that most people—Anglo, Chicano, and Mexican—do not know about a time when no Anglos lived there; indeed, they probably never imagine such a period. There is no boast of an Anglo victory, because the conquests of an earlier era are not even remembered. Comfortable in this amnesia, Anglos rarely grasp the



pain of exclusion and prejudice that Mexicans and Mexican Americans experience daily.

Today the classrooms of many of the public schools are de facto segregated. Most are predominantly Latino. Many white families have fled to private schools or to more exclusive "gate" or charter programs within the public schools. Neighborhoods are largely segregated. Many churches are still almost wholly Anglo or wholly Mexican/Mexican American. While almost every business in Santa Barbara depends on Mexican labor, Anglo employers and Chicano and Mexican employees maintain a social distance. Anglo and Latino families rarely socialize. Wages are still not comparable and fair.

Federal and state policies place additional burdens on families without proper immigration documents. In California an immigrant without documents cannot get a driver's license. To compound these injuries, the county increasingly derives funding from impounding the cars of immigrants who have been stopped at checkpoints purportedly established to find drunk drivers; the cars are seized not because the drivers are intoxicated but because they cannot produce a valid license. Until recently, these cars were impounded for thirty days, costing over \$1,000 to retrieve. Many impounded cars are abandoned, for their owners fear being apprehended by Department of Homeland Security agents. The cars are then sold, the profits going to the county. Adults are left without cars to get to work or to take their children to school. It is important to understand how maintaining a population in a state of illegality creates profits for individuals, municipalities, and the federal government. It has been argued that the practice just described is an unconstitutional measure, an "unreasonable seizure" of private property.

Once at work, those without documents cannot safely argue for fair wages and work conditions. Without owning land, without a path to citizenship, without equal wages, without ways to climb the job ladder, without access to adequate scholarships for college, and without adequate health care—without any of these things, a population is restricted in its possibilities for advancement. While this works out well for employers who want the cheapest labor and for consumers who desire cheap goods and services, it also provides all the ingredients for maintaining a permanent underclass. Access to the labor of an underclass allows income gaps to deepen, as well as a seemingly unbridgeable abyss to form between those who have been able to accumulate capital and those who are living hand to mouth.

The immigrant community in Santa Barbara calls the Secure Communities program ("S-Comm") of the Department of Homeland Security "The

Insecure Communities Program." An editorial in the *New York Times* (May 11, 2011) remarks,

[This is an] ill-conceived program . . . which sends arrested people's fingerprints through federal immigration databases, turning all local officers and jails into arms of the Department of Homeland Security. Many lawmakers and police agencies say it erodes public safety by making immigrants, especially victims of domestic violence, afraid to report crimes. They worry about giving rogue officers a convenient tool for racial profiling. And they feel betrayed because what the administration once billed as a transparent, voluntary program aimed only at dangerous convicted criminals turns out to be none of those things.

Under this initiative, approximately four hundred thousand immigrants were deported each year in 2010, 2011, and 2012. In 2011, there were ten to fifteen deportations a week from Santa Barbara County.<sup>7</sup> Santa Barbara was the sixth community in California to opt into this program. There was no public process of deciding this, no discussion of the merits of the measure.

When you are stopped in Santa Barbara for a relatively minor traffic infraction, such as having a broken headlight or changing lanes without signaling, your identification and your fingerprints are checked against not only Department of Motor Vehicle databases but also federal immigration ones. If you lack the legal status to be in the United States yet are innocent of the charge for which you are arrested, the Department of Homeland Security has seventy-two hours to take you into custody. Once this happens, you are placed in a detention center, and paperwork is readied for your deportation. More than half of those deported last year have no criminal records, or committed only minor crimes. Many of the deportees have children at home, some of whom are U.S. citizens. These children often depend on the deportee's income for their physical survival, not to mention his or her presence for their emotional well-being. So many parents have been deported in California that orphanages have been created in Lancaster and Sacramento to house minors left behind after raids swept up their parents. In Santa Barbara, 58 percent of S-Comm deportations have been of noncriminals.<sup>8</sup>

Family members left behind live each day with heightened anxiety. They worry that they should move because now the Border Patrol has their address. Yet leaving would make it difficult for family members to find them, particularly sons and daughters who were deported as minors. This program of close surveillance has compromised community policing. Peo-



ple are afraid to call police when they are needed, as in cases of domestic violence. Indeed, they are often counseled not to do so, since both parties may well be arrested. They are aware that if they are arrested and taken into custody, their fingerprints will be run through Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Even if they are not convicted of the offense for which they were arrested, they may be deported.

Daniel Kanstroom, author of *Deportation Nation: Outsiders in American History*, describes deportation as a “powerful instrument of discretionary social control, . . . a mechanism of scapegoating, ostracism, family and community separation, and, of course, banishment” (2007, 5). The fear of arrest, detention, and deportation serves to force many in the Latino community into ever-greater invisibility. A mother recently broke down when she recounted an argument with her sixteen-year-old son, who wanted to go downtown for the evening. The mother did not want him to risk being stopped by the police and then possibly deported to Mexico, where he had not been since he was two years old. She knew of families who could no longer locate a teenage child who had been taken into custody. Sometimes these minors are transferred to detention facilities in other states and have no reliable way for their families to find them. Essentially left to their own devices, they have no one to advocate on their behalf, and they face the very real threat of deportation to some place in Mexico where they do not know anyone; indeed, since many have been raised in the United States, they may not even speak Spanish very well. At the same time, families caught in such circumstances are afraid to pursue their children, fearing their own detention and thus separation from other children remaining at home.

Recent “gang injunctions” add to the anxiety besetting Santa Barbara’s immigrant community. Young persons named in such an injunction cannot be outside in their neighborhoods in the company of other gang members (including close relatives) or in any park, on the waterfront, or on State Street. Chavo Romero, of the Oxnard-based advocacy group Todo Poder al Pueblo, says that the message is clear: “Disappear, leave town, or go away to jail or deportation.”<sup>9</sup>

#### INTERNAL COLONIES: COLONIAL PRACTICES CLOSE TO HOME

If you study colonialism in various locations—Ireland, the Congo, South Africa—you will no doubt notice pernicious patterns. It can be shocking that a few people with excessive relative power can go to another people’s home territory and, within a short number of years, hold almost all economic and political control. That the newcomers can outlaw the original people’s languages, religions, and customs is nothing short of breathtaking.

That they can remove people from their land, force them to pay taxes and rent, appropriate their labor, and bring them to submission through terror and violence is aberrant and abhorrent. That people who have been self-sufficient can quickly and collectively be reduced to poverty, subservience, and dependency is bad enough. That their reduction to an inferior mode of life is then used as evidence to justify the harshness of the exploitation and racism imposed on them is almost unspeakable. This process of colonization makes the newcomers the citizens and those who were present at the beginning the interlopers. Indeed, it often forces those initially present to leave, to migrate elsewhere. As the native population dwindles and those from abroad multiply, history is rewritten, and soon most of those now present give little thought to the period of injustice and violence that paved the way for the kinds of excess privileges they now enjoy.

Colonizers have been forced out of the lands they seized; it has happened, for example, in Kenya and India. Elsewhere, however, the settlers crowded out the surviving earlier groups, settling into a fixed cultural and historical amnesia. Many Anglos would like to think that this colonial treatment happened far away, that it is now over, that our families had nothing to do with it, and that our own lives are made relatively easy and pleasant by dint of our own hard work and responsibility. I wish it were so, but it is not.

Three groups have, above all others, been subjected to extensive colonial practices in the United States: African Americans, Native Americans, and Mexicans. In differentiating immigration from colonization, the sociologist Bob Blauner defines three factors. The first is an effort to make “colonized groups become part of a new society through force or violence; they are conquered, enslaved, or pressured into movement” (Blauner 2001, 46). This distinguishes them from immigrant groups, whose members enter voluntarily, even though the conditions in their homeland may have made migration a necessity. The second is the imposition of “various forms of unfree labor that greatly restrict the physical and social mobility of the group and its participation in the political arena. The third is a cultural policy of the colonizer that constrains, transforms, or destroys original values, orientations, and ways of life” (ibid.). Anglo Santa Barbarans do not think of their city as an “internal colony,” but that term is an altogether appropriate description. The original Mexican and Spanish populations were almost literally encircled by a rising Anglo population. The latter group seized land as well as political, economic, and social power. It outlawed the Spanish language in schools and restricted or eliminated pastimes that were part of Mexican culture. It failed to fairly allocate city resources. Terror and fear—produced through lynchings, vigilantes, and KKK activity—were



used to control the population. Racial and ethnic stereotyping were used to justify the demeaning treatment of Chicanos and Mexican immigrants. While their labor was exploited, their full personhood was denied. Unfortunately, Mexican newcomers were assimilated not into the larger Santa Barbara society but into the internal colony, with all its deprivations and restrictions on economic mobility and political power. Today, others from still further south join them: migrants from Guatemala, El Salvador, Brazil, and elsewhere.

The concept of internal colonialism helps us to understand why African Americans, Native Americans, and Mexicans have not met the success many immigrant groups have achieved in the United States. Native Americans resisted the slave agrarian labor into which the Spanish mission system sought to press them. Their resistance to colonization was so great that they were subjected to massive displacement from their home regions, and their numbers were vastly reduced through genocidal policies. African Americans and many Mexicans were relegated to agricultural labor, with the ladder to other, more upwardly mobile work positioned out of their reach. After the Civil War, many African Americans became sharecroppers and tenant farmers, but they were often pressed back into servitude through racist vagrancy laws and other unjust paths to imprisonment that siphoned them into convict agrarian labor pools—"slavery by another name" (Blackmon 2009). Mexicans and Mexican Americans have experienced a myriad of legal, economic, and social forces that have pushed them to the periphery of the working world and maintained them there, restricting them largely to unskilled labor. In addition, policies that withhold citizenship have placed twelve million Mexicans in an exceptional legal status, bereft of basic rights, including the right to representation (which is not part of current deportation proceedings).

#### IMAGINING THE FUTURE

Many Santa Barbara residents want to imagine their city differently. They want to see it as a city where the wisdom and decency of living wages are adopted throughout. Where each Latino child is helped to realize his or her promise. Where friendships are as common between Anglos and Latinos as they are among the members of each group. Where federal and state laws that cause fear and insecurity are protested and resisted. Where police practices that increase insecurity and economic precariousness are given up and genuine community policing is restored. They want their town to support its young adults in gaining the education for which they are ready to strive, whether they are citizens or youth brought as children to this country.

To achieve these ends, it would help for residents to be aware of their city's history and to grapple with its shame, particularly, in this case, the shame of Anglos at the amassing of fortunes from the labor of so many without more decisively and generously redistributing that wealth. Shame can be a creative emotion when it leads to restorative and reparative actions, as we shall see in chapters 7 and 8. When philanthropic activities proceed from a historical awareness of past injustices, they can act as reparations for a history that cannot be erased but that needs to be remembered and addressed with apology, justice, and compassion.

A skeptical Anglo might be thinking, "Well, my family wasn't from here. I had no part in this." But, allowing for variation, almost all the American towns and cities in which most of us grew up were cities of two or more tales. They were homes to those with adequate or excessive resources and to those struggling against the odds of poverty and miseducation. In most cases—even if not in all—this division was traced along racial and ethnic lines. When a city is unaware of its own history of marginalizing ethnic groups and displacing them—as has happened in Santa Barbara with the Chumash, Chinese, Japanese, African Americans, and Chicanos—it is more likely to mindlessly repeat these same patterns, blind to the way this reinscribes psychic and communal wounds. To learn and reflect on our history is the first step to reparation. Through intentional dialogue between Anglos and those of Mexican descent, we can come to understand more clearly how we continue to live the destructive divisions that consign us to being a city divided against itself by pernicious "walls." Chapter 9 summarizes some of the steps other cities have taken to address similar histories and to create more inclusive communities less fraught with economic and political injustice.



"Stunning in the insights it unearths . . . [provides] impressive, timely scholarship in this era of great concern about migrancy and the increased proximity among peoples created by globalization."

—Fred Evans, Professor of Philosophy, Duquesne University

As increasing global economic disparities, violence, and climate change provoke a rising tide of forced migration, many countries and local communities are responding by building walls—literal and metaphorical—between citizens and newcomers. *Up Against the Wall: Re-Imagining the U.S.-Mexico Border* examines the temptation to construct such walls through a penetrating analysis of the U.S. wall at the U.S.-Mexico border, as well as investigating the walling out of Mexicans in local communities. Calling into question the building of a wall against a friendly neighboring nation, *Up Against the Wall* offers an analysis of the differences between borders and boundaries. This analysis opens the way to envisioning alternatives to the stark and policed divisions that are imposed by walls of all kinds. Tracing the consequences of imperialism and colonization as citizens grapple with new migrant neighbors, the book paints compelling examples from key locales affected by the wall—Nogales, Arizona, vs. Nogales, Sonora; Tijuana/San Diego; and the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. An extended case study of Santa Barbara describes the creation of an internal colony in the aftermath of the U.S. conquest of Mexican land, a history that is relevant to many U.S. cities and towns.

LOUANN ATKINS TEMPLE WOMEN & CULTURE SERIES

University of Texas Press  
www.utexaspress.com  
800.252.3206  
Printed in U.S.A.

Cover: *Parade of Humanity/Paseo de Humanidad* (detail),  
by Guadalupe Serrano and Alberto Morackis

ISBN 978-0-292-75938-1



5 2 7 9 5

9 780292 759381

CASEY &  
WATKINS

UP AGAINST THE WALL

# UP AGAINST THE WALL

Re-Imagining the U.S.-Mexico Border



EDWARD S. CASEY AND MARY WATKINS

TEXAS