

BRIAN GRATTON AND EMILY KLANCHER MERCHANT

La Raza: Mexicans in the United States Census

In 1930, the United States Census for the first and only time included a “Mexican” category on the race variable. This racial classification appeared in other federal records during the 1930s and was not fully rejected until 1939. In the 1940 census, the “Mexican” race category had disappeared, with enumerators instructed that “Mexicans are to be regarded as white unless definitely of Indian or other nonwhite race.”¹

This article traces the rise and disappearance of the “Mexican” racial category between 1920 and 1940. Archival records suggest that it emerged from the Census Bureau itself, rather than being imposed by Congress, as other scholars have argued. From the late nineteenth century forward, bureau officials, influenced by hereditarian concepts and fixated on mass immigration, struggled over classifications for new population groups, debating whether their traits were permanent racial markers or impermanent ethnic characteristics. The wave of Mexican immigrants in the 1920s drew their attention. They realized that there were persons of purely European descent in Mexico, but that most Mexicans were *mestizos*, a mix principally of European and Indian ancestries that did not exist in the Census Bureau’s racial schema. Indeed many Mexicans and Mexican Americans saw themselves as racially distinct, taking significant pride in a mestizo identity.

We thank Tab Lewis and Bill Creech for invaluable assistance in the National Archives and University of Houston archivists for exceptionally courteous access to the Perales papers. Patrick Lukens shared valuable primary records, and he, Margo Anderson, Jaime Aguila, and the *Journal of Policy History* readers provided us insightful reviews.

THE JOURNAL OF POLICY HISTORY, Vol. 28, No. 4, 2016.
© Donald Critchlow and Cambridge University Press 2016
doi:10.1017/S0898030616000257

That pride was insulted, however, when Mexicans were linked—in official statistics or in the public mind—with a *raza de color*, especially African Americans. In New Mexico and, more critically, in Texas, Mexican American leaders were also acutely conscious of what a nonwhite classification would cost them in civil and social rights. In Texas, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), challenged the Census Bureau's new racial classification of Mexican Americans, and it ultimately prevailed. LULAC had allies among politicians increasingly dependent on Mexican American votes, in the State Department and in the Mexican government. Still, by the late 1930s, it had to contend with a new group within the bureau and in the scientific community. Many population and public health experts—including those in Mexican agencies—thought a “Mexican” racial category useful, indeed essential, to vital statistics. Even after their defeat and the removal of the category in the 1940 census, bureau staff sought to identify persons of Mexican background. Ironically, the Hispanic identifier first employed in the census in 1970 was championed less by the bureau than by the Mexican American organizations once resistant to categorization. That identifier continues to evolve and may return in the 2020 census to a variable that ambiguously mixes race and ethnicity.

MASS IMMIGRATION AND RACE CLASSIFICATION IN THE UNITED STATES CENSUS

While Census Bureau officials rarely voiced openly racist views, they were, like most intellectuals in the early twentieth century, influenced by an ascendant belief in inherited racial distinctions that affected character and behavior.² They were also sensitive to the effects of immigrants from new origins. Francis Amasa Walker, director of the 1870 and 1880 censuses and the intellectual patriarch of the bureau, had, like Henry Cabot Lodge and other restrictionists, begun to voice a neo-Lamarckian view of hereditary inferiority in Southern and Eastern European immigrants. Joseph A. Hill, assistant director for the 1920 and 1930 censuses and a prominent figure in the bureau, epitomized Walker's legacy. In the first decades of the twentieth century, he and other bureau staff engaged in a debate about the meaning of race that led to the creation of the Mexican race category.³

Joel Perlmann provides close analyses of deliberations within the bureau, a discussion influenced by the Dillingham Commission's extensive and politicized assessment of immigration.⁴ The debate did not result in a firm conclusion: among bureau staff, race remained an ambiguous term, at times

a synonym for ethnicity subject to change, especially through assimilation, and at other times implying a more permanent, hereditary, and biological condition. Concern about high levels of immigration in the early twentieth century was manifest in bureau studies and in the private commentary of staff. Aware of the diverse populations within European territorial boundaries, bureau staff resisted expansion of the race variable to include categories among white Europeans, but they did introduce a mother-tongue question in 1910 designed to identify ethnic or “racial” origins more accurately than country of birth. In planning the 1920 census, Hill saw as “more important than ever before” questions on nativity and language, the latter providing “fairly accurate racial classification of our white population of foreign birth or foreign parentage.”⁵ Still, until 1930 the census race variable remained reflective of the widely accepted “grand divisions” of white, Indian, African American, and Asian origin categories.

Nothing in documents before the 1920s reveals a particular concern about Mexicans or their racial makeup. Daniel Folkmar’s influential *Dictionary of Races and Peoples*, produced for the Dillingham Commission, casually referenced Mexicans as largely of “Indian or mixed origin.” Census analysis of Indian groups in the Southwest did not lead bureau staff to speculate on the racial makeup of persons of Mexican origin in the region.⁶ Indeed, the problem of classifying Mexicans came to the bureau in the 1920s as an unwelcome surprise, sprung on them by the sudden arrival of large numbers of Mexican immigrants.

THE ORIGINS OF THE 1930 RACIAL CATEGORY

Mexican immigration in the nineteenth century had been modest. Individuals casually crossed an unmarked border, but more permanent entry was rare; census birthplace data indicate fewer than five thousand immigrants from Mexico per year before 1900. The only large concentration of native-born Hispanics, in northern New Mexico, clung somewhat successfully to an argument that they were of Spanish rather than Mexican origin. By the 1920s, however, immigration from Mexico had risen dramatically, exceeding eighty thousand per year in the data available to Census Bureau officials.⁷ While not equivalent to the flow of Europeans before restriction, the arrival of Mexicans in places where they had not previously settled incited a sharp nativist reaction. Given the rising influence of racial theory among intellectuals, the racialized conceptualization of European immigrants already embedded in immigration law, and the racist view of Mexicans in many locales in the

Southwest, it was axiomatic that xenophobia toward Mexicans would take on a racial tone. It did. In 1921, former Congressman James Slayden concluded that “in Texas the word Mexican is used to indicate the race, not a citizen or subject of the country.” Persons born in Texas of Mexican ancestry “are ‘Mexicans’ just as all blacks are Negroes though they may have five generations of American ancestors.” Eugenicians such as Charles Goethe warned of the demographic and social calamity in the mass arrival of the “Amer-ind (American Indian) peon.” Congressional attempts to extend restrictionist quotas to Mexicans often used racial inferiority as a justification.⁸

Despite the standing position of the 1897 *In re Rodriguez* decision that the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo made Mexicans eligible for citizenship (and therefore considered white for naturalization requirements), restrictionists sought their prohibition on racial grounds. Glenn E. Hoover, writing in *Foreign Affairs* in 1929, argued that Mexicans were largely Indian in background and their immigration thereby violated the clause in the Immigration Act of 1924 excluding the entry of immigrants racially ineligible for citizenship, then available only to “free white persons and to persons of African nativity or descent.”⁹

Attention to the indigenous origins of Mexican immigrants appeared in both the English- and Spanish-language press. The *New York Times* applauded Hoover’s analysis, agreeing that Mexican immigration might well lead “to a new ‘race’ problem,” since “those who enter are largely Indian in blood, with only a veneer of Spanish culture.” *La Prensa*, the San Antonio paper with the greatest influence among the Spanish-reading population in the Southwest, judged nearly all persons of Mexican origin to be primarily Indian in ancestry (including New Mexicans). However, like most of the Spanish-language press, *La Prensa* argued that admixture yielded virtues rather than vices, publishing pieces by the Mexican intellectual José Vasconcelos, who celebrated the Mexican mestizo as a new and gifted race.¹⁰ The noted anthropologist Manuel Gamio, a well-known scholar of Mexican immigration, had a less optimistic take on the Indian side of the equation, pointing to educational, cultural, and economic deficiencies. But he and other post-revolutionary intellectuals saw the integration of the Mexican population in *mestizaje* as essential in *forjando patria*, the construction of a nation founded on a unique and worthy race. Belief in the superiority of the “blended bronze and iron” of the mestizo, an inversion of the idea that hybrid races were degenerate, was firmly established in Mexico among intellectuals and celebrated by the state. Mexican American civil rights activists regularly voiced the same conviction.¹¹

In the bureau, intense concern with recent immigration can be seen in the generational boundaries placed on the 1930 Mexican-race category: “In order to obtain separate figures for this racial group, it has been decided that all persons born in Mexico, or having parents born in Mexico, who are not definitely white, Negro, Indian, Chinese, or Japanese, should be returned as Mexican.” Instructions to enumerators noted the mixed racial background of “Mexican laborers,” emphasizing that those “not definitely” of another race be entered as Mexican.¹² The limitation to two generations recalled attempts to define European “races” in the early twentieth century, in which assimilation and loss of ethnicity was conceivable.¹³ Still, a racial function appears manifest: census questions on birthplace and parental birthplace would have identified all those of recent Mexican immigrant origin. Officials knew most Mexican immigrants were mestizo in origin, but others appeared to be largely European: they wanted a measure of race within the population of Mexicans arriving in the United States.

THE BUREAU AND THE CATEGORY

The origins of the Mexican racial designation appear to lie within the Census Bureau itself, although scholars have argued otherwise. In an influential piece, Jennifer L. Hochschild and Brenna Marea Powell conclude that “political pressure” from Congress, abetted by the “deepening depression,” forced the Census Bureau to create the category. Since the idea emerged and the questionnaire was developed before the economic crisis, the latter could not have had an effect; moreover, Hochschild and Powell provide no direct evidence of Congress’s influence. Mark Reisler’s more careful account, based in governmental archival documents, also points to congressional pressure; he reports that the virulently restrictionist and racist Chair of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization (and a member of the House Committee on the Census), Albert Johnson, “convinced Secretary of Commerce, Robert P. Lamont, to have his census director classify Mexicans in a separate racial category in the 1930 census.” However, the correspondence cited refers to tabulation and publication of conventional data, not to the new racial category, nor is there documentary evidence of Johnson’s role. Margo Anderson’s authoritative history of the census states that the 1929 appropriation bill from the Congress “for the first time . . . did not specify in minute detail the questions to be asked.” Indeed Census Director Stuart, Lamont, and the Acting Secretary of Commerce, E. F. Morgan, successfully resisted the “elaborate plan” for racial schedules presented by Johnson and the eugenicists

Alexander Graham Bell and Harry H. Laughlin. Commerce officials also opposed the restraints on Mexican immigration that eugenicists, racists, and other nativists demanded.¹⁴

The bureau's role appeared first in February 1926, when Hill's office presented a topic for discussion at a weekly brainstorming meeting held by Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover, under whom the bureau operated. The unsigned memorandum posed the following question: "The immigration law has greatly stimulated entrance into the U.S. of Canadians and Mexicans, to whom it does not apply. Is there any possibility of being able to shut off the Mexican whom many sociologists believe will be far more objectionable as a national problem than most of the Europeans who are being excluded?" Attached to the memorandum was a calculation of the difference between the number of Mexicans returning to Mexico and those staying, with the note that the sojourners were "Mostly Mexican race."¹⁵

The first official step toward a separate racial category can be found in materials prepared for the December 1928 meeting of the (Joint) Census Advisory Committee. This committee, made up of leading members of the American Economic Association and the American Statistical Association, provided counsel about the enumeration schedule and the publication of census data. A staff memorandum dated November 23, 1928, listed eleven of the "Most important questions for addition," to be taken up with the Advisory Committee, including the "The color classification of Mexicans, especially of recent immigrants from Mexico."¹⁶ The extant records do not show what action the Advisory Committee took, nor do subsequent agendas mention the Mexican race category. Reflecting in 1934 on the bureau's decision, Hill recalled that "Mexicans were classified separately from the white population because of the feeling that they were not strictly white."¹⁷ Unless convincing evidence of outside pressure is discovered, it appears that the bureau was responsible for the creation of the category.

It did of course meet with approval from restrictionists in Congress, who regularly highlighted the racial threat Mexicans posed. Replying in November 1929 to a letter from Johnson, Secretary Lamont (who had testified against restriction of Mexican immigration) assured him that

It is the intention of the Director of the Census to add "Mexican" to the list of races making up the population of the United States. . . . The great majority of the Mexicans who come to this country are almost pure Indians or mixtures of white and Indian blood. The instructions to enumerators will leave some leeway; those Mexicans

who consider themselves white, or who obviously are chiefly white, will be so reported. . . . The classification cannot be closely accurate, but in view of the very large number of Mexicans in the United States it seems desirable to make some effort to segregate them from the totals for the whites.¹⁸

The 1930 census enumeration classified 1,431,473 persons as Mexican race. Nearly a fifth were native born and had native-born parents and should not have been so designated under the census rules. Area of residence strongly affected classification. In parts of Texas, the enumerator was highly likely to write “Mex” in the race column. In contrast, racial identification was low in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado, home to a large, politically effective population of “Hispanos” fervently opposed to being identified as Mexican. In Tarrant County, New Mexico, enumerator Sosteno Trujillo classified the entire Tapia family as white. While Mr. Tapia was born in the United States to U.S.-born parents, his wife was born in Mexico, so she and their six daughters met the census criteria for Mexican race.¹⁹

THE AMBIGUITY OF RACE

Few protested the 1930 census classification. The only sharp reaction came from New Mexico, where the new immigrants rarely ventured and where Hispanic voters objected to any connection to Mexicans.²⁰ *El Nuevo Mexicano*, the leading newspaper in the state, strongly criticized the Mexican race category, advising its readers that they should inform the enumerator that they were “Americans and nothing less than Americans, the same as and equal to any other element of our citizenry,” and not to be classified as “Mexicans.” The paper’s editorials were reprinted in other Spanish-language newspapers in the state. On March 14, 1930, *El Defensor del Pueblo* of Socorro, New Mexico, urged its readers to remember that “we are American citizens of Hispanic” background, not Mexicans.²¹

Little to no opposition emerged from regions with large Mexican immigrant populations, made up of persons unlikely to be citizens, still oriented toward Mexico, many of whom expected to return to their homeland. They may have been at ease with a sense of themselves as distinct from the *yanquis* they encountered north of the border. Those familiar with racial classifications in Mexico would not have been startled by the category; that country’s census inquiry on *raza* distinguished between Indians, whites, and mestizos. The racial perspective of the mass of Mexican immigrants to the United States is

ill understood, but Mexican American and Mexican intellectuals, like Vasconcelos, celebrated a separate, mestizo race.²² Indeed, Spanish-language papers in the United States published explicit support for the 1930 census category from the Mexican American attorney, diplomat, and civil rights activist, Alonso S. Perales. Born in Texas and educated in Washington, D.C., and the chief architect in the creation of LULAC, Perales was by the early 1920s vigorously protesting discrimination against persons of Mexican origin. Yet in testimony in congressional hearings on immigration on September 3, 1929, he voiced pride in both the indigenous and Spanish contributions to the “mestizo” Mexican people, who descended from “Hidalgo and Cuahutémoc.” He and other Mexican American witnesses did not argue that Mexicans were white. In his testimony, LULAC co-founder J. T. Canales contrasted Mexican labor to “white labor.”²³ In 1930, Spanish-language newspapers published Perales’s stock explanation of the census in a column the bureau conventionally sought in foreign-language papers to encourage census participation. Perales emphasized but did not criticize the “*clasificación separada*,” noting that this was “the first time the census will give to those of Mexican origin a separate classification.”²⁴

Perales’s lack of censure and the inclusion of his column in leading Spanish-language newspapers demonstrate the absence of immediate opposition to a separate racial classification outside New Mexico.²⁵ Perales was, like most LULAC leaders, linked closely by family and culture to Mexico. In the mid-1930s, he wrote that the use of three categories in San Antonio’s vital statistics (“white, Mexican and colored” [i.e., African American]) had not previously prompted complaint “because we persons of Mexican descent, regardless of citizenship, are very proud of our racial extraction and do not wish to convey the impression that we are ashamed to be called Mexicans.” He and other LULAC founders were at pains to defend themselves against charges by Mexican critics that they had abandoned their racial identity, as had M. Flores Villar, a journalist who was a Mexican citizen. Flores attacked the LULAC founders as “renegades,” who denigrated “the Mexican race. . . . [I]nstead of saying with pride ‘We are Mexicans by race’ [they] state (without seeing for a moment in the mirror their bronze color and their totally Indian aspect) . . . ‘We are Americans.’”²⁶

Practical concerns, not a lack of belief in a distinct Mexican race, had led Perales and others toward the assertion that Mexicans were white and “Caucasian.” Texas had a large African American population, a history of slavery, and a legal system that mandated discriminatory treatment of non-whites. In that state (and in other parts of the Southwest), there were *de jure*

and *de facto* separate levels of citizenship for whites and for persons of color. Despite their racial pride, LULAC's leaders saw that racial classification in the census and other official statistics could mean a loss of rights. Perales and others therefore made what Neil Foley has called a "Faustian" bargain, insisting on a white identity in official statistics when the alternatives endangered equal treatment. In 1934, Perales elicited an opinion from James T. Allred, Texas attorney general, stating that Mexicans included "persons of Caucasian descent or of mixed Caucasian and American Indian blood"; Allred concluded that "'Mexicans' must be considered 'white citizens.'"²⁷

Faustian perhaps, intentional surely, but not simply calculated. The claim of white identity rested as well on a bedrock of racism in the Mexican origin population that mirrored that among non-Hispanic whites in the United States. The Spanish term, *la raza*, is as ambiguous as its equivalent in English in the early twentieth century, meaning, at times, mutable ethnicity, and at other times, an innate, largely unchangeable nature. *Las razas de color* (African or Asian) were clearly seen as racially distinct by persons of Mexican origin in the United States. In 1928, Mauro Machado, an early associate of Perales, decried the "the cowardly way in which [Box Committee witnesses] try to make us possessors of negro blood."²⁸ Hostility to African Americans and to Asians repeatedly erupted in local condemnations of any equating of Mexicans with these groups. In 1921, *El Heraldo de México* (Los Angeles) protested the seating of Mexicans in theaters with "la raza de color." The New York newspaper *Gráfico* found it odd that American blacks saw Latin Americans as a colored race. In August 1925, the New York newspaper *La Prensa* noted the "indignant" reaction of Mexicans in Indiana Harbor, Indiana, to attempts to compel them to sit in areas of theaters given to "people of color." In 1929, the Mexican community in the copper mining town of Miami, Arizona, objected to the "disrespectful and degrading" policy of a "Greek" theater owner who required that they sit with "people of color." In the same year, the New York paper *La Prensa* reported the protest of children in Mexico against attempts in San Bernardino, California, to classify students of Mexican descent "with the black and oriental children" in that county. A similar segregation in the theaters in Lockhart, Texas, was protested in 1932, and one in Galveston, Texas, was successfully undone in 1935. In 1939, "La Unión Hispano Americana de Texas" objected to the placement of persons of Mexican origin "with negroes" in the hospital in Austin, Texas.²⁹

Racially tinged views of African and Asian Americans guaranteed a quick reaction against any classification as "colored." It led Machado and others to declare themselves "white," and for registrars of vital statistics

(many of Mexican origin) to place Mexicans in the white category when the only alternative was “colored.” Still, even these racially charged views among Mexicans pointed to the nefarious effects of discrimination: it was the practical penalty of a nonwhite classification that provided the impetus for a systematic and successful protest movement.

CIVIC PROTEST AND THE ELIMINATION OF THE MEXICAN RACIAL CATEGORY

The Mexican” racial category did not appear in the 1940 census, but it had not died an easy death. While senior officials, including an aging Hill, clung to the category, it was not they who most effectively championed its continued use. New Dealers did bring to the bureau “an extraordinarily open, liberal view of the diverse ways of life,” yet it was New Deal staff and the experts who advised them who argued most strenuously to retain the Mexican category. During the Roosevelt administration, the bureau increasingly hired staff with Ph.D.s in statistics, sociology, or economics, among the first to identify themselves as “population scientists” or “demographers.” The “Class of 1940” sought to create the first scientific census.³⁰

These experts favored a cohort component model to generate estimates of future population size and structure, an approach popularized in the late 1920s by Pascal Whelpton and Warren Thompson of the Scripps Foundation for Research on Population Problems. They proposed that subdivision of the population according to characteristics correlated with mortality and fertility—such as race and urban/rural status—would yield more accurate population projections. Mexicans and Mexican Americans had higher rates of fertility, infant mortality, and adult mortality than non-Hispanic whites and public health officials had by the 1920s begun to publicize the sharp differences between Mexicans and other groups in vital statistics. Well aware of this literature, demographers sought to identify them separately in order to improve the accuracy of projections. In 1936, Thompson explicitly called for separation of Mexicans and other groups from the catchall “colored” category in vital statistics, citing both socioeconomic and hereditary rationales.³¹

The initial lack of objection to the Mexican race category had led to its expanded use within the bureau. Census documents and staff publications employed it through the mid-1930s, as did such influential studies as President Hoover’s commissioned work, *Recent Social Trends in the United States, 1929–1933*.³² But its most fateful application was in vital statistics. In its annual reports for 1930 through 1934, following the 1930 rule, the bureau’s

Division of Vital Statistics stated that Mexicans “were not classified with the ‘white’ but tabulated with ‘other races,’” i.e., colored, though it was apparent that local registrars often did not follow this directive. Expressing concern as early as 1930, in 1932 Hill urged the bureau in his “Classification of Mexicans in Vital Statistics” to “instruct or educate the registrars” to enter Mexicans separately from whites.³³ In an Advisory Committee meeting in April 1934, Hill objected again to the inconsistency between vital statistics and the census, since the former did not effectively separate “Mexicans from the whites.” A rising figure in the bureau, Chief Statistician for Population Leon E. Truesdell, pointed to the problem in the field: in gathering vital statistics data, it was “not easy to segregate Mexicans as the Mexicans have a prejudice against returning themselves as other than white, and seventy-five percent of the local registrars in New Mexico and lower California are Mexicans who credit themselves with being white.” Census Director William Lane Austin “saw the same objection in the case of the population census, as in the same sections a large percentage of the enumerators and supervisors are Mexicans.”³⁴

In 1935, in a major bureau reorganization, Halbert L. Dunn became chief statistician in the Division of Vital Statistics, part of the shift toward more highly trained and demographically oriented staff. Dunn, a biostatistician credited with the establishment of a national vital statistics system in the United States, became a central figure in the struggle to retain a separate classification. Dunn and other advocates were well aware of the distinct characteristics of vital statistics in the Mexican origin population. As his office was to state in 1947, “The mortality rates for white infants” were powerfully affected by “the presence, in the white population of [Southwestern] States, of a large number of Mexican agricultural workers in low income groups, among whom the rate of infant mortality is extremely high.” At times, this distortion led the Division to remove these states when calculating comparisons in mortality between jurisdictions. Separate categories were crucial to the accuracy of population models the new staff wished to build. Including persons of Mexican origin distorted the rates for “white” populations. The instruction manuals for coding vital statistics from Dunn’s office listed Mexicans as a distinct race.³⁵

The attempt to classify Mexicans as nonwhite in vital statistics would ultimately spark broad protest against the Mexican race category in the census, but reaction sprang first from a different source, and in the most sensitive state, New Mexico. On February 18, 1935, Austin responded to protests sent to him on the 15th and 16th by New Mexican Republican Senator Bronson Cutting, who complained about the classification of farm operators as “Mexican” rather than white in the 1935 Census of Agriculture.³⁶ Revealing the link the

bureau had forged between Mexicans and Indians, he advised the Senator that “there has been a good deal of discussion . . . concerning the proper classification by the Bureau of ‘Mexican’ population and ‘Indian’ population. There is quite a difference of opinion among statisticians and ‘race experts’ concerning the proper classification of the two ‘races’ mentioned, and it is my intention to bring these questions up for discussion and final settlement previous to our next census of population.”³⁷

After renewed criticism, remarking that he was subject to “pressure from various learned individuals and organizations,” Austin promised Cutting that the agricultural census enumerators would not classify farm operators as Mexican unless they had been born in Mexico. He had directed all “supervisors and field representatives in New Mexico” to ensure that those of “Spanish” descent “be reported as ‘white.’”³⁸

The next, and much more powerful reaction, came out of Texas as a result of the removal of Mexicans from the white category in vital statistics. Beginning with sheer indignation that Mexicans would be classified with African Americans, protests soon revealed, as Paul Schor argues, the driving, practical concerns in Texas that made emerging Mexican American civic organizations hostile to any designation other than white in a state where segregation of Mexican children in schools was a core issue. Shortly before the election of 1936, a set of complaints came to Austin’s direct supervisor, Secretary of Commerce Daniel C. Roper, a stalwart Democratic appointee. The epicenter of the public debate, examined closely by the historian Mario García, lay in the border city of El Paso, Texas.³⁹

The controversy had its roots in the extraordinarily high rates of infant mortality in that city, which often placed El Paso in the unenviable position of first in the nation, a notoriety due entirely to high mortality among infants of Mexican origin. As the city’s health officers remarked, “The infant mortality rate among American families . . . is way below the national average. The numerous cases which occur among Mexican American infants of poorly educated families, living in unhealthy and squalid conditions, are the ones that increase our rate so rapidly.” In October 1936, City Registrar Alex K. Powell announced that his office would join four other Texas cities “in classifying Spanish-speaking residents as ‘colored,’” a category he claimed the Census Bureau had approved. El Paso’s Health Department chief, Dr. T. J. McCamant, stated that the State Registrar had permitted this classification and that L. P. Bishop, his counterpart in San Antonio, “had been authorized by H. L. Dunn, chief of statistics for the Department of Commerce in Washington to classify Mexicans as ‘colored.’” The city officers argued for the need for more accurate

accounting of the sources of differential infant mortality so that it might be addressed, emphasizing the socioeconomic sources of the problem, rather than racial ones. García concludes that the main intent of the new category was to make El Paso's mortality rate more acceptable by identifying Mexicans as the source of the city's poor performance.⁴⁰

The decision ignited a firestorm of protest in El Paso. Most important, it centered the attention of Mexican American leaders, especially in Texas LULAC chapters, on racial classification in official statistics. On October 8, 1936, Frank J. Galvan, the president general of LULAC, sent out circulars to all chapters reporting the attempt to classify "the members of the Spanish speaking race . . . as colored people." He identified the "Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce" as the source of the grave affront, calling on each council to ask their congressmen to insist that "our classification" be "white." Adolpho de la Garza, president of LULAC Council No. 5 in Mission, Texas, reported, "Councils all over the state of Texas, and some in New Mexico, protested to Washington over this error."⁴¹ Complaints about the El Paso decision filled the pages of the Spanish-language press.

A core feature in the agitation, reflecting a new phenomenon outside New Mexico, was the capacity of middle-class Mexican American organizations to persuade politicians to support their causes. The first to act, by his own account, was C. K. Quin, mayor of San Antonio. Quin claimed that he had immediately complained to both Texas senators about the classification of Mexicans among "other non-white races," unjustly categorizing "some of our best citizens as 'colored' when they are not in fact 'colored' as that term is commonly used." Cutting's Democratic successor in the Senate, Dennis Chávez, enthusiastically joined in the El Paso dispute, despite its being "outside my official jurisdiction." In the October 17 issue of *La Prensa*, the senator promised that he "would do all in my power to make sure [the category] is changed as soon as possible."⁴² Roper's acting director, Ernest G. Draper, replied to criticism from Chávez, betraying his ignorance of census classifications, or a willful decision to ignore them:

The classification objected to in your telegram of October twelve is due to an error made by the Division of Vital Statistics in not following Bureau of Census established classifications stop The Bureau of the Census has not classified as colored Mexicans in its population agriculture and business reports stop The error in classifying Mexican as colored in Vital Statistics will not be repeated stop Three classifications will be used whites including Mexicans stop Negroes stop and all other.

On October 19, Secretary Roper himself responded to a similar protest from Senator Tom Connally of Texas, as he did to other politicians, making the same promise. He maintained again, and quite falsely, that the vital statistics “classification referred to is not in accordance with the established classifications of the Census Bureau in its report on population, agriculture, etc.”⁴³

Texas politicians were especially sensitive to the political implications. Maury Maverick, a House member from the San Antonio area, had also sent Austin a telegram and a letter protesting the classification. Like Quin and a select few Texas politicians (including Vice President John Garner), Maverick had close ties with a Mexican American constituency upon which he depended for reelection.⁴⁴ Maverick described the “deadly insult” implied when “citizens in Texas of Spanish and Mexican extraction or descent are classified as ‘colored.’” In his view, Mexicans were like “Italians in New York City.” Maverick suggested officials provide a category “Other Whites—Mexican.” Austin reiterated the new bureau position in a letter to Maverick: “It was unfortunate, of course,” he wrote, “that an error was made by our Division of Vital Statistics in classifying Mexicans along with the ‘colored.’” He assured Maverick that such would “not occur again in any public information given out by the Bureau of Census. Mexicans will be classified as ‘white.’”⁴⁵

Allies south of the border also reacted to implied linkages to African Americans. The El Paso newspaper *El Continental* reported that Masons in Ciudad Juárez had sent a protest to the Grand Lodge, denouncing the classification of Mexicans as a “colored race, that is to say, black,” and petitioning their Grand Master to lodge a protest with the Mexican Ambassador in Washington. Representatives to Mexico’s Chamber of Deputies, joined by the Mexican Chamber of Commerce, called for official protests that Mexicans would be classified as “negroes” and “an inferior race.” *La Prensa* reported that the Mexican ambassador had contacted the U.S. Department of State urging that Mexican elements in the U.S. population “be included in the white race in any official Government document.”⁴⁶

The controversy prompted persons of Mexican origin who viewed Mexicans as a race distinct from whites to shift from that view. In letters to public officials in November 1936 that record his pride in his “racial extraction,” Perales judged the threat of being classified as colored sufficient to justify changing San Antonio’s three-part classification to two categories, “White, including Mexicans,” and colored. In order to “avoid confusion or incidents like that which has just occurred in El Paso,” there should be no “intermediate status of ‘mexicans.’” Such “is in accord with the Laws of Texas, which consider residents of Mexican origin to be of the white race.” Perales’s unhappy transition

from one racial identity to another can be followed in his drafts of an article prepared in 1939. Not mentioning his own endorsement, he argues that the 1930 census classification “did us great damage . . . , achieving very evident[ly] what the intention was—that we would not be considered as ‘Whites,’” with grave social consequences.⁴⁷

Dunn’s effort to get local registrars to classify Mexicans separately, in accord with the 1930 census category and essential to projection models, came to an end. Schor reports that, on October 15, 1936, Austin sent a sharp memorandum to Dunn announcing a strict policy:

One of the most serious situations the Bureau has had to face recently was your classification of Mexicans as “Colored.” The classification by race . . . is not only very difficult, but is a very delicate matter to the United States Government, and our classification must always be in accordance with the policy of the Federal Government. Please observe to the letter the following instructions. . . . The text and the tables . . . must state definitely that the classification “White” includes Mexicans. (3) Mexicans are Whites and must be classified as “White.” This order does not admit of any further discussion, and must be followed to the letter.⁴⁸

In less than two weeks, wide protests and the mobilization of political power by middle-class Mexican American groups had resulted in a seeming capitulation by the bureau. Schor concludes that the success of the Mexican American protest in 1936 was both “complete” and “remarkable,” since theirs was “the only case in which a group obtained a modification of their classification.”⁴⁹

It was, however, not yet complete. Bureau staff greatly regretted Austin’s concession to political rather than supposedly scientific standards; experts inside and outside the bureau remained convinced of the value of a separate classification. They were to mount a campaign to bring the category back for the 1940 census.

THE LAST CAMPAIGN

In 1937, as Patrick Lukens notes, Dunn complained to Assistant Secretary of State Wilbur J. Carr, that “carrying into effect the decision with respect to Mexicans means the virtual destruction of the census of vital statistics insofar as concerns their scientific use in determining certain facts in regard to health, length of life, birth rate and other important matters.” Dunn argued

that there were “fundamental biological differences between the average American and the average Mexican in the way in which they react to disease.” He cited a set of federal agencies that classified Mexicans separately, adding that insurance companies did the same. According to Lukens, Dunn thought a designation engineered by State Department staff of “White,” “White—Mexico,” with similar white categories for other Latin Americans, would function.⁵⁰

It was planning for the 1940 population census, however, that prompted a coordinated campaign. A “General Memorandum on Changes Under Consideration for the 1940 census of Population,” dated February 6, 1939, revealed the staff view. The memorandum lamented the imminent removal by “accidental circumstance” (i.e., political interference) of a classification that had “produced statistics of considerable value, since the Mexicans form a distinct social and economic class in those areas where they are numerous.”⁵¹ In June 1939, in the “Recommendations of the Central Statistical Board” for the 1940 Population Schedule, the first of eighteen recommendations from the staff proposed a solution close to the one that Dunn had found reasonable: “1. Mexicans. There is general agreement that the information regarding Mexicans obtained in the 1930 census was of great value. A desire for similar information from the 1940 census is wide-spread. It is urged, therefore, that steps be taken in some way to meet this need, perhaps by sub-heads under the category ‘white’ in column 13, named ‘white except Mexican’ and ‘Mexican.’”⁵²

In seeking to reestablish the category, the bureau faced a new and formidable opponent. Austin’s 1936 dictum had used intriguing language, noting that racial classification was “a very delicate matter to the United States Government and our classification must always be in accordance with the policy of the Federal Government.” In 1939, Under Secretary of State Noble confirmed what the Spanish-language press had reported in the controversy over vital statistics: the Mexican government had complained to the Department of State.⁵³

Opposed in the 1920s to quotas on Mexican immigrants, and in the 1930s to any other action that imperiled good relations with a neighbor still teetering on its revolutionary axis, the State Department had become wary of any potential insult. Lukens’s analysis of the little-known Andrade court case of 1935, which threatened to make Mexican immigrants ineligible for naturalization based on their Indian ancestry, details the State Department’s efforts to thwart such racial classification. Privately conceding that most Mexicans were Indian, the department’s preemptive legal strategy

was to set a wide precedent by pressuring all federal government offices to classify Mexicans as white.⁵⁴

Census staff were aware of the State Department position. Truesdell and Austin sought the support of the Advisory Committee to win over that department: "1. Mexicans. Dr. Truesdell expressed the opinion, with which the Director agreed, that the Bureau's policy with regard to the Mexican classification must be guided by the attitude of the State Department, although he felt it desirable to have an expression from the Committee as to whether it was believed the retention of the 1930 classification was urgently desirable, or slightly desirable, or undesirable. . . . After further discussion, Dr. Thorp moved that the 1930 classification be retained."⁵⁵

Thorp's view was not easily ignored, since it represented that of the Commerce Department itself. Austin asked George Wythe of that department to facilitate an appeal to the State Department for the 1930 classification, admitting but regretting that he had "issued an order that all Mexican statistics were to be classified as white." In September 1939, Under Secretary Noble appealed directly to Secretary of State Cordell Hull: "The Bureau of the Census has requested me to enlist your cooperation in working out a racial classification of the population data relating to Mexicans . . . which will satisfy the needs of the various Government agencies and other users of the population data without giving offense to the Mexican Government."⁵⁶

It was "natural that protests should have arisen from Mexican groups against such a classification since the word 'Colored' was misinterpreted to signify Negro." Nonetheless, Austin's decision "to classify all Mexicans as 'White'" was "hasty and unfortunate and . . . the policy of classifying Mexicans as 'White' should be reversed for the . . . 16th decennial census, which will be taken in April of 1940." He justified separate classification on the far higher birth and death rates of Mexicans living in the same areas as whites; public health agencies would be "handicapped if they cannot have separate data for Mexicans." Moreover, "From sociological, cultural and economic standpoints, . . . the Mexicans are different from the other racial groups. The solution of many labor problems throughout the Southwest thus depends on a knowledge of their numbers and geographic distribution. . . . The Public Health Service, the Department of Labor, and the Social Security Board are particularly concerned, and, to a lesser degree, the War Department and the Department of Agriculture."

Noble maintained that the State Department itself, as well as the Mexican government, might find reason to want to know about "the Mexicans residing in this country." He claimed that visiting staff from Mexico's census

bureau, including Emilio Alanís Patiño, Mexico's director general of statistics, had a positive view of the category.⁵⁷ Noble concluded with a proposal that hardly solved the domestic and international problems of a racial identification, since it extended its range, as a racial measure ought, beyond the 1930 limitation of two generations. Moreover, it discarded the solution Carr and Dunn brought forward to classify Mexicans as a category within whites. Instructions to enumerators would be: "Mexicans. Persons of Mexican birth or parentage who are of unmixed White blood are to be reported as 'White.' It will be found, however, that many persons of Mexican origin are of a racial mixture usually well recognized and known as 'Mexicans' or 'Spanish Americans' in the localities where they are found. Such persons, including both those born in Mexico and those whose parents or earlier ancestors were born in Mexico, are to be returned as 'Mexican.'"

The Department of State instructed Ambassador Josephus Daniels to ask the Mexican foreign office for its view. Daniels simply copied Noble's appeal to Hull, which described the 1930 category, the 1936 protests against it, and the desire of the Census Bureau to reinstate it, primarily for its utility in vital statistics. Mexican officials then asked their leading demographers for advice.⁵⁸ Noble had been correct about their view. Manuel Gamio, directing the "Departamento Demográfico de la Secretaria de Gobernación," approved of a separate category. A firm believer in the distinct status of the mestizo, he thought it "not only to the interests of American statistics but also to the majority of Mexican workers resident in the United States that it be indicated which of them are white and which mestizo." He opposed placing Mexicans in a category with African Americans, but approved of distinguishing between Mexicans of "European origin" who had a "higher standard of life and cultural index" and those of "Indo-European origin," with lower levels of both. Alanís Patiño agreed: "I am of the opinion that the classification that the [U.S. Census Bureau] intends to make in relation to the Mexicans resident in the country ought to be accepted." Patiño (whose views likely came too late to have any influence) thought that even those Mexicans classified as white were usually mestizo. Prompted perhaps by a renewed request from the Embassy, the Mexican foreign office sent a memorandum to Daniels, quoting Gamio's approving opinion word for word, without further elaboration.⁵⁹

Whether Daniels had this view in hand or not, it was to no avail. On November 16, 1939, Noble wrote Sumner Welles, under secretary of state, acknowledging Welles's letter of November 9:

We fully understand the position taken by the Mexican Government, as indicated in Ambassador Daniel's [*sic*] telegram, and we have therefore decided not to include "Mexicans" as a separate category in our racial classification. In keeping with the desires of the Mexican government and the recommendation of the State Department, Mexicans will be classified as "White" in our census statistics. . . . [While the proposal was] based entirely on our desire better to serve the interests of the Mexican population in this country and to meet the needs of Government and business statistics, [it was] not of sufficient importance to warrant risking unfavorable reaction either on the part of the Mexican Government or of the Mexican groups within this country.⁶⁰

On November 22, the Mexican ambassador to the United States, Castillo Najera, informed his government that there would be no separate classification. No record of the official position of the Mexican government has yet been produced, but the final decision fit well their earlier stance in the Andrade case.⁶¹

THE PENULTIMATE STEP: THE HISPANIC IDENTIFIER

In February 1940, Spanish-language newspapers printed copies of a letter that Welles had written to E. D. Salinas, the general president of LULAC. Welles assured Salinas that "there would be no separate classification of Mexicans in the 1940 Census." Secretary Hopkins also denied the rumor that Mexicans were not to be classified as white, stating that Mexican American leaders "who had expressed this fear were completely misinformed."⁶²

The decision was not well received by the experts who advised the bureau. Advisory Committee member Dr. Murray R. Benedict, professor of agricultural economics at Berkeley, found it inexplicable, given the prominent role of Mexicans in farm labor. Truesdell suggested to the members that sample line inquiries on mother tongue and country of birth offered a partial solution, and the bureau continued to seek other ways to identify Mexican Americans as a distinct population group.⁶³ In 1950, it inaugurated an analysis of persons of Spanish surname in five states in the Southwest, using the regular census schedule, an assessment expanded in 1960 and 1970. In 1970, the census introduced a new question in the 5 percent sample, asking a person's "origin or descent," listing the categories Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, "Other Spanish," or none of these. This self-identification as Hispanic (that term first appearing in 1980) has now become a regular part of the full enumeration schedule, next to but separate from the race variable.

The new Hispanic identifier was made possible, indeed mandated, not by bureau ambitions but by pressure from the Mexican American community. Federal legislation and policy attentive to minorities changed the ground rules. As Harvey Choldin demonstrates, Mexican American leaders, like those of other minority groups, became aware in the 1960s that remedying discriminatory conditions and gaining access to federal resources depended on census counts. Disappointed to find that vital statistics data did not list persons of Mexican origin separately despite patent mortality differentials, these leaders called for a new category, some arguing that it be racial. Mexican American organizations pressured the bureau for separate identification “in order to take advantage of opportunities resulting from the new federal legislation.”⁶⁴

The bureau resisted this political interference, objecting especially to self-reported data they thought unscientific, but to no avail. Even though the full census forms had already been printed, the Nixon White House insisted on compliance with Mexican American leaders’ demands and the bureau placed the identification question on the form for the 5 percent sample. The item devised was placed separately from the race variable, but like that variable, it was not bound by generational limits. It suggested a permanent condition.⁶⁵ Continued political pressure led to the appointment to special census advisory committees of leaders of Hispanic organizations with no social science or statistical expertise (a practice evident for other interest groups). The eventual result was the placement of the Hispanic identifier on the main enumeration form, and to a variety of procedures in government and census statistics designed to facilitate the count of Hispanics.⁶⁶

CONCLUSION

While the State Department played a pivotal role in the 1939 debate, the political pressure exerted by Mexican American civil rights organizations constituted the single most important factor in resisting racial categorization in the 1930s. Such pressure was a remarkable phenomenon, given the previous political weakness of the Mexican-origin population, as well as evidence that members of that population saw themselves as racially distinct. The 1930s had witnessed a rapid shift from the *México Lindo* generation’s strong orientation toward Mexico, which celebrated a distinct identity, to the Mexican American generation’s embrace of the United States and its racial norms. Protests emerged from the deleterious consequences of being labeled nonwhite on the northern side of the border and were enlivened by the racist view of African

Americans that many persons of Mexican origin held.⁶⁷ In the Census Bureau, what had begun as a category natural to the rising hereditarianism among intellectuals in the early twentieth century evolved into one deemed essential to the emerging science of demography. In the 1920s, Joseph A. Hill and other officials, startled by sudden increases in Mexican immigration, thought it obvious that most were not white but were largely Indian in origin. They believed that racial distinction sharp enough to merit measurement. In the 1930s, advocates of a separate category were New Deal statisticians, demographers, and public-health officials who saw the failure to identify persons of Mexican origin as a hindrance to scientific analysis. Their perspective retained elements of hereditarian thinking, as Dunn's remarks about biological differences imply, but its primary defense was startling differences in rates of fertility and infant mortality. Refusing to identify the populations subject to such differences seemed a politically driven obstacle to the achievement of scientific goals. Defeated by political forces, bureau officials persisted in seeking ways to measure Mexicans separately. It was their erstwhile political adversaries who achieved that goal in the Hispanic identifier.

The history of the census category reflects, in part, a project undertaken by state officials to distribute power along racial lines, a textbook example of the social construction of race by one group in order to define and relegate another.⁶⁸ Nonetheless, these officials were not weaving out of whole cloth, since those of Mexican origin often thought of themselves as racially distinct, a proposition encouraged by the Mexican state and the leaders of their community in Mexico and the United States. Moreover, the project failed. The 1930 census racial category disappeared and the Hispanic identifier was created, largely because persons of Mexican origin in the United States were able to construct their own history.

The story is not over, and may yet circle back to its beginnings. In recent censuses, Mexican Americans have again exhibited a tendency to see themselves as "some other race," rather than white. Faced with ambiguous responses, the bureau contemplates restructuring the race and Hispanic origin questions into a single variable for the 2020 census. In this fractured race and origin construction, Hispanic "origin" would be one choice alongside the conventional racial categories.⁶⁹ Should this occur, the 1930 category would, after ninety years of tortured history, return in a new guise to its old home in the United States Census.

*Arizona State University
Dartmouth College*

NOTES

1. Steven Ruggles et al., *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0* [Machine-readable database] (Minneapolis, 2010), <https://usa.ipums.org/usa/voliii/instr1940.shtml> (accessed 16 January 2015).

2. As George Frederickson states, “racism” requires belief in inherited “innate, indelible, and unchangeable” traits. See George Frederickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton, 2003), 54. Ethnocentrism connotes cultural, not biological, differences, subject to change.

3. Francis A. Walker, “The Restriction of Immigration,” *Atlantic Monthly*, June 1896, 822–29. For Walker’s influence on the bureau, see folder “The Coming Census (1930),” box 147, *Memoranda and Notes of Joseph H. Hill, 1905–1940*, Record Group 29.4.2, Records of the Bureau of the Census, Records of the Office of the Assistant Director for Statistical Standards 1850 to 1990, Records of the Chief Statistician (hereafter Chief Statistician), National Archives, Washington, D.C. Walter F. Willcox, “The Development of the American Census Office since 1890,” *Political Science Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (September 1914): 438–59; Margo J. Anderson, *The American Census: A Social History*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, 2015), constitutes the standard source for the history of the bureau. Chapter 6, “The Tribal Twenties,” discusses Hill and other major figures. Paul Schor is attentive to Hill and to debates over racial and ethnic categories. *Compter et classer: Histoire des recensements américains* (Paris, 2009), 218–19, 223–26 (all translations from French and Spanish are by Brian Gratton); Schor’s “Mobilizing for Pure Prestige: Challenging Federal Census Ethnic Categories in the USA (1850–1940),” *International Social Science Journal* 57, no. 183 (May 2005): 89–101, provides select material in a translation from the French. Mai M. Ngai discusses Hill in *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton, 2014), 30–32.

4. Most recently in “Views of European Races among the Research Staff of the US Immigration Commission and the Census Bureau, ca. 1910,” *Working Paper No. 648*, Levy Economics Institute of Bard College (January 2011), http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/wp_648.pdf (accessed 13 April 2015).

5. Folder “Foreigners,” box 2, Chief Statistician. Folder “I-8 Immigration and the Census,” box 148; folder “P12 Population Country of Birth,” box 150; folder “P 12 Population Group of Foreign,” box 151; folder “P-31,” box 152, *Memoranda and Notes of Joseph A. Hill 1905–1940*, Chief Statistician. Folders “Director” and “Geography,” box 1, *Office File of Joseph A. Hill, 1920–1940*. Chief Statistician. The quotation is taken from Hill’s “Scope of the Fourteenth Census,” n.d. (c. 1920). Hill revealed his anxiety about the rise of a polyglot, urban nation in “The Census—Facts and Fancies,” dated 12 March 1921, an unsigned typescript address. Folder “Papers Written by J. A. Hill,” box 4, *Miscellaneous Records of Joseph A. Hill, 1910–1940*, Chief Statistician.

6. Daniel Folkmar, *Dictionary of Races or Peoples* (Washington, D.C., 1911), 96. Folder “Indians Not Taxed 1910,” box 148. *Memoranda and Notes of Joseph A. Hill, 1905–1940*, Chief Statistician.

7. For these statistics, see Brian Gratton and Emily Klancher Merchant, “Immigration, Repatriation, Deportation: The Mexican-Origin Population in the United States, 1920 to 1950,” *International Migration Review* 47, no. 4 (December 2013): 944–75;

and Gratton and Merchant, "An Immigrant's Tale: The Mexican American Southwest, 1850 to 1950," *Social Science History* 39 (2015): 521–50.

8. Goethe's letter to Representative John N. Garner (dated 16 January 1930) was posted in U.S. Congress, House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on "Western Hemisphere Immigration," 71st Cong., 2nd sess., 29 January 1930, 165. Congressional hearings also show that employers supporting Mexican immigration used racial arguments, pointing to Mexicans' suitability as docile, nonthreatening, and temporary workers. James Slayden, "Some Observations on Mexican Immigration," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 93, no. 1 (1921): 25. Mexicans suffered substantially greater violence in Texas than in other states. See William D. Carrigan and Clive Webb, *Forgotten Dead: Mob Violence against Mexicans in the United States, 1848–1928* (New York, 2013).

9. *In re Rodriguez*, 81 F. 337 (W.D. Tex. 1897). Glenn E. Hoover, "Our Mexican Immigrants," *Foreign Affairs* 8, no. 1 (1929): 99–107. The Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 extended citizenship rights to indigenous persons born in the United States.

10. "Mexican Immigration," *New York Times*, 13 October 1929, E4. José Vasconcelos, "Raza Pura o Raza Mezclada," *La Prensa*, 13 December 1926, 3; Rodolfo Uranga, "Glosario del día," *La Prensa*, 1 November 1929, 1. The core text is Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica: Misión de la raza iberoamericana* (Paris, 1925).

11. Manuel Gamio, *Forjando patria* (1916; reprint Mexico, 1960), 98. For the "deep ties to Vasconcelos" among Mexican American leaders in the United States, see Benjamin H. Johnson, "The Cosmic Race in Texas: Racial Fusion, White Supremacy, and Civil Rights Politics," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 411. Gamio's racial ideology remains subject to debate. In "Race, Revolution, and *Indigenismo*," Alan Knight concludes that most Mexican intellectuals, including Gamio, believed to some degree in innate, biologically determined racial characteristics; *The Idea of Race in Latin America, 1870–1940*, ed. Richard Graham (Austin, 1990), 71–113. Compare Casey Walsh, "Eugenic Acculturation: Manuel Gamio, Migration Studies, and the Anthropology of Development in Mexico, 1910–1940," *Latin American Perspectives* 31, no. 5 (September 2004): 118–45; Pablo Yankelevich, *¿Deseables o inconvenientes? Las fronteras de la extranjería en el México pos-revolucionario* (Mexico City, 2011), David Fitzgerald and David Cook-Martin, *Culling the Masses: The Democratic Origins of Racist Immigration Policy in the Americas* (Cambridge, Mass.), 218–19, 233–48; and for the strongest racial view, Alexandra Stern, "Mestizofilia, biotipología y eugenesia en el México posrevolucionario: Hacia una historia de la ciencia y el estado, 1920–1960," *Relaciones* 21, no. 81 (1999): 59–91. Mara Loveman's recent treatment comes down on both sides of the fence. *National Colors: Racial Classification and the State in Latin America* (New York, 2014), 217–20.

12. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1930*, vol. II: *Population 1930: General Report, Statistics by Subjects* (Washington, D.C., 1933), 27. For enumerator instructions, see Ruggles et al., *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series*, <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/voliii/inst1940.shtml> (accessed 21 April 2015).

13. U.S. Immigration Commission member W. W. Husband recommended a two-generation race question for Europeans in 1909 testimony before the Senate, on the grounds that the third generation would assimilate. Joel Perlmann, "Race or People: Federal Race Classifications for Europeans in America, 1898–1913," *Levy Economics Institute Working Paper*, no. 320, January 2001.

14. Jennifer L. Hochschild and Brenna Marea Powell, "Racial Reorganization and the United States Census, 1850–1930: "Mulattoes, Half-breeds, Mixed Parentage, Hindoos, and the Mexican Race," *Studies in American Political Development* 22, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 59–96 (81). An example of the common use of its conclusions is Cybelle Fox and Thomas A. Guglielmo, "Blacks, Mexicans, and European Immigrants, 1890–1945," *American Journal of Sociology* 118, no. 2 (September 2012): 353. Mark Reisler, *By the Sweat of Their Brow: Mexican Immigrant Labor in the United States, 1900–1940* (Westport, Conn., 1976), 137. Anderson, *The American Census*, 156. Congressional demands might influence the bureau, but staff successfully resisted those they thought unreasonable. See the comments of the Chairman of the House Committee on the Census, the Hon. J. Hart Fenn, in "Provisions of the Census Bill," *Congressional Digest* 8, no. 2 (February 1929): 45–64, and copious archival evidence in the records of the Census Advisory Committee. See, for example, folder "Minutes Joint Advisory Committee October 18 1929," Minutes of Meetings Correspondence and Reports April 16 and 17, 1926, to October 1932. Records of the Bureau of the Census, Record Group 29.3.2, Entry 148, Administrative Records of the Bureau of the Census, Records of the Census Advisory Committee (hereafter Census Advisory Committee). See as well, U.S. Congress, "Western Hemisphere Immigration," 18–19 April 1930, and folders "67102," "67102 (Part 3)," "67102/8" "Fifteenth Census of Population," and folder "75303/26–75315/29," box 141. Record Group 40.2, General Records of the Department of Commerce, Office of the Secretary General, General Correspondence, 1903–50 (hereafter Commerce), National Archives, College Park, Md.

15. On stationery of the Office of the Chief Clerk of the Census Bureau, dated 5 February 1926. Folder "Secretary's Saturday Morning Conferences 1922–1927." Correspondence of Joseph A. Hill, 1911–32 S-Z. Chief Statistician.

16. On the Committee's history, see "Fiftieth Anniversary of Census Advisory Committee," *American Statistician* 23, no. 4 (October 1969): 20–22. Diana Lynn Magnuson reviews the committee's work in "The Making of a Modern Census: The United States Census Population, 1790–1940" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1995). Folder "Advisory Committee, 14 and 15 December 1928," "List of Topics to be Taken up with the Advisory Committee (preliminary)," Minutes of Meetings Correspondence and Reports 16 and 17 April 1926, to October 1932, Census Advisory Committee.

17. "Minutes of . . . April 21, 1934." Folder "ACMeeting, April 21, 1934," box Census Advisory Committee . . . 17–18 March 1933 to 13–14 November 1936, Census Advisory Committee.

18. Lamont's text copies a memorandum sent him by E. Dana Durand on 2 November 1929. (Durand, director of the 1910 census, served in a variety of statistical positions in the Department of Commerce). Folder "Minutes . . . JAC October 18 1929," "Minutes of Meetings Correspondence and Reports April 16 and 17, 1926 to October 1932," Census Advisory Committee.

19. John M. Nieto-Phillips, *The Language of Blood: The Making of Spanish American Identity in New Mexico, 1880s–1930s* (Albuquerque, 2004); Brian Gratton, Emily Merchant, and Myron Gutmann, "Race and Deportation: Mexicans in the 1930 and 1940 Censuses," paper delivered at meeting of the Science History Association, October 2008.

20. "Cutting Works for Box Bill," *La Estrella* (Las Cruces, N.M.), 4 May 1929, 2.

21. "¿Mexicanos o Americanos que somos?," from *El Nuevo Mexicano*, reprinted in *La Estrella*, 1 March 1930, 1, and 29 March 1930, and "En Cuanto al Censo," reprinted

in *La Estrella*, 5 April 1930, 1. “Hay que estar bien de acuerdo con los enumeradores,” *El Defensor del Pueblo*, 14 March 1930, 2. In contrast to his New Mexican colleagues, Rodolfo Uranga advised readers to report that they were Mexicans. “Glosario del día,” *La Prensa*, 1 November 1929, 1.

22. *La Prensa* reported census results on 5 August 1931 (“La población Mexicana de E. Unidos aumento ciento por ciento en diez años,” 1), describing the Mexican race classification without comment, as did *El Tucsonense* on 6 August 1931 (“Cuántos Mexicanos hay en los Estados Unidos según el censo federal,” 1). F. Arturo Rosales, “Shifting Self Perceptions and Ethnic Consciousness among Mexicans in Houston 1930–1946,” *Aztlan* 16, no. 1–2 (1985): 82–84. Beginning in 1930, the Mexican census replaced racial categories with language inquiries. Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía, <http://www.inegi.org.mx/> (accessed 23 March 2014).

23. Perales’s papers make clear his critical role in LULAC: Alonso S. Perales Papers, Courtesy of Special Collections, University of Houston Libraries (hereafter Perales Papers). Partial accounts of this transformative, controversial, and complex figure can be found in *In Defense of My People: Alonso S. Perales and the Development of Mexican-American Public Intellectuals*, ed. Michael A. Olivas (Houston, 2012); Cynthia Orozco, *No Mexicans, Women, or Dogs Allowed: The Rise of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Austin, 2009); and Perales’s *En Defensa de mi Raza* (San Antonio, 1936–37), in two volumes, or “Tomos.” Family records in folder 1, box 1, Perales Papers. For Congressional testimony, U.S. Congress, House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Hearings on “Western Hemisphere Immigration,” 71st Cong., 2nd sess., 29 January 1930, 169–70, 179–89 (Canales as “J.C. Canales”). Perales and others commonly noted the dual origins of *mestizaje* (see draft of an article dated October 1924, folder 12, box 8, Perales Papers); reference to a bronze race draws on Valconcelos’s phrase *la raza de bronce*.

24. “El censo que se levantara el mes de abril próximo dará a los mexicanos una clasificación separada,” *La Prensa*, 19 March 1930, 1. Under various titles, the piece was published widely: *El Defensor* (Edinburg, Tex.), 28 March 1930, 1; *El Heraldico Mexicano* (San Antonio), 30 March 1930, 1; *El Tucsonense*, 22 March 1930, 2. Perales’s census piece followed on the heels of articles praising his defense of persons of Mexican origin in congressional hearings. See, for example, “El Lic Perales defiende enérgicamente a los mexicanos,” *El Defensor*, 7 February 1930, 1. Schor cites a letter from Hill to Perales asking that he carry out publicity for the census, following a recommendation from Paul S. Taylor. See Schor, *Compter et Classer*, 254 and n. 36.

25. His ally and close friend, H. (Hector) T. Manuel, did warn Perales in 1931 of potential consequences. Manuel to Perales, 30 June 1931, folder 6, box 2, Perales Papers.

26. Perales to Cleofas Calleros, 10 October 1936, folder 41, box 4, Perales Papers. Perales sent similarly worded letters to John W. Brown, Texas State Health Officer and to C. K. Quin, mayor of San Antonio, on 28 November 1936: folders 9 and 32, box 4, Perales Papers. Villar made the attack in the newspaper *Mexico en el Valle*, published in Mission, Tex. Folder 24, box 1, Perales Papers; Perales’s reaction can be seen in a letter to *La Prensa* publisher Federico Allen Hinojosa, 23 October 1927, folder 9, box 4, Perales Papers.

27. Neil Foley, “Becoming Hispanic: Mexican Americans and the Faustian Pact with Whiteness,” *Reflexiones 1997*, ed. Neil Foley (Austin, 1998), 53–70. For a forthright critique of Foley’s position, see Johnson, “The Cosmic Race.” Allred’s opinion cited the seminal case *In re Rodriguez*. Perales to David Casas, 34 April 1941, folder 25, box 1, Perales Papers.

The terminology found its way into the 1943 Texas legislature's resolution asserting that "all persons of the Caucasian Race" had equal rights. Thomas A. Guglielmo, "Fighting for Caucasian Rights," *Journal of American History* 92, no. 4 (March 2006): 1212–38.

28. Machado to Perales, 27 March 1928. Folder 29, box 4, Perales Papers.

29. "La inutilidad de los consolados de facción," *El Heraldo de México*, 27 January 1921, 4. "Página Editorial," *Gráfico*, 2 October 1927, 10. "Los mexicanos en Indiana Harbor se encuentran disgustados," *La Prensa*, 14 August 1925, 12; "El Embajador Morrow enviara la protesta de los niños mexicanos a Washington," 16 May 1929, *La Prensa* (New York City), 1; "Miami odiosa distinción a nuestros compatriotas," *La Prensa*, 18 October 1929, 6. "Lockhart, Tex. Una protesta por el maltrato a los mexicanos," *La Prensa*, 14 March 1932, 8; "Galveston, Tex. Se exhiben películas mexicanas," *La Prensa*, 15 September 1935, 16; "La Protesta Presentada a Morrow," *La Prensa*, 20 May 1929, 1; "Se insiste en que no se ha hecho separación . . ." *La Prensa*, 24 May 1929, 2; "Protesta de la Unión Hispano Americana," *La Prensa*, 26 June 1939, 2. These remarks appeared side by side with protests against racial discrimination against those of Mexican origin. A graceful attempt to bridge this gap is "Las clasificaciones raciales," *La Prensa*, 15 October 1936, 3. It is noteworthy that newspapers reported hostility to *razas de color* in Mexico itself, as in that country's immigration policy: "No se permitirá la inmigración de los negros . . .," *El Heraldo de México* (Los Angeles), 9 February 1923, 3; "Restricción para que vayan Sirios, Turcos y Arabes a Méx.," *El Heraldo de México*, 26 July 1927, 4; "En Queretaro y San Luis Potosí ya no quieren más chinos," *El Heraldo de México*, 15 January 1927, 1; and "No vendrá más inmigración mexicana a este país," *El Tucsonense*, 13 January 1921, 3.

30. Anderson, *The American Census*, 180. Jan van der Tak, *Demographic Destinies: Interviews with Presidents and Secretary-Treasurers of the Population Association of America* (Population Association of America, 1991), quotation, 34.

31. Pascal Whelpton, "Population of the United States 1925 to 1975," *American Journal of Sociology* 34 (1928): 253–70. Locales, such as San Antonio, that reported Mexicans separately provided the first clues to differences. During the 1920s, the Los Angeles County Public Health Department published rates by "nationality" with Mexicans as a separate category with high rates of infant mortality and tuberculosis. See Natalia Molina, *Fit to be Citizens: Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879–1939* (Berkeley, 2006), chap. 3, esp. 92. Most public health literature emphasized socioeconomic rather than racial reasons for differences in mortality rates. Compare Benjamin Goldberg, "Tuberculosis in Racial Types with Special Reference to Mexicans," *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health* 19, no. 3 (March 1929): 274–84; to Godias J. Drolet, "Discussion," *ibid.*, 285–86; "Significance of Infant Mortality Data in Appraisal of an Urban Community," by A. D. H. Kaplan, *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health* 2, no. 10 (October 1932): 1037–49; and n.a., "Child Hygiene," *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health* 22, no. 2 (February 1932): 214–17. Despite such evidence, the secondary literature asserts that racial views dominated. See Molina, *Fit to be Citizens*, and Emily K. Abel, *Tuberculosis and the Politics of Exclusion: A History of Public Health and Migration to Los Angeles* (New Brunswick, 2008), 68. The 1930 census category promised the first separate data for the national population. Mark Ellis, "What Future for Whites? Population Projections and Racialised Imaginaries in the U.S.," *International Journal of Population Geography* 7 (2001): 213–29 (219). Warren S. Thompson, "The Field of Demography," *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation's Health* 26, no. 5 (May 1936): 499–501.

32. Edward J. Noble, Under Secretary, Department of Commerce, concluded in 1939 that “no objection was made to [racial classification] in the 1930s Census reports, either at the time these reports were issued, or for several years thereafter.” Noble to Secretary of State [Cordell Hull], 14 September 1939. Folder “67104–67104 (Part 1A),” box 141, Commerce. United States, President’s Research Committee on Social Trends, *Recent Social Trends in the United States* (New York, 1933).

33. Folder “Vital Statistics Division,” box 1, and T. T. Murphy, Chief Statistician for Vital Statistics, to Hill, folder “Vital Statistics Division,” box 3, *Office File of Joseph A. Hill, 1920–1940*, Chief Statistician. *Vital Statistics of the United States 1939*, Part 1. Prepared by Halbert L. Dunn, Chief Statistician for Vital Statistics (Washington, D.C., 1941), 2. For inaccuracy of recording, see U.S. Department of Commerce, *Mortality Statistics 1931* (Washington, D.C., 1935), 9.

34. “Minutes of . . . April 21, 1934,” folder “AC Meeting April 21, 1934,” “Census Advisory Committee . . . March 17 and 18 1933 to November 13 and 14 1936,” Census Advisory Committee. See Schor’s similar treatment of this document and additional communication between Hill and the vital statistics division, especially regarding difficulties in New Mexico, *Compter et Classer*, 255–66 n. 40.

35. Halbert L. Dunn, “Development of Vital Statistics in the Bureau of the Census,” *American Journal of Public Health and the Nation’s Health* 25, no. 12 (December 1935): 1321–26. Federal Security Agency, U.S. Public Health Service, National Office of Vital Statistics, *United States Life Tables and Actuarial Tables 1939–1941* (Washington, D.C., 1947), by Thomas N. E. Greville but under Dunn’s supervision, 104. For Dunn’s influence, see “Halbert L. Dunn,” in the official bureau history page, http://www.census.gov/history/www/census_then_now/notable_alumni/halbert_l_dunn.html (accessed 21 April 2015). Folder “V-2 Vital Statistics Coding,” box 159, *Memoranda and Notes of Joseph A. Hill, 1905–35*, Chief Statistician.

36. Cutting’s biographer shows that the senator’s sympathies, as well as the votes necessary to his success, lay in the Hispanic population. Richard Lowitt, *Bronson M. Cutting: Progressive Politician* (Albuquerque, 1992), 171–72, 213, and 323.

37. Folder “Field, 1934–1935,” box 6, Record Group 29.3.1, Records of the Bureau of the Census, Administrative Records of the Bureau of the Census 1860–1990, Records of the Office of the Director, General Records Maintained by William Lane Austin, 1922–41 (hereafter Austin), National Archives, Washington, D.C.

38. Austin to Cutting, 21 February 1935. Folder “Field, 1934–1935,” box 6, Austin.

39. Schor, *Compter et Classer*, 253–54. Such a defense had to maintain that Mexicans were not persons of color, who, under Texas and other state laws, could be or had to be segregated from whites. On this characteristically LULAC strategy, see Benjamin Marquez, *LULAC: The Evolution of a Mexican American Political Organization* (Austin, 1993), 32–33, and Craig Allen Kaplowitz, *LULAC, Mexican Americans and National Policy* (College Station, Tex., 2005). Mario García, “Mexican Americans and the Politics of Citizenship: The Case of El Paso, 1936,” *New Mexico Historical Review* 59, no. 2 (1 April 1984): 187–204.

40. “El Paso Baby Death Figure Found Highest,” *El Paso Herald-Post*, 4 June 1935, 1. “Indigent Cases Increase Death,” *El Paso Herald-Post*, 18 July 1935, 3. “Birth Record Changed,” *El Paso Herald-Post*, 5 October 1936, 2. Reaction was immediate, as can be seen in “C.C. Protests Death Record System,” *El Paso Herald-Post*, 7 October 1936, 1–2, revealing a diverse set of complainants, including the El Paso Chamber of Commerce.

The dismay over extremely high rates of infant mortality in poor sections of the city is visible well before the controversy: "E.P. Health Officer Will Advocate . . . to decrease death rate," *El Paso Herald Post*, 26 July 1933, 1; and "Multiplying Our Death Rates," *El Paso Herald-Post*, 28 July 1933, 4. Staff accounts stressed poverty and excessive birth rates as the causes, both considerably higher in the Mexican-origin population of the city. McCamant repeatedly insisted that better housing, wages, and living conditions for Mexicans were needed to reduce high death rates. "Las protestas se llevarán hasta la C. de Washington," *El Continental* (El Paso), 8 October 1936, 1. See also "El mexicano es raza de 'color,'" *El Continental*, 6 October 1936, 1.

41. Folder 10, box 4, Perales Papers. Galvan, "A Fair, True, and Unbiased Explanation of the Colored Classification," *LULAC News* 3, no. 8 (December 1936): 8–9, and see, in the same issue, Cleofas Calleros, "Facts about the 'Colored' Classification," 9–10.

42. Quin, folder 32, box 4, Perales Papers. F. I. Montemayor, 12 October 1936, to Perales from Ladies Council No. 15 of LULAC (Laredo, Tex.), box 2, folder 7, Perales Papers. Garza to Chávez, 29 October 1936, folder 48, box 1, *Series I: Correspondence. General Materials, 1923–1963. General Correspondence, 1934–1936*, Dennis Chávez Papers, Center for Southwest Research, General Library, University of New Mexico (hereafter Chávez Papers). *La Prensa* published numerous articles on the controversy in October and November 1936; Chávez's instrumental role can be seen in *El Continental*, 13 and 18 October 1936 ("Enérgica Queja del Senador Chávez . . .," 1, and "Se da fin al asunto de la clasificación . . .," 1); "Protesta de un Senador por Nuevo México," *La Prensa*, 17 October 1936, 1.

43. Folder "67103 (part 2)," box 141, Commerce. Although on leave, Roper wired Chávez on 14 October, assuring him that an investigation was under way. This folder contains the correspondence linked to Draper's and Roper's hurried telegrams of apology.

44. Folder "67103 (part 2)," box 141, Commerce. See Perales's use of this telegram in *La Prensa*, 26 November 1936: Alonso S. Perales, "La clasificación de los mexicanos como blancos," 2. For additional evidence of Maverick's attention to the Mexican American constituency (and his uneven relationship with Perales), see folder 9, box 1, and folder 1, box 5, Perales Papers. "El representante Maverick, agasado," *La Prensa*, 18 December 1936, 1, and "Hoy tendrá lugar el banquete al representante Maverick," 21 December 1936, 2. See Cynthia E. Orozco, "In Defense of My People: Alonso Perales and the Moral Construction of Citizenship," in Michael A. Olivas, ed., *In Defense of My People*. Perales described Garner as "a very good friend of our people." Perales to Roberto E. Austin, 15 March 1932, folder 9, box 4, Perales Papers.

45. Maverick to Austin, 15 October 1936. folder 23, box 1, Perales Papers. Austin replied to Maverick on 26 October, blaming local officials for racial categorization. Maverick made sure that Perales had copies of this correspondence. Maverick to Perales, 19 October 1936. Austin to Maverick, 28 October 1936. Folder 1, box 5. Quin to Perales, 2 December 1936. Folder 32, box 4, Perales Papers.

46. "Nueva protesta por el caso de McCamant," *El Continental*, 1 November 1936, 2; "La clasificación de mexicanos," *La Prensa*, 20 October 1936, 1. "Gestiones de la Embajada Mexicana en el caso de la clasificación," *La Prensa*, 2 December 1936, 1, the last referring to a subsequent controversy over Social Security forms. Perales, *En defensa de mi raza*, Tomo 2, 39.

47. Perales to Brown, 28 November 1936, folder 9, box 4. Perales to Quin, folder 32, box 4, Perales Papers. Quin replied that the Health Department had never “classified our Mexican people as colored.” The principal leader in the El Paso protest, Cleofas Calleros, was instrumental to Perales’s conversion. folder 41, box 4, Perales Papers. See also *En Defense*, Tomo 2, 41, without date, under the title “Mas Gestiones en pro de los mexicanos . . . El Represente Maverick Propone el Medio de evitar nuevos incidentes” (The article appeared in *La Prensa*, 21 October 1936, 1). Perales’s draft dated 22 January 1938 of a letter to Señorita Estelle Ripley Hudson. Folder 7, box 5, Perales Papers. For a forthright assertion of his newly minted convictions, see Perales’s letter to “The White Man’s Union Association,” of Wharton, Tex., 5 July 1937, Tomo 2, 93–94.

48. Schor cites Director of the Census to Dr. Halbert L. Dunn and a similarly emphatic message from Austin on 3 December 1936. *Compter et Classer*, 257.

49. Schor, *Compter et Classer*, 258, 338.

50. Patrick D. Lukens, *A Quiet Victory for Latino Rights: FDR and the Controversy Over “Whiteness”* (Tucson, 2012), 162–63. Mark Overmyer-Velázquez also mentions Dunn’s position in “Good Neighbors and White Mexicans: Constructing Race and Nation on the Mexico-U.S. Border,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 33, no. 1 (Fall 2013): 25–26.

51. The unsigned memorandum appears to be the work of Truesdell. Folder “Population, 1940,” box 6, Austin.

52. Folder “Census Advisory Committee 6/16/39,” “Census Advisory Committee . . . March 17 and 18 1933 to November 13 and 14 1936 [sic],” Census Advisory Committee. See Magnuson, “Making of a Modern Census,” for a general discussion (101–5); and Schor, *Compter et Classer* (256, 260), for a variant of the board’s recommendation.

53. Noble to Secretary of State [Cordell Hull], 14 September 1939. Folder “67104–67104 (Part 1A),” box 141, Commerce.

54. Secretary of State Henry Louis Stimson saw immigration restriction as serving only to “anger” Mexico and other Latin American nations. See [Stimson] to Lamont, 15 February 1930. Folder “75303/26–75315/29,” box 141, Commerce. In chaps. 3 and 4 of *A Quiet Victory*, Lukens demonstrates the State Department’s early opposition to restriction and the pro-Mexican orientation of Assistant and Under Secretary of State Sumner Wells and other State Department officials. His key argument for linkage to the race variable in the Andrade case is presented on pages 143–44; see, generally, chaps. 7 and 8. For the confusion of race and nationality in naturalization regulations, see the series by Marian L. Smith, “Race, Nationality, and Reality,” *Prologue Magazine* 34, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 91–105.

55. Folder “Advisory Committee Meeting June 16, 17, 18 1939,” Minutes of Meetings Correspondence and Reports 17–18 March 1933 to 13–14 November 1936, Census Advisory Committee.

56. After Secretary Hopkins fell seriously ill, Thorp claimed he became the unofficial director of the department. Oral History Interview with Willard L. Thorp, Amherst, Mass., 10 July 1971, by Richard D. McKinzie and Theodore A. Wilson. Harry S. Truman Library, <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/thorpw.htm> (accessed 21 April 2015). Lukens, *A Quiet Victory*, 166–67; initial and subsequent quotations from Noble are in folder 67104–67104 (Part 1A), box 141, Commerce.

57. Folder “M,” box 3, Index to correspondence 1935–38 of the Statistical Research Division, Chief Statistician.

58. Lukens, *A Small Victory*, 167–68, citing *Race Classification in the 1940 U.S. Census*. File III-411–35. Archivo Histórico de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, Mexico City. Professor Lukens has courteously provided us with copies of these archival documents.

59. Patiño's undated memorandum stated that his office received Daniels's request on 22 November, after the decision was made. Lukens concludes that the Mexican experts did not fully support the idea of a separate classification, a view with which we disagree. See Lukens, *A Small Victory*, 168–69. Gamio had, by this time, become insistent that cultural markers be used to distinguish between indigenous, mestizo, and European groups. Loveman, *National Colors*, 236–37. His memorandum indicated this preference; since it could not be carried out in the United States, a racial category would be better than no distinction.

60. Folder “67104–67104 (Part 1A),” box 141, Commerce.

61. Lukens argues reasonably that its role in the Andrade case implies that the Mexican government would have rejected a racial category. Guglielmo shows that that government lobbied strenuously for antidiscrimination and “Caucasian” rights bills in Texas in the early 1940s. See “Fighting for Caucasian Rights.”

62. “Los Mexicanos Incluidos en la Raza Blanca . . .,” *La Prensa*, 11 February 1940, 1. “En la clasificación racial del censo . . .,” *La Prensa*, 13 February 1940, 1. “La Última Barrera,” *La Prensa*, 19 February 1940, 3. Hopkins asserted that the 1930 classification had been the result of the desire of health officials for a special study of persons of Mexican origin. Overmyer-Velázquez, “Constructing Race,” finds evidence in U.S. government archives of active public protest (and support) of a separate category.

63. Folder “Census Advisory Committee, Jan. 5 and 6, 1940,” Minutes of Meetings Correspondence and Reports 18–18 March 1933 to 13–14 November 1936, Census Advisory Committee. Schor notes this document (259–60) but does not treat closely the attempt to reinstate the category.

64. “Statistics and Politics: The ‘Hispanic Issue’ in the 1980 Census,” *Demography* 23, no. 3 (August 1986): 403–18 (406). Benjamin Francis-Fallon covers this political history more sympathetically in “Minority Reports: The Emergence of Pan-Hispanic Politics” (Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University, 2012). His account demonstrates the advocacy among certain Mexican American leaders of a racial category. See chaps. 5 and 10. For a fuller account of the attempt of minority groups to increase their counts in the census, see Peter Skerry, *Counting on the Census? Race, Group Identity, and the Evasion of Politics* (Washington, D.C., 2000).

65. As David Hollinger remarks, a “race equivalent.” *PostEthnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York, 1995), 29. See Francis-Fallon, “Minority Reports,” 340.

66. A. Robbin, “Classifying racial and ethnic group data: The politics of negotiation and accommodation,” *Journal of Government Information* 27, no. 2: 129–56. Anderson discusses these lobbies in *The American Census*, chap. 10, “Census Undercount and the Politics of Counting,” esp. 230–33.

67. O. Douglas Weeks, “The Texas-Mexican and Politics of South Texas,” *American Political Science Review* 24, no. 3 (August 1930): 606–27. Rosales's “Shifting Self Perceptions” most eloquently describes the shift of perspectives between the generations.

68. Mark Ellis, “What Future for Whites?” 216; Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States* (New York, 1994).

69. Clara Rodríguez, *Changing Race: Latinos, the Census, and the History of Ethnicity* (New York, 2000). For results in the 2010 census, see <http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0102/twps0102.pdf> (accessed 21 April 2015). For the new, combined variable, see <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/03/14/u-s-census-looking-at-big-changes-in-how-it-asks-about-race-and-ethnicity/> (accessed 21 April 2015). Kenneth Prewitt discusses this potential variable in *What Is Your Race? The Census and Our Flawed Efforts to Classify Americans* (Princeton, 2013), 174–76, 201–7.